

four to two, it would also be known that the four belonged to the Labour Party. That is the weakness which I put to the Standing Orders Committee, though I did not raise sufficient objection to warrant my submitting a minority report.

Hon. H. L. ROCHE: I agree substantially with Mr. Craig. If we accept the amendment to the Standing Orders we have to face the position that there could be a majority in this Chamber adamant on some amendment, but it is quite probable that that majority in this House would have only two members at the managers' conference. I think I am right in saying that this place has had decided views on matters on occasion, and has had no adamant support from another place, or any political section.

The position is that though it wished to insist on some amendment, the will of this Chamber could be ignored owing to the constitution of the conference. Serious consideration should be given to this amendment before it is agreed to. It is a matter for regret that we have been called upon to decide this issue, in view of the number of members absent through one cause or another. I am not blaming anyone, but it would be better if the matter could be held over until more members can be present.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: I was going to suggest the same before Mr. Craig rose. This is a matter to which members should give serious consideration before casting a vote, and I was going to propose that the debate be adjourned so as to allow members to study the amendment and think over the complications that could arise. We should give a considered and not a snap decision.

Progress reported.

House adjourned at 11.21 p.m.

Legislative Assembly

Wednesday, 17th November, 1954.

CONTENTS.

	Page
Questions : Transport, as to power for trolley-bus loads	3001
Pig Iron, (a) as to Wundowie and B.H.P. supplies	3002
(b) as to request to B.H.P.	3002
(c) as to ensuring equal treatment for State	3002
Water supplies, as to Wadderin Dam, Kondinin and Corrigin connections	3002
Claremont Mental Hospital, as to provision of additional accommodation	3002
Motion : Air Beef Pty., Ltd., as to continuance of Government subsidy	3005
Bills : Canning Lands Revestment, 1r.	3003
Petroleum Act Amendment, 1r.	3003
Dried Fruits Act Amendment, 3r.	3003
Parks and Reserves Act Amendment, 2r.	3003
Married Women's Protection Act Amendment, Council's amendments	3003
Fauna Protection Act Amendment, returned	3005
Supply (No. 2), £15,000,000, returned	3005
Dog Act Amendment, 2r.	3008
Pharmacy and Poisons Act Amendment, 2r., Com.	3010
Betting Control, Com.	3011

The SPEAKER took the Chair at 7.30 p.m., and read prayers.

QUESTIONS.

TRANSPORT.

As to Power for Trolley-Bus Loads.

Mr. JOHNSON asked the Minister for Railways:

(1) Is he aware that at peak periods the trolley-buses on the Reserve-st., Floreat Park and Mt. Hawthorn routes do not always have sufficient power to proceed with the loads carried?

(2) Are steps being taken to improve this situation?

The MINISTER replied:

(1) Wembley districts—Yes.

Mt. Hawthorn—No.

(2) An additional power line will shortly be installed to serve the extension along Grantham-st. This will serve as a temporary relief until a new traction substation is erected.

PIG IRON.

(a) *As to Wundowie and B.H.P. Supplies.*

Hon. A. V. R. ABBOTT asked the Minister for Industrial Development:

(1) Are the respective prices charged for pig iron by Wundowie and the Broken Hill Proprietary Co., as follows:—

	Wundowie Grade Silicon.	Nearest B.H.P. Grade Silicon.	Wundowie Price ex Wundowie.	B.H.P. Price C.I.F.
			£ s. d.	£ s. d.
White Iron	0.25-0.5	0.3-0.6	19 12 6	18 7 6
Chilling	0.5-0.75	0.75-1.24	19 12 6	18 7 6
Standard 1	0.75-1.25	0.75-1.24	19 12 6	18 7 6
Standard 2	1.25-1.75	1.25-1.75	19 12 6	18 7 6
Standard 3	1.75-2.25	1.75-2.25	19 12 6	18 10 0
Foundry 2	2.25-2.75	2.25-2.75	20 12 6	18 12 6
Foundry 3	2.75-3.25	SS 1 2.75-3.50	23 5 0	18 15 0

(2) If the respective prices are not accurate, what are the prices charged respectively?

(3) Is it a fact that the Broken Hill Proprietary Co. does not make pig iron available or sell it in Western Australia?

(4) Will the Government request B.H.P. Pty. Co. to do so on conditions similar to those applying in other capital cities?

The MINISTER replied:

(1) The prices quoted for Wundowie pig iron are correct, but it is understood that the Broken Hill Proprietary prices are at least 30 per cent. higher than quoted.

(2) Answered by No. (1).

(3) Not known.

(4) No. Local foundries are at liberty to make their own arrangements for supplies from sources of their own choosing.

(b) *As to Request to B.H.P.*

Hon. A. V. R. ABBOTT (without notice) asked the Minister for Industrial Development:

(1) Is he aware that there exists on the Government files a request to B.H.P. not to sell pig iron in Western Australia?

(2) Is the Government willing to have that request rescinded?

The MINISTER replied:

The hon. member asked me that question some time ago, and I informed him that I was not aware of such a request and had not been able to find that it was on the file.

(c) *As to Ensuring Equal Treatment for State.*

Hon. A. V. R. ABBOTT (without notice) asked the Minister for Industrial Development:

Is he prepared to investigate the matter, because it is on the file, and will he request that similar treatment be given to Western Australia as is given to the other States?

The MINISTER replied:

I will further examine the file.

WATER SUPPLIES.

As to Wadderin Dam, Kondinin and Corrigin Connections.

Mr. PERKINS asked the Minister for Water Supplies:

(1) When is it expected that the pipeline connecting the Goldfields water supply with Wadderin Dam will be completed?

(2) How much further towards Kondinin will funds already allocated permit the pipeline to be extended?

(3) How much more money needs to be allocated to enable the pipeline to be extended to Kondinin and Corrigin?

(4) How soon is it expected that the G.W.S. will be connected to Kondinin and Corrigin?

The PREMIER (for the Minister for Water Supplies) replied:

(1) Connection to the Narembreen reticulation system will be effected by the end of January, 1955.

(2) No further.

(3) The pipeline to Kondinin will require approximately £125,000 of State funds and £125,000 of Commonwealth funds. Supply to Corrigin will cost approximately £100,000 of State funds for pipeline, reticulation, etc.

(4) It is expected that Kondinin will be connected in time to supply 1956-1957 summer requirements. The supply to Corrigin will be made as soon as possible after the completion of the comprehensive scheme.

CLAREMONT MENTAL HOSPITAL.

As to Provision of Additional Accommodation.

Mr. HUTCHINSON asked the Minister for Health:

(1) Is it a fact that there is an urgent need either for—

(a) substantial additions to the Claremont Mental Home; or

- (b) additional accommodation for the mentally sick to be provided on a different site?

(2) If so, which of the two above-mentioned courses does the Government propose to carry out?

(3) If action is to be taken along the lines suggested in paragraph (a) of No. (1), when is it proposed to commence the additions?

(4) If accommodation is to be provided elsewhere, has a site been selected; and if so, where?

The MINISTER replied:

(1) Additions are necessary at Claremont and a new institution is also required.

(2) Both.

(3) The first additions will be to Lemnos. Tenders will be called shortly. Other steps will be taken progressively.

(4) A site has not been finally selected but one is under consideration.

BILLS (2)—FIRST READING.

- 1, Canning Lands Revestment.
Introduced by the Minister for Lands.
- 2, Petroleum Act Amendment.
Introduced by the Minister for Mines.

BILL—DRIED FRUITS ACT AMENDMENT.

Read a third time and transmitted to the Council.

BILL—PARKS AND RESERVES ACT AMENDMENT.

Second Reading.

MR. LAPHAM (North Perth) [7.42] in moving the second reading said: This Bill seeks to amend the Parks and Reserves Act, 1895-1947, by adding a new subsection—Subsection (3)—to Section 5. Its purpose is to shift the responsibility of deciding whether any new structures should be erected in or arrangements entered into in relation to the King's Park reserve, from the King's Park Board to both Houses of Parliament.

I am particularly concerned that the decision should be made by Parliament in relation to the question of the establishment of an aquatic centre, or any other structure which may be used by members of the public on payment of a fee, in King's Park. I feel that the responsibility is at the moment unfairly placed as it is a very big step for any board to have to take, involving as it does a change in the principle that has so far obtained in regard to King's Park.

Probably, I do not need to remind members that the park itself is irreplaceable. Once any part of it is used for such a purpose there is not much chance of its ever reverting to the natural state, and especially when a structure such as an aquatic centre is placed upon it. Today Kink's Park is covered with the natural flora indigenous to this State. Its wildflowers are gracious and its shrubs and trees are things of beauty. Possibly the economist does not reckon on wildflowers in a park as a source of wealth, but that is all the worse for the economist.

To my mind beauty enriches and is therefore a source of wealth and should consequently be preserved. It can never be measured in £ s. d., but nevertheless it is something which brings pleasure to the eye and therefore to the mind. The Parks and Reserves Act now provides that a board may, among other things, otherwise improve or ornament such parks and reserves and do all such things as are calculated to adapt such parks and reserves to the purposes of public recreation, health and enjoyment.

Members will see that that is a great responsibility and gives embracing authority. It empowers the board to do practically anything at all in relation to the park as long as it has for its purpose public recreation. What constitutes public recreation is, of course, purely a matter of opinion. The King's Park Board is fully cognisant of its authority under the Act. In its by-laws, approved by His Honour the Lieutenant Governor on the 18th June, 1943, we find By-law No. 2 which reads—

The park shall be open to the public continually but the board may close any road or footpath in the park or any other part or parts of the park for any period for any purpose and any time.

That is a wide power and gives the board authority to do practically anything it likes in regard to the closure of certain sections of the park. By-law No. 16 grants authority to the board to give permission to any person authorised in writing by the board to make an erection or obstruction of any kind whatsoever or to make an enclosure of any kind.

Furthermore, By-law 12 gives the board authority to allow any person authorised in writing by it to solicit, or gather, money or place any other thing in the park for hire. Therefore, it appears to me that the King's Park Board has complete power in regard to the control over the reserve because its by-laws are framed to conform to the Act which confers those powers upon it. I mention these by-laws merely because some members may have a wrong idea that the King's Park Board has not the authority to erect an aquatic centre without the approval of Parliament.

It appears that quite recently the board was asked to make a decision in regard to the future of King's Park and from what I gather, it has done so. I have here an extract from "The West Australian," dated the 22nd September, 1954, which reads—

OLYMPIC POOL MAY BE BUILT IN PARK.

The King's Park Board has agreed in principle to the establishment of an aquatic centre and Olympic pool in King's Park.

This decision was made at the board's last meeting.

Permission was given for the Perth City Council formally to submit plans and specifications to the board for consideration.

The president (Sir Thomas Meagher) said yesterday that the board's decision did not bind it to the establishment of an Olympic pool in King's Park.

It merely gave the council the authority to go ahead and prepare plans and specifications for the board's consideration.

The proposed site for the pool is between Thomas-street and the area now leased by Hale School.

Accepting the Press report as being correct, it is evident that the King's Park Board has agreed in principle at least to this proposal and has asked the Perth City Council to submit plans and specifications for its approval. I feel I am entitled to assume that if these plans and specifications meet with the board's approval, it will then agree to the partition of the area under its control for the purpose of placing thereon an aquatic centre. I do not know how difficult it was for the board to arrive at that decision. The Act provides that it could have been made by a sub-committee, because Section 6 of the Act confers on the board, in effect, the right to delegate its full powers to a sub-committee.

Hon. A. V. R. Abbott: Has not the Government the right to veto at any time?

Mr. LAPHAM: So far as I can see, it has no authority.

Hon. A. V. R. Abbott: Members of the board are only managers for the Government. They are not a body corporate.

Mr. LAPHAM: I feel that such a decision by the board should not be hastily made and as much publicity as possible should be given to the proposal before any agreement is reached. The only knowledge that I have is that there is a tentative suggestion to set aside a part of King's Park for the establishment of an aquatic centre. I think that if a decision is to be

made on this suggested proposal, it should be arrived at by the highest authority in the State, which would be Parliament.

In my opinion, the establishment of an aquatic centre in King's Park would represent a complete departure from the generally accepted principle, which is upheld by the members of the public, rightly or wrongly, that it is a reserve that should be retained in its natural state to depict the Western Australian bushland. King's Park represents something of which the people of this State are intensely proud. It is the only park of its kind in the world. It attracts visitors from all countries and it is renowned for its natural beauty.

Overseas visitors have openly expressed admiration of the foresight and statesmanship shown by the founders of such a reserve. Many who are not residents of this State are envious of our King's Park because such a reserve does not exist in their own State or country. They have their swimming pools and their bridges. Perhaps they have a host of other beauty spots, but they have none to equal King's Park. Beauty lovers enthuse over the wealth of beauty that abounds in King's Park such as its kangaroo paws; its orchids and flowering gums and they also regard the site as being ideal. It has given delight to the eye of man for many years and it should be retained for such a purpose in the future.

I must admit that there are far too many trees, shrubs and other flora in the park which are not indigenous to this State. The native flora unfortunately, has been replaced by many botanical importations. Nevertheless, I feel that it would be sacrilege and an act of vandalism to agree that this heritage of the State should be whittled away by a partial partition, no matter how small. If members will give this measure serious consideration, they will agree with me, because King's Park has been set aside for a specific purpose and it must be admitted that it should be retained in its natural state.

The idea has grown in the mind of the public that it should be preserved to depict Western Australian bushland, and I consider that that is how the administrators of the park should look at the position with a far-seeing eye. To allow our King's Park to be used for any purpose other than that of a park, would set a precedent which would culminate in its beauty being destroyed. I am irrevocably opposed to this proposal. Annexations have been made in the past, but this Bill does not interfere in any way with them. It seeks only to prevent the repetition of such mistakes being made without the approval of both Houses of Parliament.

