

The **MINISTER FOR INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT**: They are happy to get pig iron of any grade, but mostly they receive the grade they specify. They do not just take the grade we give them, but specify what they want and get it.

Hon. A. V. R. Abbott: And pay more for it.

The **MINISTER FOR INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT**: They are not paying more in relation to the average export price, and that is an important factor. Another point is that manufacturing concerns in Western Australia have a number of advantages. They are getting pig iron when and how they want it delivered. They do not have to bear the high costs of carrying big stocks to provide against shipping difficulties. They have the best quality available, and this enables them to feed in 30 cwt. of scrap to one ton of pig iron. None of the imported pigs will come within 30 per cent. of that. These are facts and figures which the hon. member apparently has not taken into consideration.

Hon. A. V. R. Abbott: Yes, I have.

The **MINISTER FOR MINES**: This iron is available at all times at a minute's notice, and this is an important factor which the majority of manufacturers recognise and are happy about, but one or two are bellyaching, and they have done so over a period of years. The policy is not going to be altered just for one or two.

Vote put and passed.

Vote—Fisheries, £44,014:

HON. A. V. R. ABBOTT (Mt. Lawley) [11.17]: Not a great deal of money has been spent on fisheries. The estimate is £44,000, but the department had a revenue of about £7,600 last year, so the expenditure is only £36,000. The department is doing valuable work, and I would like to see the vote higher with a view to having more research done. I would also like the status of the department raised because it has become a large department since the crayfishing industry has developed. The head of the department, Mr. Fraser, does an excellent job, and I do not see why his status should not be raised. I know this has always been resisted by the Public Service Commissioner, but I think that, because of the amount of wealth that the fisheries create in Western Australia, some consideration should be given to this point.

Oysters are being sent here, in bottled form, in fairly large quantities from the North-West, and I think that some investigation of the beds up there should be made to see what effect this gathering of wild oysters is having. I have not any knowledge of this matter, but it would be a pity if the natural beds

were so depleted as to cause harm. The Minister could give that question some consideration.

Progress reported.

BILL—WHEAT INDUSTRY STABILISATION.

Returned from the Council without amendment.

ADJOURNMENT—SPECIAL.

THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION (Hon. W. Hegney—Mt. Hawthorn): I move—

That the House at its rising adjourn till 2.15 p.m. tomorrow.

Question put and passed.

House adjourned at 11.20 p.m.

Legislative Council

Friday, 3rd December, 1954.

CONTENTS.

	Page
Bills : Native Welfare, 3r.	3530
Radioactive Substances, 3r.	3530
Betting Control, 3r.	3530
Parks and Reserves Act Amendment, 1r., 2r.	3547
State Government Insurance Office Act Amendment (No. 2), report, etc.	3550
Bookmakers Betting Tax, 2r.	3550

The **PRESIDENT** took the Chair at 2.15 p.m., and read prayers.

BILLS (2)—THIRD READING.

1, Native Welfare.

2, Radioactive Substances.

Returned to the Assembly with amendments.

BILL—BETTING CONTROL.

Third Reading.

THE CHIEF SECRETARY (Hon. G. Fraser—West) [2.18]: I move—

That the Bill be now read a third time.

HON. N. E. BAXTER (Central) [2.19]: I feel I cannot allow this Bill to go through its last stage without lodging a final protest against it. It is a measure that will

remain with us for three long years and is one that affects the working people more than anybody else. It also concerns an industry which has been built up in this State over many years—the racehorse industry.

The Minister for the North-West: You admit that it is not a sport, then?

Hon. N. E. BAXTER: It is an industry and also a sport. It is a sport for those who treat it as such. It has been known as the sport of kings. Actually it is not a sport to be dabbled in by those with only a few pounds in their pockets.

The Chief Secretary: You think it should be called the sport of kinks!

Hon. N. E. BAXTER: Throughout the British Empire, as the Chief Secretary is aware, it has been known as the sport of kings.

Hon. J. J. Garrigan: That is a good recommendation.

Hon. N. E. BAXTER: Apparently those who represent the working class wish them to aspire to the height of kings—

Hon. C. W. D. Barker: Hear, hear!

Hon. N. E. BAXTER: —with a couple of pounds in their pockets. Throughout Australasia the Governments of each State and of New Zealand have given consideration to this matter.

Hon. C. W. D. Barker: You do not look a bit righteous.

Hon. N. E. BAXTER: For the information of the hon. member, I feel righteous; more righteous than he will feel in three years' time!

The Minister for the North-West: That will be his worry.

Hon. N. E. BAXTER: May he have a conscience during the three years that the measure is in operation! A totalisator system has been installed in New Zealand, and it is working satisfactorily.