I understand that in 1897 portion of the park was granted to Hale School in exchange for the present Observatory site, while in 1899 the King's Park Tennis Club was granted a section and similarly, in 1903, the King's Park Bowling Club also had a portion reserved for its use. Apart from those excisions, there has been no partition since. Therefore, I feel that it would be a retrograde step in 1954 if this House or any future Governments were to allow this heritage to be used for the establishment of a scheme other than that which the public feel it should be used for.

In these circumstances, I seek endorsement of a clause in the Bill to provide that both Houses of the Legislature must agree before any partition of this reserve can take place. I seek it not because of any thought that a greater or lesser degree of competency exists in Parliament, in comparison with that applicable to boards. But knowing the functional safeguards which exist from the time when leave is sought to introduce a Bill to the time it becomes a statute, and knowing the publicity which is given to it, combined with the opportunity of the public to voice its opinion, I am satisfied that by such means no drastic alterations can be effected without the approval of the general public.

To my mind, members of this Parliament have a sacred trust to hold King's Park in its natural state, intact for posterity. If members will cast their minds back 15 years they will realise that adjacent to Perth was quite a considerable area of bushland, but today we find that the natural bushland is rapidly being taken up. I am prepared to wager that in 50 years' time, we shall have to go a very long way from the metropolitan area to find any bushland. In 50 years' time the people will thank every member of this House for disallowing any further partition of King's Park for any purpose.

After all, many good reasons could be given why a medical school, a hospital or even an Olympic swimming pool should be built there, but the fundamental principle underlying the creation of the park should never be altered. Of course, these are my views and the Bill does not bind any member to them. It only provides for the legislative Chambers of this State to accept the responsibility for any alteration to the basic principles of preserving this land as park land. I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

On motion by the Minister for Lands, debate adjourned.

BILLS (3)—RETURNED.

1, Married Women's Protection Act Amendment.

With amendments.

2, Fauna Protection Act Amendment.

3, Supply (No. 2), £15,000,000. Without amendment.

MOTION—AIR BEEF PTY. LTD.

As to Continuance of Government Subsidy.

Debate resumed from the 10th November on the following motion by Mr. Court:—

That, in the opinion of this House, the Government should continue the assistance to Air-Beef Pty. Ltd. by relieving the company of charges from the Wyndham Meat Works in excess of 1.2 pence per lb. (or the adjusted charge under the formula) or at least enter into an arrangement to taper off assistance over an agreed period of years.

MR. JOHNSON (Leederville) [8.5]: I do not wish to prolong this debate except to make a few short observations. The experiment, which has been described as Air Beef Pty. Ltd., has been quite useful. As was stated in this House, it has aroused a great deal of interest and it has been of great value. That value is in the test which the scheme has given to a theory. The theory, as expounded by the mover of the motion, was that air transport of beef from inland killing centres to external ports of delivery was of benefit to the cattle industry and to the State.

The scheme has had a very fair testing period; that is what it should have had. To extend what has been purely an experiment beyond the period of test, would, of course, be unsound unless there were further extensions of the experiment taking place. However, we have no record of any current or, for that matter, recent changes in either the theory or practice of this experiment. It has been proved, and I think quite successfully, that beasts can be killed inland and transported to the coast effectively. The mechanics, the economics and the finance of the scheme have been shown.

The air companies have had a great deal of assistance in testing their theory. They have been underwritten during the period of test. Although this undertaking is called Air Beef Pty. Ltd., according to the list of shareholders supplied by the mover of the motion, of approximately 16,000 shares issued, 13,000 are held by the airlines. It must be to the great interest of the airlines to prove this theory. Had it been a fact that the experiment was a success, I think we would have seen a reversal of the conditions which have been revealed.

Mr. Hutchinson: Has it been a failure?

Mr. JOHNSON: This motion was introduced by a member of a city constituency who is regarded by at least members on

this side of the House, as the spokesman for the financial interests of St. George's Terrace.

Hon. A. V. R. Abbott: Have you a right to speak for the Government?

Mr. JOHNSON: I have a right to speak for myself and for some members on the back-bench.

Mr. Hutchinson: Just because the mover represents a city constituency, it does not mean that he cannot interest himself in other parts of the State.

Mr. JOHNSON: I agree. I do not contend that he should not take an interest in the other parts of the State. Had the scheme been a success, we would not have seen the motion being moved by the member for Nedlands whom I, at least, regard as the mouthpiece of big business.

Mr. Court: You have no right to say that. It is not true.

Mr. JOHNSON: I do say it.

Hon. A. V. R. Abbott: It is not correct either. He represents Nedlands. Do you represent the commos?

Mr. JOHNSON: Am I entitled, Mr. Speaker, to ask for a withdrawal of that interjection?

Mr. SPEAKER: If the hon. member considers the comment offensive he can demand a withdrawal.

Mr. JOHNSON: I certainly consider it most offensive and I would very much like a withdrawal.

Hon. A. V. R. Abbott: I merely asked a question whether the hon. member represents the commos.

Mr. SPEAKER: The member for Leeder-ville has considered it to be offensive.

Hon. A. V. R. Abbott: In that case I withdraw it.

Mr. Oldfield: You know he is a sensitive type, and you should not say these things!

Mr. JOHNSON: Furthermore, an apology for the inference contained in that question would come quite well when we leave the Chamber. Privately, I think it should be given because I understand the implication behind the question. If the member was honest, he would not have implied the intended smear which came with the question.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! The hon. member had better continue with the motion.

Mr. JOHNSON: The point which I wish to make and to which I refer again, even though I am told it is inaccurate, which it is not, is that this motion was introduced by a member of a city constituency whom I regard as the mouthpiece of big business interests because he speaks with their tongue. I do not know whether he has been instructed by them, but he certainly thinks their thoughts.

Mr. Oldfield: At least he does think.

Mr. JOHNSON: And the hon. member should admire him for that. There is also an inference in that remark, but I do not think I shall be called on to withdraw it.

Mr. Oldfield: I am not as small as you are.

Mr. JOHNSON: Had the scheme been a success, we would not have seen this motion introduced by the member for Nedlands opposed by the member for the district most directly concerned. Had it been the outstanding success which everybody wished at the time of its inception, this motion would have come forward in another way and it would have been introduced by the member for the district concerned.

Mr. Court: In what way has the scheme failed?

Mr. JOHNSON: It has failed because it has been proved quite accurately that it does not pay.

Mr. Court: I do not think you are quite right.

Mr. Oldfield: The railways do not pay, but you do not suggest closing them down.

Mr. JOHNSON: There is an official publication by the company concerned, and every member has been supplied with a copy.

Mr. Oldfield: You would not suggest closing down the railways because they do not pay.

Mr. JOHNSON: I am now speaking about air transport of beef.

Mr. Oldfield: You have not answered my question.

Mr. JOHNSON: The air beef company in its publication has a good deal to say about these points. If some of them are accurate, they have it in their own hands to make it pay. On page 46 of this booklet appears the following:—

As the scheme becomes an established function, so much can be done to effect economies which could reduce the present cost by 25 per cent.

A 25 per cent. saving would more than cover the subsidy which the firm is seeking through the mouth of the member for Nedlands.

Mr. Court: That is the reason why the firm needs the subsidy—in order that it may reach the stage of development where a subsidy is no longer a factor.

Mr. Hutchinson: He ignores that.

Mr. Oldfield: He does not understand.

Mr. JOHNSON: If that is the attitude, how long does the firm want? I have an idea that it has had seven years.

Mr. Court: Another two years.

Mr. JOHNSON: Did not Jacob serve seven years? Is that not long enough?

Mr. Court: Your own Premier said five years. The firm has asked for another two years; and two of the years it had were very severe drought years.

Mr. JOHNSON: That is part of the experiment, or it should be.

Hon. A. V. R. Abbott: There are other industries much more heavily subsidised.

Mr. Oldfield: The Premier helped Chamberlain Industries to a great extent.

Mr. JOHNSON: And those people have been helped.

Mr. Oldfield: You do not believe in private enterprise, do you?

Mr. JOHNSON: I do not. But the people who preach it should be consistent, and they should not do what is being done now. They should not preach the socialisation of losses and the individualisation of profits. These people are not prepared to take a risk. They want the Government to do so. If the experiment is a good one, they should be prepared to take a risk, if they have any enterprise.

Mr. Court: They have taken a great risk.

Mr. JOHNSON: They have not lost a penny; they have been subsidised. There are a couple of points in this booklet which are of interest, though they are perhaps not completely germane to the trend of my argument. I will mention them because I have the book in my hands. I only wish the member for Moore were here so that he could hear this. On page 54, we read—

In comparing the relative costs of air and surface transport, it is usual to ignore the hidden Government subsidies to surface transport, in the shape of capital cost of construction, the annual interest thereon and the substantial annual maintenance costs.

On page 59 appears the following:—

It is this ready acceptance of indirect subsidy to rail and road transport which conveys the general impression that they are basically more economical than air. The user never pays the full costs.

And reverting to page 52, we read—

Air transport must be subsidised.

I must concede most willingly that the experiment has a great deal of value. It has proved that, given the right circumstances, there is a future for the air transport of country-killed meat to distributing centres. It would appear to me—as perhaps nothing more than a casual observer—that one of the things required is a series of centres which would give to the transporting body a full 12 months of work. The killing season in the Kimberleys, during which this transport is undertaken, is only short.

If the experiment is to be a success, it would appear that the company should develop a further killing centre, based, possibly at Kalgoorlie or somewhere in that lower region; and that there should be a third centre based at Esperance, where the killing season would be at a different period. It seems to be an economic necessity, if a conception such as this is to be made to pay, that the transport body should have a full year's work.

It also appears to be necessary that the service should be made available to a wider range of suppliers than is the case with the current experiment. Once again, as a more or less casual observer, I feel that some experiment in the form of a quick and easily transportable killing floor, or some kind of freezing plant which could be put down rapidly, or at least cheaply, at any place where there are cattle to be killed, is a necessity. I understand that a parallel experiment is taking place in the dairying industry, whereby milking machines are being transported to cows instead of the animals being taken to the machines. I do not know whether that experiment has reached the stage where it could be called a success; but I know that some figures have been collated in connection with the matter; and one which did stick in my mind when I read of the experiment was to the effect that the yield per cow was averaging slightly higher.

I want to refer to the contention that one of the objectives of the air beef experiment was to weed out and kill, and sell to the public, scrubbers and low-grade stock which it is claimed could not get to the killing centres. It has also been stated that the subsidy paid to suppliers is given only to those who provide first-quality beef. Unless I have misunderstood the position, there is a grave contradiction in those two statements.

Mr. Court: That is not quite the position. The second supplementary payment is made only in respect of export quality cattle. That is not necessarily the subsidy.

Mr. JOHNSON: Possibly I misunderstood the reference; but it appeared to me to be a contradiction. It seemed that the two conceptions of weeding out weak and bad stock and encouraging the production of good stock cut across each other. What the situation is, I do not follow.

Mr. Court: Do you not think that the two are complementary? One object is to get rid of low-grade stock so that eventually the whole herd will be improved.

Mr. JOHNSON: I follow that point and approve of it, and also of the idea of encouraging the provision of high-grade supplies. But it does not appear to me to be automatic that a payment

to one section of the suppliers would produce a further supply of the other type of product.

Mr. COURT: They are not after low-grade cattle in the long-term plan. I think you have lost sight of the fact that this is a long-term plan, and that eventually they want a herd of superior quality.

Mr. JOHNSON: It looks to me very much as though the long-term and short-term plans are at variance. But there may be some weakness in my comprehension of the argument put forward. However, there are two major points on which I rose to speak. The first was that the hon. member who raised this question is not one who represents the cattle-producing areas, but one who represents a city constituency, and who has at least an inclination to consider the interests of the financial people in the Terrace.

The second point is that this cry from believers in private enterprise for assistance from the Government is a very serious contradiction. It is something which could come quite decently and honestly from believers in Government enterprise, but which no supporters of private enterprise can decently produce. They cannot honestly apply for Government assistance in an experiment designed to prove whether their ideas are good or not.

Mr. COURT: You have missed the main point of this proposition altogether. I am not interested in the shareholders of Air Beef Pty. Ltd. I am interested in the industry of cattle-raising in the Kimberleys.

Mr. JOHNSON: The only answer I can make to that interjection is that it is apparent that the only people who really benefit from this are the owners of the station at which the scheme operates, and perhaps those in its immediate neighbourhood—though on that point I am open to correction—and, most particularly, the airlines.

Mr. COURT: That is not fair comment. They do not get a dividend out of this company, and they are on unpayable freights.

Mr. MANNING: What about the consumers at Leederville? Do they not benefit?

Mr. JOHNSON: Not at all. They pay the subsidy along with the other people of the State, and the meat is no cheaper. I imagine it is not good quality meat, either, if the scrubbers have been utilised. I would sooner have meat from Harvey.

Mr. OLDFIELD: Obviously you do not want to see this great country of ours develop.

Mr. JOHNSON: I do not want to see Government money wasted on an uneconomic enterprise.

Mr. COURT: Do you want the Wyndham Meat Works to close?

Mr. NORTON: I move—

That the debate be adjourned.

Motion put and a division called for.

Mr. SPEAKER: Ring the bells.

Mr. HUTCHINSON: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, was there not only one voice calling for a division?

Mr. SPEAKER: There were plenty of voices.

Division taken with the following result:—

Ayes	22
Noes	21
Majority for	1

Ayes.

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

(Teller.)

Noes.

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

(Teller.)

Pairs.

Ayes.	Noes.
Mr. Guthrie	Mr. Ackland
Mr. Tonkin	Mr. Hill
Mr. Kelly	Mr. Yates

Motion thus passed.

Debate adjourned.

BILL—DOG ACT AMENDMENT.

Second Reading.

MR. RHATIGAN (Kimberley) [8.32] in moving the second reading said: This Bill was introduced in the Legislative Council by Hon. C. W. D. Barker, and he should be commended for bringing it forward. In dealing with the measure, it may be necessary for me to mention dogs and bitches, but I shall not be referring to any living person. As a result of the damage which dogs are doing all over the State, it is essential to try to maintain some control over them.

Considerable damage is being done on the sheep and cattle stations in the northern parts of the State by wild dogs, and domestic dogs that have gone wild. Members representing northern districts have

received quite a number of letters from pastoralists and road boards asking that some action be taken to control the dogs which they claim are quite out of control. There is no need for me to tell members of the destruction which can be, and is being done, by dogs, both dingoes and domestic dogs that have gone wild. I have here photographs of sheep that have been dealt with by dogs, and they are available to hon. members, if they care to see them.

The Agriculture Protection Board is doing an excellent job in the destruction of dingoes, both with doggers who are scattered through the outback, and by the aerial baiting scheme, but the way the Act is at the moment, the board's job is being made doubly hard. By the amendment proposed in the Bill we hope to ease the position. The board has sufficient to do to deal with the wild dingo, which lives and breeds in the most inaccessible places, without our adding to its difficulties by letting domestic dogs go wild and breed with dingoes and cause destruction. The total number of scalps on which the bounty has been paid is 33,022; and I suppose it would be safe to say that 50 per cent. would be scalps of domestic dogs that had gone wild.

For the purposes of the department, the State is separated into divisions, and the figures relating to the destruction of dogs in the different divisions are as follows:—

Division	1951-52	1952-53	1953-54
Metropolitan	—	—	—
Northern Agricultural	80	149	66
South West—			
South West subdivision	92	143	79
Great Southern sub- division	107	124	106
Eastern Goldfields	477	1107	512
Northern Goldfields	2220	2215	1904

The North-West is divided into subdivisions. The north-western subdivision extends from Carnarvon to a boundary south of Port Hedland; the southern subdivision covers the country around Nullagine, Marble Bar and Port Hedland; and the northern subdivision takes in Wyndham, Hall's Creek and the West Kimberley road districts. The figures for those subdivisions are as follows:—

Division	1951-52	1952-53	1953-54
North Western	1481	934	1298
Northern—			
Southern subdivision	672	522	837
Northern—			
Northern subdivision	6739	5680	5388

These figures give an indication of the widespread menace of the dogs. During the 29 years in which the department has been operating, it has paid in bounties for scalps the sum of £382,539. To this amount must also be added the salaries of those employed by the department. This figure amounted to £177,504 for wages, etc.,

paid to trappers. The number of inspectors and doggers employed by the department is as follows:—

Division	Inspectors	Doggers
Agricultural	1	12
Goldfields	1	5
North West	1	9
Kimberley	1	4

So we can see that every effort has been made by the department to keep this menace under control, but unfortunately it is increasing greatly. One of the causes of this increase is the vast number of dogs which natives have in their camps, and which are breeding. Section 29 of the Dog Act provides—

Any adult male aboriginal native may register one male dog free of charge, the collar and disc for which shall be supplied free of charge by the registering authority, but such dog shall be kept free from mange or other contagious disease. Upon representation being made by any person to a justice of the peace that such dog is a dangerous dog or is liable to spread disease by reason of its neglected state, the justice may order the destruction of the dog.

Whenever the number of dogs found in the possession of one or more natives shall be in excess of the number of adult natives in such party, such dog or dogs in excess, except such of the said dogs as are duly registered shall be liable to be destroyed, and all police officers and constables are hereby authorised to destroy the same.

When that provision was put in the Act, it was undoubtedly necessary for natives to have at least one dog, but now there are very few natives who are not in contact with some form of civilisation, so they do not need to have dogs for hunting as they did in the old days. The natives are either employed on stations, where they are maintained, or they are supported by missions. The trouble is that the natives are registering their dogs; that is, they have one dog registered free, as they are entitled to under the Act, and, in addition, they may register, and are registering, another half dozen.

Anyone who knows a native is aware that he is far from prone to kill a litter of pups or to kill a dog at all. Even to put a dog out of its misery seems to be against his ideas. He would sooner see a dog starve to death than hit it on the head. Nowadays, when natives leave the stations in the North, they invariably travel by motorcar or plane, and, in consequence, they leave their dogs behind, with the result that they go bush and commence killing calves and sheep on stations. So, by amending this section of the Act, we shall be doing the dogs and the natives a good turn.

I am sympathetic to the native in respect to his need to have a dog, but, as things are at present, frequently the native, in order to provide for his dog, goes without himself. The dogs often do not get sufficient to eat, and, as a consequence, they roam the paddocks at night and kill the stock. As they get a taste of the blood of the sheep, so there is a tendency for them to go bush and mix with the dingoes, with the result that the problem is getting right out of hand. During the past few years, vast sums have been spent on aerial baiting in the north, as follows:—

Areas	1951-52	1952-53	1953-54
	£	£	£
Northern	7675	6224	12,856
South Eastern	—	330	499

It can be seen, therefore, that the department is not neglecting its efforts to control the dingo. The purpose of the Bill is to render some assistance by restricting the number of dogs a native is permitted to have. The proposal is to increase registration fees for dogs in an effort to control their numbers. The purpose of the Bill is quite obvious, and I do not think there is any need for me to stress further what it seeks to do. Members on both sides of the House must realise what a menace uncontrolled dogs are in any part of the State. I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

On motion by the Minister for Housing, debate adjourned.

BILL—PHARMACY AND POISONS ACT AMENDMENT.

Second Reading.

MR. MOIR (Boulder) [8.45] in moving the second reading said: This Bill was introduced in another place by Hon. R. J. Boylen, who is a qualified pharmaceutical chemist. It is considered that the Act should be amended in order to tighten up a loophole that has existed. I understand that both the British Medical Association and the Pharmaceutical Council have given their blessing to this amendment. It is only a short Bill and I will endeavour to be as short as I possibly can in giving an explanation of its purpose. Section 44 of the Act restricts the ownership of a pharmacy to—

- (a) A pharmaceutical chemist.
- (b) A friendly society.
- (c) A medical practitioner, except such persons or companies as were operating a pharmacy when the Act was amended in 1937.

The latter part applies to such pharmacies as are conducted by Boans and Foy & Gibsons, and doctors who were formerly pharmaceutical chemists. It has come to the notice of the Pharmaceutical

Council that a doctor who, as far as has been ascertained, has never been registered as a pharmaceutical chemist, intends to open a pharmacy in the metropolitan area and conduct it in addition to his medical practice. This is considered to be unethical and undesirable from the viewpoint of both professions and certainly not in the public interest. It is admitted, by people who are conversant with the position, that in some areas where the services of a pharmaceutical chemist are not available, it is necessary for a doctor to supply medicines to patients, and that is provided for in the Bill.

Pharmaceutical chemists have to undergo a fairly lengthy training. I believe they serve a four-year apprenticeship and then have to gain experience before they are registered by the board. On the other hand, while a medical student would have a certain amount of training in pharmacy during his medical course, it would be for only a very short period in comparison and it is obvious that a medical practitioner would not be a qualified pharmacist. The practice of a doctor owning and operating a pharmacy is considered by the B.M.A. to be unethical. If any doctor did establish himself in such a business, it would be against the ethics of his association and it is felt that he would not have much regard for ethics in other directions.

The Pharmaceutical Council has consulted the B.M.A. and has obtained its agreement to the amendment in this measure. It is considered that this Bill is necessary because—

- (a) The public should have the right of free choice of chemist. In the case of a doctor owning a pharmacy, he would be subject to the temptation of writing prescriptions in cipher, which would not be understood by other chemists, thereby compelling the patient to obtain the medicine from one pharmacy.
- (b) The doctor would be tempted to unnecessary or expensive prescribing if he were in a position to secure profit from the prescription as well as his fee for medical service. In short, patients would be likely to be given a prescription whether necessary or otherwise. The disregard of medical ethics already referred to makes this a very real possibility.
- (c) In ordinary practice the chemist frequently detects overdoses and incompatibilities in prescriptions. These are referred back to the prescriber for correction before dispensing. If the doctor were also the dispenser, the public would lose this added protection.

- (d) There have been instances of collusion between doctors and chemists in attempts to defraud the Commonwealth Government in connection with pharmaceutical benefits. So far this has occurred only rarely. The existence of a system under which a medical practitioner could provide both services would seem to offer greater opportunity to the unscrupulous for dishonest exploitation of public funds.

No doubt other aspects of this question will occur to members and they may consider it not to be in the public interest, nor desirable for a medical man to be allowed to own a pharmacy. It could be said that such person could have a manager in charge of his business and the manager would be a registered pharmaceutical chemist. But I believe it is hard to obtain such qualified people; there is a great shortage of them and the tendency would be there, if the services of a manager were lost, for the doctor to act in the interim. That would be incompatible with the carrying out of his duties as a medical practitioner. For those reasons, I believe this Bill is necessary.

The measure met no opposition in another place; in fact, it was supported by a member of the medical profession who is a member of the Legislative Council. I commend the Bill to the House.

Hon. A. V. R. Abbott: Are its provisions retrospective?

Mr. MOIR: No. I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

Hon. A. V. R. Abbott: I would like to move that the Committee stage be made an Order of the Day for the next sitting of the House.

Hon. Sir Ross McLarty: You cannot do that! It is not your Bill!

Mr. SPEAKER: Order!

In Committee.

Mr. J. Hegney in the Chair; Mr. Moir in charge of the Bill.

Clause 1—agreed to.

Progress reported.

BILL—BETTING CONTROL.

In Committee.

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

The CHAIRMAN: Progress was reported after Clause 4 had been agreed to.

Clause 5—Legalisation of betting with bookmakers:

Mr. MANNING: I move an amendment—

That the words "or (b) at or on registered premises" in lines 31 and 32, page 5, be struck out.

If agreed to, only gambling on the race-course will be permitted.

The Minister for Housing: You are looking after the silvertails.

Hon. L. Thorn: You should know about silvertails; you are one yourself.

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

Mr. MANNING: I do not like the Bill and I object strongly to the legalising of s.p. or off-course betting.

Mr. Lawrence: What is the difference between that and on-course betting?

Mr. MANNING: It would be a retrograde step to permit the establishment of those premises the owners of which would be seeking patronage. The premises would be established in the main streets of country towns and in prominent positions in the metropolitan area. To cater for the business available, they would need to be large establishments with extensive equipment. We would have the advertising that goes with all types of business and there would be rivalry between competitive bookmakers. Before long every race meeting in Australia and outside it would be broadcast and probably televised; the shops would have television equipment and expensive appointments and gambling would be increased considerably.

Mr. May: I think you have been reading Jules Verne.

Mr. MANNING: I do not think there is any doubt that gambling will be increased. I am concerned, because it will bring about a lowering of the morals of the community. The younger generation will be brought up to accept gambling as part and parcel of community life. It will also be a retrograde step from a national point of view. There has never been any real attempt to stamp out s.p. betting; it has only been fiddled with in the past. If the Government is determined that there should be gambling and people allowed to gamble, let them confine their activities to the proper place—on the racecourse.

Mr. Lawrence: What reason can you give for that?

Mr. MANNING: I do not like gambling at all. If the Government insists that there shall be gambling, let it be on the racecourse.

Mr. Brady: It is not the Government, but the people that insist.

Hon. D. Brand: What absolute rubbish! It is only a minority.

The Minister for Housing: Even minorities have their rights.

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

Mr. MANNING: I am concerned that the younger generation will accept this as legal and right; it will lower the moral tone of the community.

Mr. May: Do you not think it is already established?

Hon. L. Thorn: It is in Collie.

The Premier: It is in Harvey, too.

Mr. McCulloch: It is also in Toodyay.

Mr. MANNING: Very little goes on in Harvey. I trust the Committee will accept the amendment.

The Minister for Housing: You are even laughing at your own amendment!

Mr. YATES: Since the second reading speech on this Bill I have remained silent listening to various opinions expressed as to whether betting should be made lawful or be allowed to continue as an unlawful practice. I have yet to be convinced by speakers on my side of the Chamber that the evil will be any greater if indulged in on the racecourse or off it.

Mr. Lawrence: Hear, hear!

Mr. YATES: I have no brief for it. Many members bet with s.p. operators; that is well known. They know they are breaking the law, but they continue to do so. I have expressed opinions on this question since I have been a member and I repeatedly asked for some information from my Government when it was in office, and the present Government as to what their intentions would be regarding the restriction of starting-price betting; not its abolition because that would be impossible. I have taken notice of the report of the Royal Commission on this matter.

Mr. May: You are the only one who has. Your Government took no notice of it.

Mr. YATES: I have also taken notice of the many annual reports submitted by the Commissioner of Police who, as the head of the Police Force, is a most responsible officer in the community and is appointed by the Government. It is his duty to enforce the laws of the State and see they are enforced. On-the-course betting has done as much harm as off-the-course betting without legislation in this State, as it has with legislation in other States.

For my part, I do not know what is best for the community. I am sincerely trying to make up my mind which way to vote so that it will be for the good of the community. We should give a certain type of restrictive legislation a try, and if we find the position becomes aggravated, we can do what they did in South Australia and repeal certain sections of the Act.

With a strong Commissioner of Police and with severe penalties, hundreds of starting price operators would be put out of business. If that is not a start, I would like to know what is.

Mr. Oldfield: You would only have a few bookmakers who would remain in business.

Mr. YATES: I am not interested in that. Once it becomes legal, they become as respectable as other business men. I have no brief for them and I am trying to make up my mind which way to vote. I have been inundated by telephone calls and letters from certain people both in my electorate and outside of it. Some of the letters are not very nice; they have threatened and indicated what will happen to me if I vote for the Bill. That has never concerned me when I vote for any Bill which I think may be in the best interests of the community.