Hon. J. J. Garrigan: That is a gamble just the same.

Hon. N. E. BAXTER: I am not objecting to the gambling aspect, as the hon. member knows, but to the principle by which the Bill will handle gambling. It is not even a democratic principle.

Hon. R. J. Boylen: What is the meaning of democracy?

Hon. N. E. BAXTER: The hon. member would not know its meaning, when he supports a measure of this nature.

Hon. R. J. Boylen: I want to learn.

Hon. N. E. BAXTER: The New Zealand Government has instituted a totalisator system which is working satisfactorily there from all angles—from the point of view of the return to the Government,

which in a way is a minor matter; from the point of view of the public, which is a grave matter; and from the point of view of the racing-clubs, which is a serious matter—because, by the use of the totalisator system, racing can be kept clean. That, however, will not happen in this State.

Betting shops were tried in South Australia and resulted in chaotic conditions, and so affected racing that it went to a very low level. Betting shops have been tried in Tasmania where the result will be the same as that in South Australia. The authorities are attempting the same thing in Queensland; and I can assure the House that there, and in any other State which establishes betting shops, the method will fail. It has failed in one State, and it will fail in the rest; yet our Government is prepared to foist it upon the people. I shall vote against the third reading of the Bill, and I know that those who vote for it will in a few years' time be sorry for having done so.

HON. L. C. DIVER (Central) [2.25]: I take this opportunity of saying a few words in condemnation of the passing of the Bill. I shall vote against the third reading. I feel that the measure has not the right title. It should be a "Bill for the paralysing of the Horse-racing Sport in Western Australia"; because surely that is what it will do. Once the Bill becomes law, members will not have to wait long to see its actual effects. It would appear that those who have supported it are prepared to set their faces against all the evidence of the experiment made in our sister State. I pray that Cabinet, when determining the individuals who shall constitute the betting control board will make the wisest choice, because upon that board will devolve a terrific responsibility in regard to the control and spread of vice throughout Western Australia.

This House, in conjunction with another, has now passed a Bill that is about to have its third reading, and this Bill will make it lawful to carry on something that has not been lawful over the years. I suppose the next measure of this nature that we will have before us will be one for the legalising of gaming in the form of dice, two-up, and the playing of cards for money.

The Minister for the North-West: You know that is not right.

Hon. L. C. DIVER: Why not? There is nothing hurts more than the truth.

The Minister for the North-West: That is untrue.

Hon. L. C. DIVER: There would be no interjection if it were untrue. It is with a feeling of dejection and sorrow, and not anger, that I see the Bill being presented for its third reading. I shall vote against it.

HON. E. M. HEENAN (North-East) [2.28]: I support the third reading. Now that the second reading and Committee stages have been passed, I think it is incumbent on all concerned to wish the Government well in the implementation of this measure. I am sure the Government is as well aware as anyone else of the evils that could be attached to the faulty administration of a measure of this kind. The Government is not careless or unconcerned about the welfare of the community; but it feels that after all these years of vacillation, the time has arrived to grapple with this problem in a practical way. In this life we are never certain of success, and in these matters we have to screw our courage to the sticking place. If we fail, we fail; but if we have courage, we will not fail. I think this is the way we have to look upon this measure. Give it a trial and do not condemn it from the start.

Hon. N. E. Baxter: It condemns itself.

Hon. E. M. HEENAN: From the speeches of one or two members, one could easily draw the deduction that they are hoping and praying that a lot of the worst things will happen. If they do, those members will say, "We told you so!", and they will get a lot of satisfaction out of it. I think that is the wrong approach. I can see a lot of good things happening. I can see a lot of the present evils disappearing, and I can see people complying with the law. I can see the police being given a free hand to enforce the law, and we should all abide by it.

Hon. C. H. Henning: Have they not been given a free hand before?

Hon. E. M. HEENAN: Apparently over the years the public demand has grown into a practice that has been accepted all round; and the police, the Government, and the community have not known where they stood. I do not blame the police; they have been placed in a most invidious position. But now I hope that there will be no inhibitions or restrictions placed upon them, and that everyone will be compelled to abide by and respect the law.

No one wants more or less than that. I think to allow our young people to grow up and form an opinion that laws can be broken and nothing will happen would be bad. I fully realise the risks and dangers that are attendant on this measure, and I am not brushing aside the experience of South Australia. But I hope that we will have learnt by that. We can all learn by other people's mistakes.

Hon. A. R. Jones: You have not shown it up to date.

Hon. E. M. HEENAN: I hope this board will be a wise one, and that it will keep constantly in mind some of the unfortunate things that happened in South Australia. I trust that its decisions will be wise, and that it will receive the support

and backing of the community. That is the attitude that we ought to adopt at this stage, and not start prophesying that all these dreadful things will happen.