Mr. Lawrence: Bravo!

Mr. YATES: I intend to vote for this Bill in order to bring betting within the scope of the law, so that all sections of the community can pay their just dues to the Government. Those engaged in the business will pay the same tax and this will not be a case of one section paying while others escape. That is a point which has been overlooked.

Hon. D. Brand: They can operate outside the scope of the Act, and avoid paying the tax.

Mr. YATES: If the penalties are made severe enough, they will curb the activities of those outside the law.

The Premier: Each licensed man would become a detective.

Mr. Oldfield: That would be a nice state of affairs; it would be like Nazi Germany!

Mr. YATES: The hon. member's interjection is not reasonable.

The Premier: It is not even sensible.

Mr. YATES: We have informers in the Police Force today; we have had them for many years. I said I would support the second reading, but it is not my intention to support the entire Bill, because there is a lot in it that needs amendment. I believe members should support anything that will minimise s.p. betting by restricting and controlling it. The Bill was introduced as a non-party measure. It is completely non-party.

Dame Florence Cardell-Oliver: It is not

Mr. YATES: If it is non-party and there are 24 members on that side and 24 on this, one would have thought that an average of 12 on each side would cross

the floor. It has developed into a completely party Bill, and this refers to all members except myself.

Mr. May: You were doing very well until you said that.

Mr. YATES: It is not possible for all members on one side of the House to have one opinion on the matter and for all the members on the other to have another.

Hon. A. V. R. Abbott: You should know that ours was not a party Bill.

Mr. YATES: I am aware of that.

The CHAIRMAN: I ask the hon. member to confine his remarks to the amendment before the Chair.

Mr. YATES: You, Mr. Chairman, allowed a good deal of latitude last evening.

The CHAIRMAN: Perhaps so, but I propose to keep members nearer to the point tonight, and I ask the hon. member to confine his remarks to the amendment.

Mr. YATES: The points I am trying to make are connected with the matter of registered premises. It is important to me that my opinions should be recorded. The Bill is an attempt to minimise the ever-increasing activities of s.p. betting throughout the State. It has been said that if s.p. betting is confined to premises, it will increase. Collie has had complete immunity ever since s.p. betting has been rife. That town has been a law unto itself, but this is proof that, irrespective of whether premises are licensed or not, people will still want to bet.

I have been told that there are 14 s.p. operators in Collie. I have seen them operating in the street and the policeman going by and having a look at the board and not making an arrest. Yet I have not heard of an increase in crime in that district or of residents going bankrupt because of s.p. betting. If we legalise off-the-course betting, is it likely that the board would permit of 14 premises being operated at Collie?

Hon. Dame Florence Cardell-Oliver: Of course.

Mr. YATES: I am certain it would not, because a proportionate number of licences in Perth would total 500 or 600. The board would restrict operations wherever possible so that people who desired to bet could do so, just as they may now buy a ticket in the lotteries. In my view one form of gambling is no different from another. If we invest money in order to make a profit, it is a gamble. We have legalised the lotteries and people buy tickets on the chance of winning a large sum of money.

Hon. D. Brand: Do you think that all gambling should be legalised?

Mr. YATES: No; who would want to legalise bridge played for 1d. or 3d. per 100? There are bridge clubs and rummy clubs, and if we had to legalise every form

of gambling, we should be working here all the year round. At present we are dealing with s.p. betting only. I am not keen on the licensing of registered premises or of any person for the purpose of betting. People will bet and, even prior to the Royal Commission, representatives of the churches said that it would not be possible to abolish betting and that they favoured betting on racecourses only. However, I am convinced that if we are going to allow betting in any form, we must make provision for those who wish to bet off the course.

Mr. Oldfield: You cannot restrict the amount of bookmaking.

Mr. YATES: If people want to spend their money in that way, they should be free to do so. If we are going to allow betting in any form, we must make provision for those who cannot go to the races. Men on shift work and people in hospitals cannot attend the races. In 1945 I was a patient in Hollywood Hospital for many months and patients there were able to place their bets with a man who visited the hospital.

Mr. Hutchinson: They do not bet in Hollywood Hospital now.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! There is too much conversation in the Chamber and I cannot hear what is being said.

Mr. Lawrence: I rise to a point of order; I cannot hear what is being said.

The CHAIRMAN: Neither can I. The time of the member for South Perth has expired.

Mr. OLDFIELD: The whole argument of those who support the measure is that it will have the effect of controlling and restricting betting. That is entirely illogical.

Mr. Yates: How do you know it will not?

Mr. OLDFIELD: It might lead to a restriction of the number of bookmakers operating, though the board would be able to license as many as it considered desirable.

Mr. Lawrence: On a point of order, has that anything to do with the amendment under discussion?

The CHAIRMAN: No; we are dealing with the question of registered premises and not with betting generally.

Mr. OLDFIELD: I intend to link my remarks with the amendment. If the words are deleted, off-the-course betting will not be legal. The object of the amendment is to leave off-the-course betting as at present. No matter how many or how few operators were licensed, they would tout for business and offer every inducement to the public to walk into the parlour. A lovely business! The board would not be able to restrict the punters, though it could restrict the number of licensed bookmakers.

The CHAIRMAN: The clause does not deal with bookmakers. It deals with the right of people to bet on registered premises. The hon. member must confine his remarks to that aspect.

Mr. OLDFIELD: The board will decide what premises shall be registered and Parliament will have no say as to how many there shall be. Consequently we do not know whether it will restrict the number of registered premises or not.

Mr. Lawrence: There are none operating today.

Mr. OLDFIELD: Some are operating by means of telephone calls. It is impossible for anyone to say how many premises will be registered.

Mr. Lawrence: On a point of order, that matter arises under a later clause of the Bill.

The CHAIRMAN: The member for Maylands may proceed.

Mr. OLDFIELD: My argument must be pretty close to the mark. No matter how many premises may be registered, there will still be a certain amount of illegal betting that will have to be policed. Where one person now bets on Saturday afternoon, there will be many. Experience in South Australia showed that the number of bettors and the amount of money involved increased greatly with the licensing of betting shops.

Mr. Lawrence. It is a Bill to restrict and control betting.

Mr. OLDFIELD: It will increase the amount of revenue for the Government. I support the amendment.

Mr. LAWRENCE: I wish to congratulate the member for South Perth, as it is refreshing to hear words of wisdom from the Opposition benches.

Hon. Sir Ross McLarty: I thought you would hear them on the wharves from Mr. Roach, Mr. Healy and others.

Mr. LAWRENCE: I do not think the remarks of the Leader of the Opposition were warranted. He smiled as he made them, but it was an inane smile. The member for Harvey suggests that we legalise betting on racecourses but that those who cannot afford to attend there should not be entitled to bet.

Mr. Manning: They should not bet if they have not the money.

Mr. LAWRENCE: The hon. member hates betting and thinks it a curse and an evil, yet would legalise it on the racecourse. His was the most sanctimonious, hypocritical and mealy-mouthed speech I have heard in this Chamber. What is the difference in gambling on or off the course?

The Premier: No difference in principle.

Mr. LAWRENCE: Not one iota.

Mr. Court. Yes, there is.

Mr. LAWRENCE: Why be sanctimonious and hypocritical and make betting legal for one section of the community and illegal for another? Would the member for Nedlands, with his smug grin—

Mr. Nalder: Stick to your speech.

Mr. LAWRENCE: Very well. I will stick to the hon. member or anybody else who keeps interjecting. Would the member for Nedlands say that an old-age pensioner who has supplemented his income to the extent permitted by the means test—I think about 30s. per week—should not be allowed to bet off the course?

Mr. Court: My answer is "Yes."

Mr. LAWRENCE: He is entitled to bet?

Mr. Court: I am all for legalising betting on the racecourse.

Mr. LAWRENCE: How can a pensioner afford to attend a racecourse.

Hon. Dame Florence Cardell-Oliver: I can name a dozen who could.

Mr. Court: You are thinking of the supplementary income under the wrong Government. It is much greater now.

Mr. LAWRENCE: The hon. member will not answer "Yes" or "No". The member for Harvey represents a country constituency. If there were no races on the local course, would he deny local residents the right to bet on the Perth Cup, without coming to Perth? Many of his electors bet on such occasions and if they heard his remarks on this subject, I doubt whether they would vote for him at the next election.

Mr. Perkins: It is a change to find members on the Government side worrying about country people.

Mr. LAWRENCE: Just because the hon. member is now probably living in easy street, he thinks the battlers on this side of the House have not worked in the country—

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The hon. member must connect his remarks to the question before the Chair.

Mr. LAWRENCE: I am endeavouring to, but these interjections—

The CHAIRMAN: The hon. member should take no notice of interjections. Then he will make much better progress.

Mr. LAWRENCE: The member for Harvey said the younger generation would be brought up to accept betting as part of everyday life. Is it not better for them to be brought up to the idea that betting is controlled to some degree than that it flourishes illegally?

Mr. Hutchinson: But you said—

Mr. LAWRENCE: Go and eat your carrots.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! Each member is entitled to express his views without a lot of interjections which, under Standing Orders, are entirely disorderly. Members must keep order.

Mr. LAWRENCE: The amendment would lead to more illegality because whatever we do, and however we police the activities of s.p. bookmakers and those who deal with them, this Chamber agrees conclusively that betting cannot be stamped out. It is therefore logical to allow people who cannot afford to attend racecourses to bet if they so desire. I strongly oppose the amendment.

Mr. YATES: I will quote from page 807 of the report of the Royal Commissioners who inquired into this vexed question in 1948. They stated—

It having been established that there is a considerable desire for betting facilities, and that control by the Legislature is called for, we proceeded to consider the various suggestions made to us during our inquiry as to the form that control should take. The view that betting should be confined to the racecourse and that all forms of off-the-course betting should be suppressed, was expressed by the churches and social bodies, the metropolitan racing and trotting clubs, the course bookmakers and the Breeders, Owners and Trainers' Association. By none of its supporters was it suggested that course betting was any less harmful ethically, morally, socially or economically than off-the-course betting. The view of the churches and social bodies was in effect, "We would like to see betting totally suppressed by law but we regard this as impossible. The next best thing is to reduce it as much as possible, and this can be done by confining it to the racecourse, where it can be better controlled and the number who can participate will be limited."

Now I will read out the figures in connection with the increase in betting on racecourses. In 1939, 24,432 people paid admittance to the W.A.T.C. course, and in 1947 the figure had increased to 112,259.

Hon. Dame Florence Cardell-Oliver: Due to the increase in population.

Mr. YATES: That was in the enclosure. In 1939 the figure for the leger was 30,670, and in 1947 it was 90,839.

Hon. D. Brand: Would not such increases be reflected in legalised betting shops?

Mr. YATES: In 1939, in the case of the W.A.T.C. there were 55,568 in the enclosure, and in 1947, 211,196. In the leger in 1939 there were 70,620, and in 1947, 113,702. In spite of these figures,

church organisations and other social bodies suggest that betting be reduced by confining it to the courses. The figures prove conclusively that whether it is controlled or not, betting will increase in this country while the population increases and the standard of living improves. There were vast changes in the standard of living between 1939 and 1947—changes for the better—and over that period the basic wage increased greatly. Under those circumstances more money will be wagered and more people attend racecourses, but there are those who cannot do that, and I refer to people in country centres and parts of the metropolitan area 25 or 30 miles from the city. There are also the people in the North.

Had the Government introduced a Bill to abolish betting, I think every member would have voted for it, as none of us is keen on the present system. The previous Government accepted income from racing and trotting clubs throughout the State and, with that, the position as it stood. It was an illegal operation and business. The previous Government allowed it to continue, and the present Government has also been happy to receive the income from the racing clubs. However, it is not prepared to allow it to continue without control. No one can tell whether the Bill will be for the ultimate good of the community, but I am prepared to give it a trial. If it does not prove satisfactory, I shall be prepared to admit that I made a mistake, in the same way as did the parliamentarians in South Australia.

Hon. D. Brand: Surely you are not prepared to give it a trial after what they have said?

Mr. YATES: I am convinced that Western Australia is different from South Australia. I am also convinced, like the Commissioner of Police, that betting can be controlled. He does not like anything of this nature.

Hon. D. Brand: Surely you are not going to pass a Bill dependent on the personality and character of one man!

Mr. YATES: I have also read the reports of previous Commissioners of Police, all of whom said they wanted something done by legislation. In the latest report issued by the Commissioner of Police he said—

Starting-price off-the-course betting continues its well established practice throughout the State and will continue while the present law and the limited means of enforcing it exist.

I express the hope that a suitable betting Act will shortly be brought into existence which will enable more effective control to be maintained, and abolish the present undesirable procedure of utilising the obstruction

clauses of the Traffic Regulations to penalise starting-price betting operators who practise in the streets.

So, even as late as this year, the commissioner has cried out for an Act which he can administer and enforce the law through the men under his control.

What about off-the-course operators who use the telephone? Very little has been said about them. The report of the Royal Commission in this connection stated that off-the-course betting constituted that done by any person who communicated bets by post, telegram or telephone, provided that the betting was on credit. That is a system that has been operating in Perth and country centres for many years, with complete immunity to the operators. Some of them, as the member for Subiaco mentioned, have a number of telephones on their premises to carry on their operations.

Provided no money changes hands, and that settlement takes place on another day, those men are completely immune from the law. P. B. Healy, a large metropolitan bookmaker, gave evidence before the Royal Commission, stating that his association comprised 35 members, all of whom conducted business in the metropolitan area. He also said that 8,713 bets of amounts under 10s. were laid on one Saturday, and that amounts of 10s. and over totalled 12,279. So telephone betting is another form of off-the-course betting that has grown up and about which very little is heard.

Mr. Hutchinson: That betting is legal, is it?

Mr. YATES: Of course it is. In the report of the Royal Commission it was stated that most of the headquarters of s.p. bookmakers were found to be in hotels, billiard saloons, hairdressers' shops and other establishments, but that the great majority of them operated on streets and vacant lots.

The CHAIRMAN: The hon. member's time has expired.

Mr. PERKINS: I support the amendment. I realise that if it were accepted it would considerably mutilate the Bill and also many other clauses would need to be recast. However, at least it raises one of the fundamental issues which members have to face in dealing with this question. So far as I am concerned, it is an important point. I believe that betting off the racecourse should be made legal.

We hear a great deal about class distinction. On that aspect, my first comment is that it is most extraordinary for a party which is supposed to represent the least affluent of the community, and which over the years has had as its objective the raising of workers' conditions, to introduce a Bill such as this, which will have

the effect of dragging the workers down instead of lifting them up. I suggest to some members opposite that they should consult the wives of a few of their electors.

I agree that the charges for admission to a racecourse are fairly excessive, but the Government would have no difficulty in bringing pressure to bear on racing clubs to provide at least one section of the racecourse which could be entered by the people for a nominal fee and where all the facilities for betting could be made available. My reason for favouring betting on the racecourse rather than anywhere else is that obviously a person who is willing to go to some trouble to travel to a racecourse has a keen desire to bet on horse-races.

The Minister for Works: It might be more difficult for him to get to a betting shop.

Mr. PERKINS: It will not be, after this legislation is passed. Unless the board acts differently from what we anticipate, there will be betting shops established in the most accessible spots so that the turnover will be as great as possible.

The Minister for Works: Take a man working on the Murchison, for instance.

Mr. PERKINS: The Minister is again referring to the country. Most members on the other side of the Chamber represent Goldfields electorates where the facilities for betting are similar to those in the metropolitan area. I think that members who represent country areas should take the kick from their electors if it is coming to them.

The Minister for Works: It is not a question of taking the kick.

Mr. PERKINS: The Minister has suggested that there will be reaction from people in the country, but I do not think it will be as great as the Minister thinks. We all know that telephone betting is perfectly legal at present, and that form of betting, in my opinion, has fewer of the undesirable characteristics of gambling than other forms. Telephone betting is almost in the same category as on-the-course betting because a person who desires to bet has to go to some trouble to lodge a bet by telephone. The Premier is smiling to keep his courage up, but he is not too happy about this measure. My main objection to the Bill is that it will encourage young people to hang around established betting shops on a Saturday afternoon.

Mr. Heal: Where are they?

Mr. PERKINS: I will not reply to inane interjections by the hon. member.

Several members interjected: Oh!

Mr. PERKINS: If these young people lost their money on their first few bets it would discourage them to continue gambling, but, if they won, most likely they would be led on. Members must agree with me that punters must eventually lose. If

gambling is desirable—and surely members on the other side do not agree that it is!—why does not the Government legalise all forms of gambling? I do not favour gambling.

The Premier: Of course you do!

Mr. PERKINS: People who engage in gambling should go somewhere so that they do not furnish a temptation to others to fall into their foolish ways. We must consider the results of the Bill, which is the most important aspect. It is a question of how the legislation will work out. We can point to many undesirable consequences of legalising betting shops in the State. They will act as a temptation to young people who have not formed decided views on what is right or wrong. Once they are enticed into the betting shops there is a great danger that many will become confirmed gamblers. If this amendment is agreed to and betting on race-courses is legalised, it would be necessary to direct racing clubs to allot portions of the courses to which people can enter by paying a very small fee. I cannot imagine that happening because the racing clubs derive much money from bookmakers' licences and from totalisator percentages. Off-the-course betting is a dead loss to them. It would be in the interests of racing clubs to get patrons on the courses.

Hon. Dame Florence Cardell-Oliver: The flat in South Australia was free.

Mr. PERKINS: It might be. I do not want to start a debate on the entrance fee. The amendment will overcome the difficulty which prevents the less affluent section of the population from going to race-courses, and would be a great improvement on the suggestion to legalise betting shops, which will become centres of attraction designed to entice as many people into them as possible. I support the amendment.

The MINISTER FOR POLICE: The principle involved in this motion was decided the other night after 13½ hours of debate. By a majority vote, the principle of legalising off-the-course betting was accepted. It was the view of the majority of members that legalised off-the-course betting should be given a trial. The remarks of some members opposite are the quintessence of hypocrisy and cant. Members representing country centres know what goes on in their electorates.

Mr. Nalder: What about answering some of the questions raised in the second reading debate?

The MINISTER FOR POLICE: Listening to the drivel for 13½ hours, I concluded that most of it was not deserving of an answer. The members for Wagin, Kataning, Harvey, Roe and Blackwood know what goes on, as does the member for Greenough.

Hon. D. Brand: I know what will happen if betting shops are legalised.

The MINISTER FOR POLICE: He knows what goes on now as well as I do. After acting for 18 months as Minister for Police, I can say that not one request has been made by the members mentioned to overcome illegal off-the-course betting.

Mr. Bovell: Does that include me also?

The Premier: No.

Mr. Bovell: The other night you said I did not know what went on. You must be consistent.

The MINISTER FOR POLICE: No request for suppression was made by those members, and the member for Vasse comes within the same category. The member for Maylands who is chattering away had not the courage to say the other night whether he wanted s.p. betting to be suppressed or not.

Mr. Oldfield: I said it was rife everywhere.

The MINISTER FOR POLICE: I want to correct the inference of some members that betting shops will be made very attractive. The member for Roe said these premises would be garnished, whatever he may mean by that. It was said they would be blazing with advertisements. A picture was painted to indicate that the proprietors would do everything to make them attractive, including hiring a band to play outside s.p. premises.

Mention was made of lounge chairs being provided. This is what actually happened in the State which has successfully conducted legalised off-the-course betting since 1932. I quote from a statement of the Queensland Royal Commission which went to Tasmania to investigate s.p. betting. It says—

The members of your Commission visited the Central Bookmakers' Club in Hobart on the morning of the 12th January, 1952. The Club is housed in an old one-storey building of barn-like construction with a bitumen floor. The bookmakers occupy cubicles round the perimeter of the building and the bettors congregate in the centre. Each bookmaker has boards on the back wall setting out particulars of the races in Sydney and Melbourne and local events, the names of the horses and the odds at which he is prepared to bet, but there is no solicitation for business and no calling of odds. There are 19 bookmakers in this club carrying on business.

At the entrance to the club there is a large notice prohibiting minors from attending. We noted that no minors were present, but some women were among the bettors; we estimated them at about 10 per cent. of the total.

Mr. Oldfield: On a point of order, in keeping with the ruling on a matter raised previously, I would point out that we are

now dealing with the registration of premises and not with bookmakers calling the odds in licensed premises.

The CHAIRMAN: The amendment deals with betting on premises.

The MINISTER FOR POLICE: The report continues—

Racing information from the mainland is supplied by a Bookmakers' Association, to which all bookmakers contribute, and much of the information is on similar lines to that supplied by Black's Press Agency in Queensland.

We visited quite a number of bookmakers' clubs in the suburbs and country centres and in nearly all we found that the accommodation was very plain, and very few amenities such as seating accommodation, were provided.

Members opposite spoke about lounge chairs being provided. I do not know where that happened.

Hon. Dame Florence Cardell-Oliver: In South Australia, when I was there.

The MINISTER FOR POLICE: That was when Noah was a boy! The report further said—

We visited also the clubs in Launceston where the conditions were similar to those in Hobart.

Launceston is the second largest city of Tasmania, and comes within the category of Hobart. There is no garnishing of premises in those cities or lounge chairs, and there would be none in this State if off-the-course betting were legalised.

Hon. Sir Ross McLarty: Anyhow, they would be quite unnecessary.

The MINISTER FOR POLICE: Members opposite should realise that the Royal Commission appointed by their own Government was hamstrung because it could only investigate ways and means, other than the legalising of betting shops. Had it not been for that restriction, the Royal Commission would surely have recommended the legalising of off-the-course betting for a trial. A picture has been painted of young people frequenting betting shops. I have never had a bet with an s.p. bookmaker but on rare occasions I have placed bets on racecourses.

Mr. Oldfield: And very rare, too.

The MINISTER FOR POLICE: It was very rare. I do go to the Perth Cup and the Kalgoorlie Cup and in weak moments I have been persuaded to bet on what were regarded as certainties. In order to inform my mind of what takes place in betting shops in my electorate, recently I have entered them on frequent occasions. I would say that the vast majority of patrons are not young. The young people in my electorate are out playing tennis, cricket or football on Saturdays.

Despite what has been represented to us as occurring in South Australia, I find that in Port Pirie the young people still engage in these sports and their football and cricket clubs are flourishing. Some member referred to the lowering of moral standards in Launceston. No one who has met the people of that charming city can say that their morals are on a lower plane compared with those of the residents of Western Australia or another State. Most of the people frequenting the betting shops are of middle age or more. The percentage of young people is very small. We have heard stories of women flocking into these shops.

Hon. Dame Florence Cardell-Oliver: That is true.

The MINISTER FOR POLICE: The Royal Commission said that approximately 10 per cent. of those in the betting shops in Tasmania were women. Would the member for Subiaco say that a woman should not be permitted to have a bet if she felt so inclined? The hon. member is one who espouses equal rights for the sexes. Surely she would not say that women who have the means to do so should not be permitted to back their fancy, the same as their husbands or brothers! We have heard a lot of sob-stuff about women with babies in prams. On the same principle of equal rights for the sexes, is it to be said that a woman who has recognised her responsibility to the nation by presenting it with another citizen, should be debarred from equal rights in this direction?

Hon. Dame Florence Cardell-Oliver: If there were 50 per cent. of women in this Chamber, you would never get a Bill of this kind through.

The MINISTER FOR POLICE: I would not hazard a guess on that. But reliable information indicates that only 10 per cent. of those frequenting betting shops in Tasmania are women. I think that the average woman would have too much sense to go into a betting shop.

Hon. Dame Florence Cardell-Oliver: The men have no sense if 90 per cent. of the frequenters are men.

The MINISTER FOR POLICE: I would not advise anybody to bet on a race-course, or by telephone, or in a starting-price betting shop, because I think it is a losing proposition. But when people earn their money, I see no reason why, provided they meet their financial obligations, they should be debarred from spending what surplus they have in whatever way they please.

This principle was decided two or three nights ago after a debate lasting 13½ hours. If it is desired to have a re-hash of the debate, we can sit here till 6 o'clock tomorrow; and then I suppose we will have the leaders of the two parties opposite

going to "The West Australian," and complaining of frustration, and how on ten occasions they tried to take the business out of the hands of the Government.

The CHAIRMAN: I suggest to the Minister that that is not relevant to the amendment.

Opposition members: Here, hear!

The MINISTER FOR POLICE: Very well. The principle involved is whether off-the-course betting should be legalised. That was decided upon, and the Government is not prepared to back down from the decision. The same principle is involved in this clause. I suggest that we go on with the matter and endeavour to put the Bill into shape. The Government is not wedded to any of the provisions except those of this kind. But if an amendment is moved to stultify the Bill, the Government will not fall for that. Let us get the Bill into shape and send it to another place.

Mr. MANNING: I disagree with the Minister that we resolved this principle the other evening. I am seeking to delete this subclause in an effort to restrict gambling. I am mindful of the opinions expressed by Government members that they are most anxious for betting to be legalised. If that is so, I suggest it is better to legalise it on the racecourse and make it illegal off the course. In that way we would have some reasonable control over gambling. If off-the-course betting is legalised, we will have a very wide field, covering the whole of the State; and great difficulty will be experienced in exercising control. I disagree that the Bill seeks to restrict gambling.

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

Ayes	20
Noes	23

Majority against	3
------------------	---

Ayes.

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

(Teller.)

Noes.

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

(Teller.)

Amendment thus negatived.

Hon. J. B. SLEEMAN: I move an amendment—

That after the word "law" in line 39, page 5, the following words be added:—"In all winning bets made with off-the-course bookmakers, the odds paid shall be the actual starting price up to a limit of fifty to one. Place bets shall be paid at totalisator odds. The prices at which horses started shall be those as given out by States Press of 7 Barrack-st., Perth.

We should do something to protect the punters; and if this amendment is carried, that objective will be achieved. Bookmakers can generally look after themselves, and get the best end of the stick. Usually the punter who goes to the races gets tens, twelves and fifteens, and the man who stays at home and bets has to take twos and threes. We should see he gets the right price. We cannot interfere with that because that is the starting price. That is unfortunate. But when it reverses just now and again, and the poor old punters picks a horse that pays 45 or 50 to 1, he is told, "You cannot get more than the limit." I do not consider there should be any limit unless it is a reasonable one.

Hon. A. F. Watts: What is the States Press you are talking about?

Hon. D. Brand: Is that a legal concern?

Hon. J. B. SLEEMAN: I see that my friend, the Leader of the Country Party, is very unsophisticated.

Hon. A. F. Watts: I am, about this part of it.

Hon. J. B. SLEEMAN: It is an agency which does not engage in bookmaking, but obtains information and sends it to bookmakers throughout the State. It is very reliable. We should take its prices because the bookmakers tell me they have always been reliable. If we stipulate the prices published in "The West Australian," very often the punter could not have another bet until the paper came out on the Monday morning. Many people who frequent s.p. bookies have not too much money to bet with. They might say, "I will give a dollar a fly;" and if they do not win, they go home. I think that is the way most of them carry on.

The CHAIRMAN: I suggest to the member for Fremantle that he add his amendment as a subclause.

Hon. J. B. SLEEMAN: Very well.