Hon. N. E. Baxter: There is no prophesying about it.

HON. J. MURRAY (South-West) [2.34]: I think this is the second occasion that I have risen to speak on the third reading of a Bill. I do so without apology to members, but merely to explain some points to those who are carried away with some degree of enthusiasm and who placed certain amendments on the notice paper believing that I might be prepared to support them because those amendments were somewhat along the lines of some of my remarks.

Certain amendments on the notice paper had reference to totalisators, and in my second reading speech I made it clear that I believed a State-wide system of totalisators was the answer to the problem. But I pointed out also that there was no provision for it in the Bill, and therefore I delivered an alternative. Never, at any stage in my second reading speech, did I suggest that a hybrid system would work. If the amendments on the notice paper had been agreed to, we would have been faced with a hybrid proposition.

Hon. H. K. Watson: You do not call the present proposition a pure blood or thoroughbred, do you?

Hon. N. E. Baxter: Far from it.

Hon. J. MURRAY: I said that I did not think it was the answer to the problem. But this is the Bill the Government has seen fit to introduce, and therefore it is the Government's responsibility. I also pointed out that the success or failure of this proposition depended upon the composition and actions of the board. But to get back to my remarks about a hybrid system. If the amendment were agreed to there would be nothing but totalisators within a 25-mile radius of the Perth Town Hall. Outside that radius there would be registered premises where present-day practices would continue and an owner could get the odds about his horse.

The disadvantage of that system would be that nobody would know whether the owner had succeeded in getting his money on at 6 to 4, or whatever odds he was prepared to take, and the general public would go to the racecourse with very little information. Such a system would have few benefits and would be little different from what is proposed in this legislation, because little extra money would reach the racecourse—certainly no more than is the case today.

Attempts were made to alter the board. This is a Bill for which the Government has accepted responsibility; and I was not, and am not, prepared to alter the board and so compel the Government to appoint

certain people. If an error is made and the right personnel are not placed on the board, that is the Government's responsibility.

Hon. N. E. Baxter: And yours, do not forget.

Hon. J. MURRAY: If such people are placed on the board, it will be Parliament's responsibility, at some future date, to see that they are removed. If not, the people of Western Australia can vote against the Government.

Hon. C. H. Simpson: It is difficult to remove an Act once it is on the statute book.

Hon. J. MURRAY: Yes, that is so. Unfortunately experience in the past has shown that, irrespective of the type of Government in office, once it gets a vested interest in anything it is reluctant to alter the set-up. The Government must get a vested interest in this.

The Minister for the North-West: There is no vested interest in it.

Hon. J. MURRAY: The remarks I made on the second reading may have led some members astray. I said that in my view the best alternative would be a system of licensing premises, and that these premises should close at 1 o'clock and no payment of winning bets should be made until the working day following the race meeting. I do not know whether I was expected to support certain amendments that were moved in Committee, but one member moved an amendment that the betting shops be closed at 1 o'clock on Saturdays, and that the radius be limited to 25 miles from the Perth Town Hall. There was no reference at all to the payment of winning bets. That also would involve a hybrid proposition which I could not support.

Never at any stage was I prepared to amend the proposals in the Bill. I was prepared to accept the measure as it stood and let the Government take the responsibility for it. If that amendment had been carried, the shops would have closed at 1 o'clock on Saturday afternoon. People would have been able to bet on Eastern States events until that time, and winning bets would have been paid. That would have been the position of those who did not go to the racecourse.

Hon. C. H. Simpson: They could bet on events before the shops closed.

Hon. J. MURRAY: Undoubtedly. But many of these people are enthusiastic. They like to get their money back if possible; and if there is a hotel handy, many of them like a schooner in between races. It is their social event. What would be the effect of the 25-mile limit? Safety Bay could have a number of licensed shops; and because that town is outside the 25-mile limit, people from Rockingham and Fremantle would go there on Saturday afternoon to do their betting.

Hon. A. R. Jones: Would people go from Fremantle, and Rockingham, and Safety Bay to have a bet? Do not be silly!

Hon. J. MURRAY: Muchea, Mundijong, Mundaring, Chidlow and Sawyer's Valley, are all outside the 25-mile limit.

Hon. N. E. Baxter: They go past the racecourse to go there.

Hon. J. MURRAY: But they do not need to go past the racecourse if they live at Rockingham or Fremantle. The point is that any of these towns outside the 25-mile radius would have, to use a colloquial term, an open slather. They would remain open and would pay out on winning bets. It would be an added attraction for people to go to those places.