Mr. HEAL: In principle I agree with what the hon. member is aiming at, but I think the proposition he has placed before us is a dangerous one. At present the s.p. bookmakers have an association which stipulates the limit prices that shall be paid throughout the metropolitan area. I believe that if a horse in the Eastern States wins at 40 to 1 the limit here is 20

to 1; if it pay 40s. for a place the limit is 30s. I agree that these limits are restrictive and that the punter does not get a fair go.

Mr. May: Why should there be a limit at all?

Mr. HEAL: The punters can take it or leave it. They do not have to bet. On races in the metropolitan area the limit is 33 to 1, and, I think, the place limit is 55s. The limit on races in the country areas is 10 to 1, and 17s. 6d. for a place. Under these conditions the punters are handicapped.

Hon. J. B. Sleeman: They are certainly cramped a lot.

Mr. HEAL: I believe that in a schedule of the Tasmanian Act certain principles are laid down that the licensed operators must obey. Some such schedule should be placed in the Bill. It might be better to leave this to the board. Members would rather see people bet on the course than off the course. If the amendment is carried, a professional punter who wanted to place £100 on a horse could put it on with an s.p. bookmaker and get set for the full amount, whereas if he went to the racecourse he might get a certain amount of tens and some fives. Although I have not much sympathy for the s.p. bookmaker he would be under a severe handicap if this were to apply.

Hon. A. V. R. Abbott: He does not have to take the money.

Mr. HEAL: That is so, but he does. The Minister should give this matter some consideration. I cannot support the amendment.

The MINISTER FOR HOUSING: I can claim to be even purer in this matter than is the Minister for Police as I have never been on a racecourse.

Mr. Heal: You have been on a trotting course.

The MINISTER FOR HOUSING: It became my pleasurable duty to perform a ceremony at Gloucester Park and I attended there on two occasions; the only times that I have been on such premises. I sympathise with what the member for Fremantle is seeking to achieve, but from a study of the Bill and the somewhat meagre knowledge I have of betting, I feel that his amendment strikes at the very roots of the legislation. In other words, it will make it unworkable. I feel that money that is laid on horses on the course has the effect of depressing the odds.

People who go in for betting do so, by and large, for one reason, namely, to make as much for themselves as possible. Under this amendment they will have every incentive to refrain from placing their money on the racecourse. The more or less professional punter will therefore have every

reason for doing his betting off the course. This could conceivably have the effect that the s.p. bookmakers could not operate because they would be accepting bets completely in the dark. In the metropolitan area it might be possible to get some idea of what the odds were on the course, but I understand that on occasions there are some pretty violent changes in respect of the odds that are called.

When we realise that people will be operating at Esperance, Wyndham, Newdegate and other isolated places, we can appreciate that it will be practically impossible for the shop bookmakers to be kept informed of the odds. I am inclined to agree with the view expressed by the member for West Perth. Someone in this Committee might think 50 to 1 is a fair limit and someone else might consider it should be 25 to 1 and so on. By and large we would all be having stabs in the dark. The question of a limitation in respect of both winning and place bets should be determined by the betting control board. The effects of its activities can be far greater in other respects than deciding that the limit should be 25 per cent. as against 40 per cent., assuming that some figure other than the one selected is the correct one.

Hon. A. V. R. Abbott: Do you think the board has power to regulate in that connection under the Bill as it stands?

The MINISTER FOR HOUSING: No, I am not suggesting that. I have not examined the point. But if there is no provision to cover the limitation of odds, it would be a simple matter to have one inserted. What the member for Fremantle seeks to do, would, in my opinion, cause chaos and confusion, and would tend to make people bet off the course for the purpose of keeping the odds up on the course. The off-the-course bookmaker would be faced with an intolerable position and might have to meet a financial burden that would, in many instances, be impossible for him to meet.

The majority of members were, at the second reading stage, prepared to give the legislation a trial to see how it would work, and if after a trial period it was found that the exaggerated matters that were mentioned came true, action could shortly be taken to overcome the problem. I appeal to the member for Fremantle to reconsider his amendment because of the repercussions it would have on the entire legislation.

Hon. A. F. WATTS: I must confess to almost complete ignorance of the points that were dealt with by the previous speakers but one thing stands out crystal clear and that is that the intention of the amendment is to increase the return which the bettor is likely to obtain. The whole point of my opposition to the measure is that I fear it will increase the attractiveness of betting, and therefore will enrol a much

larger proportion of people in it. Therefore it is obvious that I must oppose the amendment. I make my position plain. I shall vote against the amendment.

Mr. McCULLOCH: The letters "s.p." stand for "starting-price." The Bill does not say that bookmakers off the course must adopt the starting price on the course. I have seen places operating in Collie where the bookmakers quoted the odds they were going to pay. The same thing is done at Busselton. I know of cases where horses started in Perth at 8 to 1 but were quoted at 10 to 1 in Collie and Busselton. I do not think the member for Fremantle has taken all aspects into consideration. Why confine it to course odds? If the s.p. bookmaker off the course is willing to give more why confine it?

Mr. WILD: Whilst I agree in principle with the member for Fremantle, I cannot support the amendment. Punters, particularly at the small country meetings, think that on many occasions they are guillotined because they get such short odds. But I think this must be left to the board. If there is a limit to 50 to 1 and it is legal to bet off the course, it is possible that many owners will get people to ride their bicycles around the suburbs and place bets of £3 or £4 at each of the small betting shops and have absolutely nothing on the course. An s.p. bookmaker would suddenly find himself up for £100 or £150 while holding only £2 or £3. As a result I cannot agree to the amendment. I want to make my position perfectly clear. The other evening I was one of the earliest speakers and I thought this legislation would be dealt with on a non-party basis.

Hon. J. B. Sleeman: Is it not being dealt with in that way?

Mr. WILD: I feel that something ought to be done, but I do not agree with this method of doing it. But as the Minister has said, the Chamber has agreed to the second reading and therefore we must try to extricate ourselves from what I think is a difficult mess. If the Premier were here, I would tell him to his face that I think he will be a sorry man in a few years' time for people will say, "Look at Hawke's betting shops!" That is something Parliament will have to face. We should not try to increase betting off the course, and, in my view, it should all be on the course. For the reason that this amendment will place the s.p. bookmaker at times in an impossible position, and also because it will introduce something that we do not want—that is, more betting off the course—I oppose the amendment.

Hon. J. B. SLEEMAN: One member gets up and says that he agrees in principle with the amendment but will not support it; another gets up and says that he has sympathy for it. Sympathy is no good for the punter when he is losing money; he

wants more than sympathy. He wants odds, and that is what he is entitled to get. The member for Dale talked about Hawke's legacy that will be left behind. If I thought that, I would not support the Bill. I went to the trouble to visit the Eastern States and I do not think there are three members in this Chamber who saw the South Australian position when that legislation was operating.

The CHAIRMAN: The member for Fremantle must confine his remarks to the amendment.

Hon. J. B. SLEEMAN: As I said, I was in South Australia and saw the position in that State.

Mr. Wild: I saw it, too.

Hon. J. B. SLEEMAN: It was 10 times better than what we have here now. We have people in lane-ways with lavatories to the right of them, lavatories to the left of them and lavatories all round them. Do people call that respectable?

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The hon. member must try to explain or justify his amendment.

Hon. J. B. SLEEMAN: I hope the amendment will be carried because I think it is necessary. With regard to the Minister for Housing, I can see that a few of the bookmakers have been talking to him and putting up their side of the case. He must think that the s.p. bookies are deaf and dumb. In the same way as in South Australia and Tasmania, these bookies are provided with the latest information. That may not apply to those in the outback areas, but it does to those in the metropolitan area and the big centres. They know the prices on the course.

The member for Dale might be running a book at Armadale and a person says to him, "I want to put £100 on Timothy." The member for Dale will say, "Nothing doing. I cannot take a bet beyond £2." Bookmakers are not foolish, and I think we should protect the punters because to a certain extent they have been taken down. Bookmakers can look after themselves. I know a number of them, and they will not be taken down as easily as people seem to think.

THE MINISTER FOR POLICE: I have no particular views on this matter but to enable members to come to a decision I would like to quote the case of Tasmania because they have experienced legalised off-the-course betting since 1932. Nothing is laid down in the body of their Act, but I have a copy of the racing and gambling regulations, dated the 12th December, 1953, and in the appendix are set out the maximum odds which a bookmaker is obliged to pay on the various big races. They quote the Melbourne Cup in Victoria and the Caulfield and Moonee Valley events. The maximum odds are 66 to 1

on the Melbourne and Caulfield Cups and 50 to 1 on the other big races, and they range down for trotting races on race-courses in the metropolitan area of Melbourne to 20 to 1, 15 to 1 on greyhound racing, and so on.

In New South Wales the maximum for the Sydney Cup, Epsom, Metropolitan and the Doncaster, is 50 to 1, and then the odds are graded down. The same sort of thing applies in Queensland where the Doomben £10,000, and a couple of other events are listed at a maximum of 50 to 1. Then the appendix deals with the principal races in Tasmania and the only State not listed is Western Australia. I suggest to the hon. member that it might be better, in view of the satisfactory operation of the system in Tasmania, to adopt that idea.

Mr. Hutchinson: Do you know the reason for the grading?

The MINISTER FOR POLICE: I should say that it would be much easier for a bookmaker to make a book on a big race like the Perth Cup or the Railway Stakes than on a small race at Cunderdin or Merredin with a £40 stake and expect him to pay 50 or 60 to 1. I do not know much about bookmaking.

Mr. Hutchinson: Do you want the punter who cannot get to the races to have as good a proposition as the fortunate one who can?

The MINISTER FOR POLICE: Yes. The figures I mentioned are the limits which a bookmaker has to pay on the big races.

Amendment put and negatived.

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

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

“No bet or transaction arising out of or in connection with a bet shall be enforceable at law.”

If the amendment is agreed to, the existing principle will still obtain, and if the measure become law and betting is made lawful, no betting transaction will be an enforceable contract. As we all know, some people in the excitement of the moment, pledge themselves beyond their means. It must be remembered that a bookmaker is a trained and professional bettor; he knows exactly what he is doing and is not swayed by emotion, excitement or temptation. If he were not a hard, level-headed businessman, he could not carry on bookmaking. In my opinion, the present position is much better than the one envisaged in this Bill.

Hon. J. B. Sleeman: But that is because betting is illegal.

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

Hon. J. B. Sleeman: It is not that way in Victoria.

Hon. A. V. R. ABBOTT: It may not be.

Mr. McCulloch: If this is agreed to, a bookmaker need not pay either.

Hon. A. V. R. ABBOTT: It would cut both ways. The board would be able to exercise its discretion. As members know, if a bookmaker does not pay his debts, he loses his licence.

Mr. Heal: At the racecourse.

Hon. A. V. R. ABBOTT: Yes. I do not think that we should make credit betting responsible at law. That would be very dangerous.

Mr. LAWRENCE: I am surprised at the member for Mt. Lawley moving such an amendment, especially when he talks about excitement and temptation. In the past, the hon. member has several times suggested that penalties should be stiff for breaches of the law, but in the case of this offence he feels there should be no penalty. Surely that is an encouragement for people to bet!

Hon. A. V. R. Abbott: That is a weak argument.

Mr. LAWRENCE: It is not. If a man knew he could recoup his losses of last week without fear of his property being confiscated, is not that an encouragement for credit betting? The regulations under this measure will be made by the board. It is possible that a heavy bond will be asked for by the board before a man is allowed to operate. Surely the hon. member does not think that a bookmaker will accept bets knowing he will have to go to law to confiscate property.

Hon. A. V. R. Abbott: Why should he not if he is legally entitled to?

Mr. LAWRENCE: He should be legally entitled to because a contract is entered into.

Hon. A. F. Watts: Are you opposed to credit betting?

Mr. LAWRENCE: I am.

Hon. A. F. Watts: Do you think a bookmaker will give credit if he cannot recover the amount?

Mr. LAWRENCE: That may be so. In the case of a contract, it should be recoverable at law.

Hon. A. V. R. Abbott: This should be an exception.

Mr. LAWRENCE: There should be no exception in the case of a contract. I oppose the amendment.

Hon. J. B. SLEEMAN: I, too, am surprised at the member for Mt. Lawley. This will cater for unscrupulous people who make bets with a bookmaker and when they lose forget about them. The bookmaker may go broke and lose his licence, but he is not able to take action to recover the money owing to him.

Hon. A. F. WATTS: I cannot see the point being made by previous speakers. If a bookmaker cannot take his debtor to court to recover an amount owing to him, it is unlikely he will give him credit.

Hon. J. B. Sleeman: He is a confidence man.

Hon. A. F. WATTS: The bookmaker will take cash. Betting transactions cannot be recovered at law at present, and the member for Mt. Lawley wants to leave the law in that position. It is my opinion that it would be one of the surest ways of at least limiting, if not preventing, the giving of credit which, I understand, is what members, including those who have just spoken, desire. We do not want to encourage a bookmaker to give credit because, even if this provision were in the Bill, he would know he could not recover it in a court of law and he could not take proceedings anywhere else. If the amendment is not carried, the position will be that he can recover in a court of law, and as long as the punter has the asset behind him and the bookmaker knows he can recover his debt in a court of law, he will give him credit, which is the reverse of what the hon. member wants.

Mr. Heal: It will restrict the punter.

Hon. A. F. WATTS: I do not see how. The whole transaction should be on a cash basis.

Mr. O'Brien: What about telephone betting?

Hon. A. F. WATTS: I refuse to be side-tracked. This will mean filling the courts of law with litigation concerning betting which hitherto has been entirely absent because the law has frowned on the whole business. I would like to point out that there is a provision in stronger terms in the Lottery and Gaming Act of South Australia.