I have spoken to the third reading in order to explain my attitude, because some members probably honestly thought I would support certain amendments that were submitted. Unfortunately some amendments have been made. I would much rather the Bill had passed in the form originally introduced—except for the dotting of the "i's" and the connecting of the "a's"—because it is the Government's responsibility. The Government has decided that this measure is in the best interests of the State, and it has accepted the full and free responsibility for it. With those few remarks I support the third reading.

HON. H. K. WATSON (Metropolitan) [2.45]: I was rather interested, and not a little surprised to hear Mr. Murray join himself with those who must take the full and free responsibility for this Bill which is about to pass the third reading. Before it does so, I want to lodge my final protest against the measure. We find the churches do not want it, and the racing clubs do not want it; and indeed I have yet to find someone who has asked for it. I dare say that in the course of time we will discover where the pressure has come from.

The Minister for the North-West: There has been no pressure.

Hon. H. K. WATSON: The only representations I have had, have been those against the measure. I have had no requests to support it at all. Despite the experience they have had in South Australia, and to a lesser extent in Tasmania, the Government still proposes to go for this proposition with its head down.

The Chief Secretary: Did your requests come from the churches?

Hon. H. K. WATSON: From the general electors. I do not mind telling the Chief Secretary that I had more letters in connection with this matter than I had on the rent Bill, and I would have thought that was a sufficiently controversial question.

Hon. Sir Charles Latham: It proved we were right, too.

Hon. H. K. WATSON: I suppose I received about 150 letters, and not one of them asked me to support the measure.

The Chief Secretary: That is not many out of 300,000 or 400,000 people.

Hon. H. K. WATSON: But I do think it is indicative. In the Federal Constitution there is a famous clause known as the Braddon Blot. I understand that the Act that was put through in South Australia—on which this Bill is largely based—was known as Butler's Bloomer. I imagine that after this Bill becomes law, the betting shops we will see scattered around the country will be known as Hawke's Horrors.

The Minister for the North-West: What do they call them now?

Hon. H. K. WATSON: I would also like to record my protest at the manner in which the Government has steam-rolled this Bill through. The measure was brought down and the Government was not prepared to accept any substantial amendments. It fought every one, and with the assistance of this House was able to carry its intentions. It seems that the whole concern of the Chief Secretary and the Government in this matter, and their approach to it, has been, "How can we protect the people so that they can always bet on the Eastern States races?" What is the attraction in the Eastern States races for the Government to want to be certain that the people should bet on them? It seems an extraordinary approach, particularly by a Labour Government. I would commend to the Government and its supporters the words which were uttered by the late Hon. P. Collier some years ago, and which were read by Sir Charles Latham the other night. Those statements and sentiments, expressed by Mr. Collier, are as true today as they were then.

HON. A. F. GRIFFITH (Suburban) [2.49]: This has been a most interesting debate; and as Mr. Watson said, I do not think we have seen a Bill come to this Chamber with such speed as this one has—not in this session of Parliament at any rate. Only about three days elapsed from the time it was introduced in another place and the time we received the message here.

The Chief Secretary: I do not think that is quite correct.

Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: If it is not, how many days was it? The Bill was introduced in another place on Tuesday, it was dealt with on Wednesday and—

The PRESIDENT: The hon. member must not allude to debates in another place.

Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: We sat here a little later in order to receive the message from another place so that we could deal with this measure in a prompt manner.

The Chief Secretary: It was in order to give you more time to consider it.

Hon. F. R. H. Lavery: And he is not at all grateful for it, either.

Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: I find myself in disagreement with the sentiments expressed by Mr. Heenan. He suggested that because this Bill had passed the second reading, we were beholden to give the Government our support on the third reading. That is something to which I cannot subscribe. When I refer back to debates we had in this House during a previous session on another Bill—and I am referring to the rents and tenancies measure—I find that speaker after speaker got up on the third reading and told Mr. Watson of the dire circumstances this country would face because of the amendments he introduced. Was there any suggestion then, that because that Bill had passed the second reading, Labour members were beholden to give it their support on the third reading in the hope that it would turn out all right? In that case the Bill did turn out all right and the dire things it was threatened would happen did not, in fact, occur.

The Minister for the North-West: Who is threatening this time?

Several members interjected.

The PRESIDENT: Order!

Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: All I can say is that I sincerely hope that what I fear will not eventuate.

The Minister for the North-West: Tell us what you think will happen.

Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: In the first place I think the Short Title of the Bill is wrong.

The Minister for the North-West: But tell us what you think will happen.

Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: Instead of its being called the "Betting Control Bill" it would have been better, perhaps, if it had been called the "Betting Encouragement Bill." There is no question but that the Government's attitude has been to make it easy to bet.