Hon. J. B. Sleeman: That does not make it right.

Hon. A. F. WATTS: I know it does not, but it shows that it has been thought of elsewhere. Subsection (2) of Section 50 of that Act states—

No action shall be brought or maintained in any court to recover any sum of money or valuable thing—

- (a) alleged to be won upon any bet; or
- (b) which has been deposited in the hands of any person to abide the event on which any bet has been made.

That is the position we should retain. I support the amendment.

Hon. J. B. SLEEMAN: The bookmaker will not give credit unless he knows the punter can pay. When the punter cannot pay, he will tell the bookmaker to jump in the lake. That is not right. Has not the hon. member heard of punters who at one

time were men of standing but with whom the bookies will no longer bet? I oppose the amendment.

Mr. LAPHAM: This is a most unusual amendment and I find it hard to understand. Here we are trying to legalise an industry and it is suggested that we take from individuals operating in that industry their normal rights under common law of recovering their dues. The bookmaker is responsible for paying the money owing to his clients. Provision is made, before a bookmaker is licensed, that he has a guarantee that in the event of his falling on bad times he will be able to pay the debts owing to punters. But, while we are enforcing the guarantee by the bookmaker, we are permitting the punter to use his credit while backing winners and to welsh when he gets on to a loser. There is no logic in it. In the case of a hire-purchase agreement, it would mean that as long as there is money to pay the instalments it is all right; but when there is no money, nothing can be done about it.

Hon. A. V. R. Abbott: You want time payment betting?

Mr. LAPHAM: I do not. This amendment supports people with no sense of responsibility; they are not true citizens and will not stand up to their obligations. It is helping the confidence man.

Hon. A. V. R. Abbott: I am helping the wife and family.

Mr. LAPHAM: The hon. member should support them when the basic wage is under discussion. I cannot support the amendment.

Mr. YATES: Gambling debts are not recoverable at law, but if the s.p. bookmaker settles his weekly transactions by cheques and those cheques are posted to clients weekly and one client takes a knock for, say, £100, the bookmaker who has been dealing with a punter for a year or so, if he has kept a record of all the cheques, can sue and the courts must grant him the money back. That is borne out by a Supreme Court decision last year. If a bookmaker paid by cheque—and I believe a majority would where the betting was by mail or post—there would be a record of the cheques and he could recover from the client. If we license bookmakers and make the transaction legal, we should complete the whole transaction. A client might bet to the extent of £500 and the bookmaker might have committed himself to other bets on that account. If on settling day the client did not pay, the bookmaker could not recover. Thus the bookmaker could be placed in a very awkward position. He might not be able to meet his obligations and probably would lose his licence. Thus the punter could make it

hard for the bookmaker. In the Supreme Court case, the bookmaker had paid by cheque and the money was recoverable.

Hon. J. B. Sleeman: Payment by cheque is legal tender.

Mr. YATES: But it was not a lawful transaction and the money was recoverable. If we made it legal and binding, the punter would know that, if he did not meet his obligations the money was recoverable at law. This in itself would constitute a restriction on betting. I consider that the amendment foreshadowed by the member for Maylands would be more suitable.

Hon. A. V. R. ABBOTT: The reason why a bet is not recoverable is that judges have long held that it is not in the public interest that a wagering debt should be recoverable. That has been the law in England for hundreds of years and I consider that the judges there have acted very wisely.

Mr. Yates: A cheque would be recoverable.

Hon. A. V. R. ABBOTT: That is a different matter. We ought to be very careful before we disturb such a principle, and we shall disturb it if the clause be passed in its present form. If we legalise betting shops, we shall, in effect, be saying that it is in the public interest to wager and bet. I appreciate the argument put forward by the member for Fremantle, namely, is it fair that the bookmaker should have to pay whereas the person who bets need not? Bookmakers are keen businessmen. They do not go bankrupt or get into serious difficulties.

Hon. J. B. Sleeman: Some do now and again.

Hon. A. V. R. ABBOTT: That might be so. They are able to judge those to whom they will give credit. Many people have a few beers and lose the £2 or £3 that they have to outlay, and then it is a big temptation for them to ask the bookmaker for credit. If the bookmaker knows he is legally entitled to recover the debt, is there any reason why he should not extend the credit?

Mr. McCulloch: Would this only apply if the bet were on credit?

Hon. A. V. R. ABBOTT: Yes. Many members have seen people borrow money in an endeavour to recover their losses. Most of us have seen men in the two-up ring borrow a few pounds in order to keep on betting. To disturb the old-established English principle of law would be unwise. I hope the Committee will accept the amendment.

Mr. BOVELL: If bets become recoverable at law, a punter might consider he had a dead cert and might go into debt as

as result, and the bookmaker might recover the debt by distraining on the goods and chattels and other property of the punter, with the result that the punter's wife and family might lose their home. Gambling, with some people, is a disease that they are not able to overcome. I say with some diffidence that if we leave the position as it is, so that a gambling debt is a debt of honour, it will be far better for all concerned. I emphasise the danger of allowing gambling debts to be recoverable at law. The Committee should consider the far-reaching effects that such a principle might have.

Hon. Sir ROSS McLARTY: I ask the Minister to give the amendment his most serious consideration. I have no doubt that when in the days gone by the Legislature decided that debts of this kind should not be recoverable at law, the decision was arrived at only after full consideration by Parliament. Without doubt, the legislation was enacted to give protection to those people who were prepared to go into debt in order to gamble. Certain people, when gambling, will go beyond the limit in the hope of getting something back.

Some members have said that if a punter has some surplus money to invest, he has every right to invest it. It is largely not surplus money, so he goes into debt and actually borrows money in order to bet further in the hope of recouping his losses. The bookmaker, as a businessman, must protect himself. If the amendment is agreed to, he will hesitate to give credit in cases where he knows he may not recover the money or thinks he might have to sue for it, because the court might find that the payment of the debt would make for hardship on the family of the person concerned, and order only a nominal payment. There is no doubt those are the reasons why past Parliaments agreed to the present position.

Amendment put and passed.

Mr. OLDFIELD: The amendment I have on the notice paper is not now altogether necessary, although I would like some of its principles included in the measure. The amendment just agreed to makes it impossible to recover a betting debt, whereas that which I proposed to move would prevent betting debts being incurred, seeing that, in the case of a phone bet, the money would have to be lodged previously with the bookmaker and in other instances would have to be paid to him before the commencement of the race. In that way, it would prevent people getting into debt through credit bets. I propose to move an amendment as follows:—

That a new subclause, to stand as Subclause (3), be added as follows:—

No bet or transaction arising out of or in connection with a bet shall be lawful under this Act

unless the consideration for the bet shall be paid or delivered in money at or before the time at which the race in respect of which the bet is made commences.

Point of Order.

Mr. Yates: I think this amendment is out of order as the Committee has just agreed that no betting transaction shall be enforceable at law and the proposed amendment of the member for Maylands would cut across that.

The Chairman: In view of the amendment that the Committee has just agreed to, that now proposed to be moved is out of order.

Committee Resumed.

Clause, as amended, put and passed.

Clause 6—Constitution of betting control board:

Hon. J. B. SLEEMAN: I move an amendment—

That the words "one member being a person to represent the Western Australian Turf Club" in lines 17 and 18, page 6, be struck out.

If I had my way, I would have the one board to control betting, lotteries, racing and trotting. I think the time has arrived when something should be done to see that the control of trotting and racing is taken out of the hands of the people who are interested in it.

Hon. D. Brand: That would make the board even more powerful than the Government.

Hon. J. B. SLEEMAN: We would want good men to run it.

Mr. Hearman: Do you want a woman on it?

Hon. J. B. SLEEMAN: I might give the hon. member consideration in that regard! We should have an independent board. We all received a letter from the W.A. Trotting Association in regard to betting, and this is how a portion of it reads—

We believe that you will find from a careful perusal of this report that the advantages of totalisator investments are overwhelmingly in its favour, and that the proposed legalising of bookmakers is a retrograde step which will have far-reaching effects on the culture and economy of this State.

That is a letter from people who have been taking money illegally from bookmakers for years. They charge bookmakers to bet on the course—to do an illegal act. I cannot see how these people could accept a seat on the board, if it is offered them by the Government, because of their views on bookmakers. I hope the Committee will

agree to the amendment and, if it is carried, I shall move to strike out the next two lines.

Hon. Sir ROSS McLARTY: I am particularly interested in this clause and intend to oppose the amendment. I am concerned about the qualifications required by the other three members of the board, and I ask the Minister to give us that information. There are many clubs affiliated with the W.A. Turf Club and the W.A. Trotting Association, and these organisations are vitally interested in, and affected by, this legislation.

Hon. J. B. Sleeman: They will be affected to the extent that they will be getting a lot of money out of it.

Hon. Sir ROSS McLARTY: That is so, and they are the governing bodies in both cases and should be represented on the board. I am glad to know that, before salaries of members of the board are agreed to, Parliament will have some say.

Hon. J. B. Sleeman: Do not you think it will start for another 12 months?

Hon. Sir ROSS McLARTY: Even if it does, the regulations will have to be tabled, and objection can be taken to them at that time. We know what qualifications two members of the board will need.

Hon. J. B. Sleeman: How do you know?

Hon. Sir ROSS McLARTY: One will come from the Trotting Association and one from the W.A.T.C.

Mr. Hearman: No; it says that those two members shall represent those bodies.

Mr. Court: They are nominated.

Hon. J. B. Sleeman: But it does not say who they shall be.

Hon. Sir ROSS McLARTY: I think the two representatives would come from those two organisations. However, I would like to hear from the Minister as to the qualifications of the other three members.

Mr. BOVELL: I agree with the Leader of the Opposition. During the second reading debate, I suggested that the qualifications of the other three members should be included in the Bill and, as a suggestion, I said that one ought to be the Commissioner of Police, another a judge of the Supreme Court, and the third the Under Treasurer or his deputy. I think it was the Minister for Housing who interjected and said that a judge of the Supreme Court would have to consent to his appointment. In that case, we should appoint a stipendiary magistrate. I think the suggestion is worthy of serious consideration.

Mr. WILD: I consider it necessary that both these bodies be represented on the board. As it appears that this legislation will become law, these two organisations

could be likened to the producers in the industry and, as the Government has thrown out its chest this session about giving producers representation on different boards, I think it should agree to it in this instance and vote against the amendment. We could reach the position that they had in South Australia when betting was legalised in 1935 and it was thrown out in 1946. The number of people who attended the courses gradually became fewer and fewer. In my view, it is necessary that these two organisations be represented so that their viewpoints can be placed before the board. I notice that the member for Mt. Lawley has an amendment on the notice paper to the effect that the representatives of the club and the association be nominated by those two organisations. I think that is most essential, otherwise we could have five people on the board who did not possess a knowledge of horse-racing and trotting.

Mr. McCULLOCH: I am inclined to agree with the member for Fremantle. On the Licensing Board, for example, the members are not necessarily connected with hotels. If a representative from the W.A. Trotting Association and a representative from the W.A. Turf Club are appointed to the board, they will have two votes between them and I think they would be inclined to favour certain individuals who are now waiting to be registered as bookmakers on the course.

Mr. Hutchinson: Would you suggest that a representative of the s.p. operators should be appointed to the board?

Mr. McCULLOCH: Yes, if we have a representative for—

The CHAIRMAN: The hon. member should confine his remarks to the amendment.

Mr. McCULLOCH: I agree with the amendment because I do not see any necessity for five men to be appointed to the board. The work would be no greater than that of the Licensing Court, for example, nor would this body have to handle as much money as the Lotteries Commission.

Mr. O'BRIEN: I support the amendment. I do not know whether the W.A. Turf Club or the W.A. Trotting Association desires a representative to be appointed to the board. In my opinion, five highly qualified men should be appointed.

The PREMIER: The racing club and the trotting clubs organise the sport on which this Bill, to a large extent, is based. For many years those people who do not choose to go to the courses have used the illegal s.p. betting method to invest their money on horse-races or trotting events. S.p. betting has grown to such proportions that some practical attempt by Parliament must be made in an endeavour to put the

system under control. In the opinion of the Government, the Bill is a practical approach to the problem and I think it would be unreasonable for Parliament to say to the racing clubs or the trotting clubs that they cannot have representation on the board.

The Government considers that they should have representation in the proportion proposed in the clause. It has been suggested that if those representatives are appointed to the board they will have an axe to grind. They would naturally be interested in the welfare of the racing and trotting clubs respectively and we could not blame them for that. At the same time they could bring to the discussions and deliberations of the board a great deal of practical experience in connection with horse-racing and trotting. The Bill does not provide that they shall have majority representation; they would have two-fifths representation. The other three members would be men of commonsense who would, I think, be awake to any special move which the racing club or trotting club representative might put forward.

Mr. Yates: Would you call for applications for those three positions?

The PREMIER: No, I do not think that we would call for applications. I think the members of this Chamber could rely on the Government to choose three men who would be respectable members of the community and to ensure that there would be no shadow of doubt as to their integrity, their balance and their honesty, so that this legislation would be operated in a manner which would be reasonably satisfactory, at any rate, to all interests concerned.

Mr. Yates: I think it would be wise to call for applications just the same.

The PREMIER: If applications were called for these particular positions, there would be a great wad of them and they might not be applications from men who would be most suited to do a job thoroughly and satisfactorily. I think one of the members, as suggested by the member for Vasse, who would be appointed by the Treasurer, would be the Under Treasurer of the State or his deputy.

At this stage I might indicate that it is the thought of the Government, when all the clauses of the Bill have been considered to try to insert a new clause to provide that this legislation will operate until the 31st December, 1957, and no longer. We would consider that a reasonable trial period. It would mean that in 1957 the Government of the day would have to introduce legislation to re-enact the law. I hope the Committee will not interfere with the proposal to give racing clubs, as such, a representative and trotting clubs, as such, a representative. The Government would have no objection to an

amendment to allow a racing club to nominate its own representative or to allow the trotting club to nominate its own representative.