The Minister for the North-West: You know that is not right.

Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: It is right.

Hon. R. J. Boylen: You do not believe it.

Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: I would ask Mr. Boylen to search his own conscience and not tell me what I should believe.

Hon. R. J. Boylen: You are searching somebody else's conscience.

The PRESIDENT: Order!

Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: I am stating what I believe; and I would ask Mr. Boylen to express his own opinions, and not mine, if and when he gets up to speak. I am just as entitled to have my convictions on this Bill and to express them as any other member.

Hon. R. J. Boylen: I do not think they are correct.

Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: I do not care what the hon. member thinks.

Hon. R. J. Boylen: Do not let it upset you.

Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: We have seen attempts by members of both Houses to make amendments to this Bill. We tried to introduce certain amendments last night. For the benefit of Mr. Boylen, if he looks at the division list he will find that there were occasions on which I was on either side of the House voting for amendments which I thought might improve the measure. But the Government stuck doggedly to the Bill, and was not prepared to accept amendments of any import.

Hon. R. J. Boylen: Members on this side of the House were on the same side as you were last night on the divisions.

Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: I was on the same side as the hon. member.

Hon. R. J. Boylen: You were a good judge, too.

Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: There has been no acceptance of any important amendment put up by members on this side of the House in an endeavour to improve the Bill.

The Chief Secretary: Is that the first time that has happened?

Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: No, and I should say, if I can be a judge of what might happen in the future, that it will not be the last time.

The Chief Secretary: Irrespective of the Government in power, it will still happen.

Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: I will grant the Chief Secretary that. It is an admission that he is prepared to force things through by weight of numbers. There is no doubt that this measure has been forced through by weight of numbers.

The Minister for the North-West: Does not the majority rule?

Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: Yes.

The Minister for the North-West: Then what are you growling about?

Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: I am satisfied to accept the will of the majority, although in this case I do not think it is for the betterment of the people. On the question of whether the will of the majority should rule, we find that the Government refuses point-blank to take a plebiscite on this question.

Hon. R. J. Boylen: No, it did not.

Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: It did. I realise that I cannot refer to a debate in another place; but if I were able to do so, I would.

The PRESIDENT: Order!

Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: I do not propose to do so, of course.

The Minister for the North-West: Tell us what you think will happen.

Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: I do not propose to be a soothsayer, and I am not prepared to make predictions.

The Minister for the North-West: You were only bluffing.

Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: The Minister wants me to look into the future and predict all the dire things that may take place because of this legislation. I still think this Bill should have been called the "Betting Encouragement Bill". We heard Mr. Barker tell us that millions upon millions of pounds were expended on betting every year. He added that there was a demand for this legislation because of those millions of pounds of the people's money that is spent. The hon. member told us he was free to vote as he liked on this issue. Time and time again he said, "We are free to vote as we like".

Hon. C. W. D. Barker: Did not I express my views freely?

Members interjected.

The PRESIDENT: Order! I would ask members to be tolerant and give the hon. member a hearing.

Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: Thank you, Mr. President. It was tantamount to an admission that the hon. member was not always free to vote as he wished. Mrs. Hutchison, my colleague in the Suburban Province, said "Thank God I am free to vote as I like on a non-party measure!" Perhaps the hon. member did not mean to say that; but she did say it. It is in "Hansard".

Hon. R. F. Hutchison: I plead a mistake.

Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: At least the hon. member is honest; but I think she is wrong in supporting this legislation. I appeal to the Government not to go on with the measure. It is no use asking the Government to appeal to the people on this issue; if it did so it would probably appeal to them on the basis of "punters only voting". That would have been a satisfactory conclusion for it to come to!

The Minister for the North-West: You have some democratic thoughts!

Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: Surely we ought to have conducted a referendum on a matter such as this; and if the people of the State had said, "Yes, we want this legislation", then I am certain that members on this side of the House, and of both political thoughts, would have given it support.

The Minister for the North-West: They will have the opportunity.

Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: Do I understand the Minister to say that an opportunity will be given for a referendum to be held?

The Minister for the North-West: No, I mean at the elections.

Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: I do not want to bring politics into this. I wanted to be quite sure that I heard the Minister correctly. To have referred the matter to a referendum would have been the fair and proper thing to do. Once more I lodge my protest against this legislation, because it is not the answer to the question. I know it is useless to appeal to the Government to side-track from the course it proposes to steer in relation to this measure, and I oppose the third reading.

HON. C. H. SIMPSON (Midland) [3.0]: The third reading stage of a Bill affords an opportunity for members, if thought desirable, to recast their decision. If I thought that there was any possibility of this House reversing the decision that has been arrived at, I would put that suggestion forward in all seriousness; but, judging by the expressions of opinion during the debate, I think it would be useless, and so I shall content myself with registering a protest against the passing of the measure.

I believe that this is the first occasion on which a Bill has been introduced in this Chamber to deal with what is recognised as a social evil. Every speaker who contributed to the debate admitted that betting, when carried to excess, was a social evil. The issue, as I saw it from the very beginning, was this: Is this legislation to legalise betting going to minimise or exaggerate the very evil we are trying to deal with? In my opinion, the time will come when members of this House who have sponsored and supported this legislation will be sorry to see the results that have accrued from it.

The moral aspect, as far as legislation is concerned, has not entered into consideration during the debate because it is assumed that fundamentally we adopt a moral attitude to all legislation. This measure, I believe, is violating a fundamental moral principle, and violated moral principles have a habit of hitting back. There is just as much chance of a man's disregarding a fundamental moral principle with impunity as there is of him violating a physical law. So I think results will stem from this legislation that in time we shall deplore. As I see it, the measure will give a cloak of respectability to betting in shops. It means that those who have in the past indulged in s.p. betting in discomfort and in fear of the law will be able to do it openly, and many who refrained hitherto will enter the shops because of betting having been legalised.

Hon. E. M. Davies: As it is on the race-course.

Hon. C. H. SIMPSON: In the concluding part of my contribution to the second reading debate, I admitted that, over the years, this urge to bet had been allowed to become degraded. This is not something that we can correct entirely in a short space of time, but I believe that, by a programme of education and by the provision of opportunities for people to employ their leisure, it could in time be substantially reduced, if not altogether eradicated. I am still of that opinion, and I believe that this was a constructive contribution to the debate.

A majority of members have waved aside suggestions which I think could have contributed to a solution of the problem. They have waved aside any consideration in the direction of applying a totalisator system. I was not at all satisfied that we had been given facts and figures to convince us that this was impracticable, as was claimed by those who opposed the suggestion.

I am afraid that one of the effects of having s.p. shops operating, particularly in the metropolitan area on Saturday afternoon, will be to interfere with attendances at sports meetings. This has been the experience in other countries, and I fear that that will be the effect here. I may be thought to be adopting a one-sided attitude to the question, but I should like to mention something that deliberately I did not say in the course of the second reading. Two of my closest friends who, for some reason, developed the betting craze late in life, got into trouble and poisoned themselves. Apart from that one tragic mistake, they were estimable characters in every way, and in both cases their employers were prepared to forgive them and permit them to carry on. But the mistake was made and the penalty was paid.

The Chief Secretary: That happens without betting shops.

Hon. C. H. SIMPSON: The facilities afforded by broadcasting created the appetite, together with the opportunity of communicating by wire with s.p. bookmakers. Whether those bookmakers were operating legally or illegally does not matter. The fundamentals of the evil lend themselves unfortunately to such tragic occurrences.

I have always drawn a distinction between betting as I regard it and gambling, which can be sublimated into something worth while. I can point to two instances—the men who risked their lives to rescue, in the one case, a nun at Trigg's Island and, in the other case, people off the coast at Scarborough. Each of those men lost his life in trying to save the lives of others. Those were instances of gambling which

was sublimated to the highest possible degree. Thus, it becomes a question into which channel we can direct this urge of human nature. I have registered my protest; I am afraid it is futile, but I offer the House those reflections to ponder for what they are worth.

HON. C. W. D. BARKER (North) [3.7]: I am quite prepared to accept full responsibility for my action in supporting this measure. I congratulate the Government on having introduced the Bill and wish it well. Now that a majority of members are of the opinion that this Bill should be passed into law, everyone should be prepared to get behind the Government and assist it to make a success of this legislation.

Betting has been referred to as a social evil, but I do not think that that description is quite right. In my opinion, it is debatable whether betting is a social evil. Rather is it a human folly. I should define as a social evil the employment of child labour and things of that sort, but I cannot see that betting is a social evil in any way.

I repeat that I wish the Government well in its efforts to deal with this problem. I am satisfied in my own mind that success will depend upon the constitution of the board, and I hope that the Government will secure the right men for the job and particularly the right man at the head. Then we shall be able to clean up something that has long existed in this State and has needed very badly to be cleaned up.

HON. J. G. HISLOP (Metropolitan) [3.9]: Mr. Heenan expressed the opinion that the time had arrived when those of us who had voted against the Bill should stand behind the Government and wish it well in this matter. I rise to congratulate the Government on its success in getting the measure passed and I also congratulate it on its prescience.