Hon. J. B. SLEEMAN: The Premier started off by telling us that these people are entitled to representation because they control racing and trotting in this State.

The Premier: They organise it.

Hon. J. B. SLEEMAN: The Premier inferred that without these associations, we could not have any trotting or galloping in this State.

The Premier: No.

Hon. J. B. SLEEMAN: It would go on just the same; it could be run by a betting board as is done in Tasmania. They take charge of betting, trotting and galloping.

Amendment put and negatived.

Hon. A. V. R. ABBOTT: The Premier has said there would be no objection to organisations nominating their own representative, and that is sensible. I move an amendment—

That after the word "club" in line 18, page 6, the words "and nominated by the committee thereof" be inserted.

Amendment put and passed.

Hon. A. V. R. ABBOTT: My next amendment applies to the W.A. Trotting Association which would be placed on a similar footing. I move an amendment—

That after the word "association" in line 20, page 6, the words "and nominated by the committee thereof" be inserted.

Amendment put and passed.

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

That after the word "Governor" in line 23, page 6, the words "provided that the chairman shall be the commissioner or his nominee" be inserted.

The Minister for Police: Commissioner of what?

Hon. A. F. WATTS: Commissioner of Stamps. I understand he occupies the position of Under Treasurer. But there is always a specific officer appointed as Commissioner of Stamps and that officer of the Public Service under this measure will deal with the collection of the turnover tax, returns from the bookmakers and sundries of that nature. It would be desirable for that officer, or a nominee of his department considered suitable for the purpose, to be appointed chairman of this board. It would ensure his independence and would ensure reasonable contact with the Government in regard to the officers of the board and in all matters in which the board was concerned.

The MINISTER FOR POLICE: I do not like this proposal at all. We propose to constitute a board consisting of a representative of the Trotting Association and a representative of the Turf Club. That will provide for the proprietary side of the sport upon which the betting will be conducted. The Leader of the Opposition asked what I thought the qualifications of these men should be. I would say that of the three Government nominees one should be the Under Treasurer or his deputy and the other two remaining nominees should be men with a thorough knowledge of racing, trotting and betting, and, in addition, be men who had proved that they had considerable administrative ability. With all due respect to the Commissioner of Stamps, he may not know a trotting horse from a racehorse.

Hon. A. F. Watts: He is the Under Treasurer.

The MINISTER FOR POLICE: If we had the Under Treasurer as the Government nominee we would preserve the financial side of it, but to load the board with the Under Treasurer or his deputy, and then with the Commissioner of Stamps and one person other than that, we would probably have one out of three who would know a trotting horse from a racehorse.

Hon. A. V. R. Abbott: It was not thought a good idea to put the Under Treasurer on.

The MINISTER FOR POLICE: From the financial point of view, it would be a good idea. If we were not putting the Under Treasurer on, there might be some justification for suggesting the Commissioner of Stamps. But the hon. member also wants to dictate as to who shall be chairman of the board.

Mr. Hutchinson: You would have to understand the function of the board and say whether you wanted betting to become a booming industry or not.

The MINISTER FOR POLICE: We do not want it to become a booming industry. We want to provide the minimum facilities consistent with the demand. We do not want an army of police pursuing the punters along the lanes, etc. I favour the Under Treasurer or his deputy being appointed on the board, rather than the Commissioner of Stamps.

Amendment put and negatived.

The MINISTER FOR POLICE: A correction appears to be necessary in Subclause (6) on page 7. The word "any" in line 14 should be corrected to read as "and."

The CHAIRMAN: That is a typographical error and permission can be given to correct it.

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

That the word "Governor" in line 31, page 7, be struck out and the word "Minister" inserted in lieu.

The term "Governor" implies the use of the Executive Council. That seems to be a cumbersome procedure for filling a temporary vacancy. The procedure for filling long-term vacancies is covered by Subclause (5).

Amendment put and passed.

The CHAIRMAN: There is a gentleman in the Speaker's gallery taking down notes. That is strictly against parliamentary procedure and I would ask him to refrain from doing so.

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

That at the end of Subclause (10), page 7, the following words be added:—

"The deputies of the members nominated respectively by the committee of the Western Australian Turf Club and the Western Australian Trotting Association shall be respectively chosen by the committees of those corporations."

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

Clauses 7 and 8—agreed to.

Clause 9—Applications for, and discretion of board to grant, licences:

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

That at the end of Subclause (2), page 8, the following words be added:—

"but no licence shall be transferable or pass to the personal representative of a deceased licensee."

I am sure no one wants to see a repeat of the position which arose under the Licensing Act, where trading in licences for large sums of money was a common occurrence. I am sure that is not intended by the Bill, and if it is not, it is certainly desirable that the licences should be personal to the applicants holding them. If a person relinquishes his licence, then the board should decide the person to hold it. The licence should not be the subject of trafficking. On the death of a person who held a licence, the board should decide whether his representative should have it or not. Doubtless in a proper case the representative would be given the licence. Again, the representative should be prohibited from trafficking the licence.

The MINISTER FOR POLICE: I agree with the contention that licences should not be passed from one person to another. In many cases the representatives of a licensee may be his wife or son. If this amendment is agreed to, in the event of the death of the licensee, the licence cannot be transferred to his son or wife.

Hon. A. V. R. Abbott: I doubt if that is so.

The MINISTER FOR POLICE: This amendment says no licence shall be transferable.

Hon. A. V. R. Abbott: The board could grant a new licence.

Hon. A. F. Watts: That is what I had in mind, to permit the board to deal with the matter and grant a new licence.

The MINISTER FOR POLICE: That would overcome the position. I do not see any objection to it. I do not want a total prohibition to grant a licence to the son or wife of a deceased licensee. I appreciate that an existing licence would not be transferrable, but the board should be able to issue a new licence to the wife or son if considered desirable.

Amendment put and passed.

Hon. A. V. R. ABBOTT: A bookmaker should carry on at one shop only, just as a hotel licensee is permitted to hold a licence in respect of only one hotel. He should be allowed to operate either on a racecourse or at a registered shop. Only a certain number of premises would be available for betting, and some of the operators now carrying on would have to go out of business. It is advisable that the bookmaker should be made personally responsible for the conduct of his business and that he himself should carry it on. As the first of several amendments, I move—

That the letter "(a)" in line 23, page 8, be struck out.

The MINISTER FOR POLICE: This will alter the intention of the Bill, which was that all bookmakers were to be licensed by the board and, if the racing or trotting club agreed that one should have the right to bet on the course and also in registered premises away from the course, that would be permissible. The member for Mt. Lawley desires that the operations of a bookmaker shall be limited to on-the-course or off-the-course betting. I have discussed the matter with the Minister for Works, who was a member of the Cabinet sub-committee and decided that the bookmaker should operate either on or off the course. Therefore I have no objection to the amendment, but I suggest that the hon. member, in his series of proposed amendments, should include one to add after the word "licence" in line 31, the words "but not on both."

Hon. A. V. R. Abbott: That is my intention.

Mr. LAPHAM: I have not a copy of the amendments and it is extremely difficult to follow what is proposed. We could possibly do an injustice to a course bookmaker by adopting the amendment. The procedure of years should be permitted to continue. A bookmaker commences to bet on Thursday night because he has to make a market for betting transactions before going to the course, and the amendment might debar him from operating previous to the race meeting. I do not think that is the intention of the member for Mt. Lawley, but it could happen. The matter should receive further consideration; otherwise we shall deprive the bookmaker of an existing right. Further, a bookmaker settles with clients, not on the course, but at a club or at his own home, and he should still have that right.

The MINISTER FOR POLICE: There is no intention to interfere with the functions of a bookmaker on or off the course, except that an on-the-course bookmaker must be approved and licensed by the board and would not be permitted to operate in registered premises. Provision is made to protect the position at Tattersall's Club. If a bookmaker did his settling there, he would not be interfered with.

Amendment put and passed.

On motions by Hon. A. V. R. Abbott, clause further amended by inserting after the words "bookmaker" in line 24, page 8 the words "either (a)"; by striking out the word "and" in line 27, page 28 and inserting in lieu the word "or"; and by striking out in lines 28 and 29, page 8 the words "entitles the holder and his agent on his behalf, to carry on."

Hon. A. V. R. ABBOTT: I want to ensure that a licence shall not be granted to a limited liability company. The licensing should be on a personal basis. I move an amendment—

That after the word "years" in line 35, page 8, the following paragraph be added:—"(c) to a body corporate."

This will prevent a licence being granted to a limited liability company or any other body corporate.

Amendment put and passed.

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

That after paragraph (c) of subclause (5), the following paragraph be added:—"(d) to an undischarged bankrupt."

The proposal is self-explanatory. If the Minister does not agree with the amendment, I can advance arguments in favour of it.

The MINISTER FOR POLICE: The amendment is all right, but it is not much of a compliment to the board. An undischarged bankrupt could not very well be registered because he would have to put

up a bond, and it would be unlikely that anyone would put up a bond for him; and even if one were put up, some of his creditors would probably claim on it. I have no great objection to the amendment, but I think it is unnecessary.

Amendment put and passed.

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

That after paragraph (d) of Subclause (5) the following paragraph be added:—" (e) to a person who is not a natural-born or naturalised British subject."

The MINISTER FOR POLICE: Under certain circumstances there would be no objection to a person who was not a natural born or naturalised British subject being granted a bookmaker's licence. Many of the people we have brought from overseas have settled in little communities, and particularly in remote areas it might be desirable to licence one of their number as a bookmaker even though none of them might have been in the country long enough to become naturalised.

Amendment put and passed.

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

That after (d) of Subclause (5) the following paragraph be added:—" (e) To any person in respect of more than one registered premises."

The MINISTER FOR POLICE: This is covered in Clause 11, in paragraph (b) of Subclause (2).

Hon. A. V. R. ABBOTT: In those circumstances, I ask leave to withdraw my amendment.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

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

That the words "or body, whether a body corporate or not," in lines 4 and 5, page 9, be struck out.

Amendment put and passed.

The MINISTER FOR POLICE: I move an amendment—

That the words "or body" in line 6, page 9, be struck out.

Amendment put and passed.

The MINISTER FOR POLICE: I move an amendment—

That after the word "board" in line 8, page 9, the following words be added:—"and in this subsection 'person' means an individual person and does not include more persons than one in respect of one licence or a body corporate."

Amendment put and passed.

Hon. A. V. R. ABBOTT: I wish to include a provision to ensure that a bookmaker shall be present on his premises in the same way as the licensee of a hotel

is required to be on his licensed premises. This will prevent him from employing a dummy to carry on the business. I move an amendment—

That a new subclause, to stand as Subclause (8), be added as follows:—

A bookmaker shall not be absent from the registered premises in respect of which he holds a license while open for business on more than twenty-eight days in any one year without written permission of the Board.

Mr. YATES: I would like the member for Mt. Lawley to make it 28 consecutive days because the premises might be open for only three days in each week and that would permit the bookmaker to be absent for four or five months. Twenty-eight consecutive days would mean that he could be absent for only one month.

Mr. HEAL: I want the Minister to clean up one point. If this amendment is agreed to, will it mean that a bookmaker on the course will not be able to have registered premises off the course?

Hon. A. V. R. Abbott: That has been passed already.

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

Clause 10—agreed to.

Progress reported.

House adjourned at 12.58 a.m. (Thursday).

Legislative Council

Thursday, 18th November, 1954.

CONTENTS.

Page

Question: Radio interference, as to legislation for suppression	3030
Bills: Native Administration Act Amendment, 1r.	3030
Milk Act Amendment, 3r.	3030
Vermin Act Amendment, 3r.	3030
Stock Diseases Act Amendment, 3r., passed	3030
Marketing of Eggs Act Amendment, 3r., passed	3030
Argentine Ant, Assembly's message	3030
Native Welfare, 2r.	3031
Traffic Act Amendment (No. 2), Com.	3036
Dried Fruits Act Amendment, 2r.	3041
Dentists Act Amendment, Com.	3041
Limitation Act Amendment, 2r.	3043
Standing Orders Committee, consideration of report, Com.	3044

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

QUESTION.

RADIO INTERFERENCE.

As to Legislation for Suppression.

Hon. L. C. DIVER (without notice) asked the Chief Secretary:

(1) Has the Minister received any complaints from local authorities or other bodies in rural areas concerning interference to wireless reception, which is due to the fact that no legislation exists to make the fitting of suppressors on electrical machinery and equipment compulsory?

(2) If the answer to No. (1) is in the affirmative, will the Minister advise whether he proposes to introduce the desired legislation this session?

(3) If the answer is no, will the Minister take steps to introduce the legislation required during this session?

The CHIEF SECRETARY replied:

I thank the hon. member for supplying me with a copy of these questions he has asked without notice. The replies are as follows:—

(1) and (2) No, I have not received any complaints. I have made inquiries at the Local Government Department, and it also has received no complaints in regard to this matter.

(3) No, because we would need to have some information on the matter and also give some attention to the drafting of the proposed legislation; and it is hoped that the session will finish within the next few weeks. Therefore, it would be impossible to introduce such legislation before the end of the session.

BILL—NATIVE ADMINISTRATION ACT AMENDMENT.

Introduced by Hon. H. L. Roche and read a first time.

BILLS (4)—THIRD READING.

1, Milk Act Amendment.

2, Vermin Act Amendment.

Returned to the Assembly with amendments.

3, Stock Diseases Act Amendment.

4, Marketing of Eggs Act Amendment.
Passed.

BILL—ARGENTINE ANT.

Assembly's Message.

Message from the Assembly received and read notifying that it had agreed to the Council's amendments.