I did not realise that members of the Government possessed such a depth of psychological understanding—a depth that other parties have never exhibited. I congratulate them on having been able to see that, out of nearly 40 members of their own party, there would not be one solitary person who would have any conscientious objections to the Bill, even though it were made a non-party measure, and yet at the same time to be so minded that there would be in the Opposition parties those who would conscientiously vote against the Bill. I think that exhibits an understanding and psychology that few political parties have ever possessed, and I should like to congratulate them on bringing to this session something that has never previously been exhibited. The Government's attitude to the introduction of the non-party measure is: While we stand firm, you may do as your conscience

dictates. I think we now have a much clearer understanding of its attitude to a Bill of this nature.

There is one more thing that I should like to suggest. In view of this urgent desire that those who bet should not be limited in their activities, but should have every opportunity to indulge in betting on Eastern States races—and I take it equally on the trots and gallops here—I suggest that when these shops are open from 10 a.m. to 10 p.m., there will be a public need that has not been provided for under this measure. The Government should seriously consider recommitting the Bill with a view to providing that the betting shops should be able to supply meals, because it would be most alarming if the public, who will be occupied in the betting shops for at least 12 hours on end, were not able to obtain refreshments. Of course, if people left the premises, they might miss a race.

In view of what has happened in other States, it is also desirable that a clause be inserted in the Bill permitting betting shops to have attached to them, in the same way as have picture theatres, rooms—crying rooms they are termed—in which babies and their prams may be accommodated.

Hon. A. F. Griffith: And for punters too?
Several members interjected.

The PRESIDENT: Order!

Hon. J. G. HISLOP: This would ensure that the adults were not disturbed. I would also suggest that very serious consideration be given to the introduction of a suitable amount of vitamin B into the liquid refreshments that the betting shops will be able to sell. The point is that so many of the patients will be people who are occupied during the week and who will now miss their golf and other games on the Saturday. They will be spending 12 hours on the Saturday in the humid atmosphere of the betting shops and should receive in their soft drinks a suitable amount of vitamin D in substitution for the sun's rays that they will be missing.

Hon. E. M. Heenan: Would you also have a surgery attached?

Hon. J. G. HISLOP: Well, it might be advantageous to have a welfare nurse. These matters deserve careful consideration, seeing that the people are going to alter the whole of their social outlook.

The Minister for the North-West: What have they been doing?

Hon. J. G. HISLOP: I believe one of the correct ways of altering this desire for betting in the Australian people is to encourage the cultural habit, the absence of which arises from a lack of what is a tradition that we have not been able to build up for ourselves. I am certain that the European people devote much more time to the cultural side of life than we do.

I should hope that a percentage of the money to be raised as a result of the betting shops will be directed to the enhancement of cultural pursuits. Some of the funds might be given to libraries in country towns and another portion might be devoted to increasing the subsidy to State orchestras. We might also increase the financial ability of the Adult Education Board to take city plays to the country and introduce the residents to some of the cultural attainments, to which we may hope they will turn and be diverted from the type of social evil that betting undoubtedly is; and when those matters have been adjusted, I feel that success might attend the efforts of this Government which I have congratulated.

THE MINISTER FOR THE NORTH-WEST (Hon. H. C. Strickland—North) [3.16]: I, of course, am going to support the third reading of the Bill, and not because I have any conscience to be afraid of. I cannot understand members talking about their consciences when apparently they want no control whatever over betting and prefer to support the present system of non-control and continual breaking of the law. There are only two alternatives—

Hon. C. H. Simpson: The police have a responsibility.

The MINISTER FOR THE NORTH-WEST:—either to allow the present situation to continue—

Hon. A. R. Jones: That is not an alternative.

The MINISTER FOR THE NORTH-WEST: I repeat that there are only two alternatives to the Bill. The first is to allow the present situation to continue and the other is to install totalisators. In my honest belief, so far Parliament has taken the wisest choice, which is to impose some control and legal authority so that the Government will have power to control what is freely admitted by everybody to have become a social evil. If there is anything unconscionable in that, I have a lot to learn.

Hon. N. E. Baxter: I'll say you have!

The MINISTER FOR THE NORTH-WEST: When we have those who—through pressure, ignorance or straight-out stupidity—consistently and persistently oppose legislation which has been framed to implement control over unlawful conduct and practices, it is difficult to know where we may finish up. The hon. member believes in the present situation, plus mobile totalisators—

Hon. N. E. Baxter: I believe in honesty.

The MINISTER FOR THE NORTH-WEST: He might be quite honest in his belief, because there is nothing dishonest

in it; but the point is that the set-up he supports would contribute nothing at all towards reducing the evil of betting, if it is an evil. I therefore suggest that some of the sustained opposition to the measure has been inspired by—

Hon. A. F. Griffith: Be careful!

The MINISTER FOR THE NORTH-WEST:—interests which are directly connected with racing and betting. To assert that attendances at race meetings will fall off as the result of this measure would, I suggest, be making a precarious guess. I do not think this legislation will make any difference to the race-clubs when control and legislation of betting are established, as against the present practice. I suggest that unless the race-clubs take a little more interest in what they give the public they will not attract larger attendances.

Hon. N. E. Baxter: The starting-price bookmakers will be very generous, of course.

The MINISTER FOR THE NORTH-WEST: They have been in existence for 40 years to my knowledge and that of the hon. member, so there is nothing new about them, at all.

Hon. N. E. Baxter: But they do not give anything away.

The MINISTER FOR THE NORTH-WEST: I repeat that the race-clubs could do much better. I recall an instance which showed that apparently the W.A.T.C. did not want big crowds to go to the racecourses. I refer to one race-course proprietor who operated here up until the last war and during part of it. In order to encourage larger attendances, he provided cheap rail fares to the course and good refreshments at reasonable prices. He was attracting big crowds in that way and was receiving his return from the totalisator. He even went so far as to abolish the admittance charge to the leger, but the W.A.T.C. told him that if he did not levy a charge they would cancel his racing dates.

Hon. E. M. Davies: That is similar to what the L.V.A. did in regard to counter lunches in the pubs.

The MINISTER FOR THE NORTH-WEST: We know that the racing authorities do not want people to go to the courses because they do not cater for them. They have had plenty of opportunity to do as is done in other parts of the world, and particularly Great Britain and the Eastern States, and institute a flats system. But no! They do not want the working people there because it is the sport of kings! The position would probably be much better if the Government formed an independent control board to control racing in all its aspects—

Hon. N. E. Baxter: And socialise it.

The MINISTER FOR THE NORTH-WEST: —and conduct it in order to ensure at least that when a person made an investment he would have a possibility of receiving a return.

Hon. N. E. Baxter: Do they not have that possibility now?

The MINISTER FOR THE NORTH-WEST: No. I would put it in this way—that it has never worked out successfully, as the hon. member told us several times during the debate. He certainly told us some Nat Gould stories about what goes on. I can assure the House that much more encouragement could be given to racing by the W.A.T.C. if it catered for the crowds.

Hon. A. F. Griffith: Do I understand you to mean that at present the punter has not a chance?

The MINISTER FOR THE NORTH-WEST: Some of them. Where an owner of a horse which is a stayer and races in long-distance races is allowed to start in a sprint race, anyone with a knowledge of the circumstances knows that its chance of winning is absolutely nil.

Hon. N. E. Baxter: That be blowed! What about Phar Lap?

The MINISTER FOR THE NORTH-WEST: I repeat that that horse's chances of winning are nil; but the race-club accepts its nomination and handicaps it, and allows it to run in the race.

Hon. N. E. Baxter: That does not say you have to back it.

The MINISTER FOR THE NORTH-WEST: They do not put up a notice telling the public that it has no hope, and they accept the people's money on the tote.

Hon. N. E. Baxter: Do people have to back that horse?

The MINISTER FOR THE NORTH-WEST: I have given a simple illustration which I am sure 99 per cent. of race-goers are well aware of.

Hon. A. F. Griffith: Yet you introduced a Bill to assist a racket like that!

The MINISTER FOR THE NORTH-WEST: I did not introduce the Bill; but the hon. member is in favour of existing rackets continuing, and he prefers absolutely no control. That is his objective, as he has consistently and persistently opposed any control at all. In South Australia at one time there were totalisators only, and horse-racing was reduced to a very small institution.

Hon. C. H. Henning: But they had illegal bookmakers, just as they have here.

The MINISTER FOR THE NORTH-WEST: At one time they had totalisators only.

Hon. C. H. Henning: Yes, and illegal bookmakers.

The MINISTER FOR THE NORTH-WEST: That is so. And with the public patronising illegal bookmakers, just as they have done here for 40 years, the racing-clubs decided eventually to license bookmakers on the racecourses. Following that, they found that business began to pick up. During that period several South Australian horse-owners left that State and went elsewhere, taking their horses with them. Some of them came here and still remain. When the race-clubs woke up to the fact that the totalisator was not what they thought it might be, they licensed bookmakers on the course—and later, off-the-course also—to overcome the evil. South Australia abolished racing and bookmaking during the war years; but when racing commenced again they licensed the tote, and the bookmakers on the course, together with some bookmakers in country towns. But I understand that there are licensed betting shops in only one centre now. I refer to Port Pirie where, I believe, there are six or seven shops.

Hon. C. H. Simpson: There are eight shops.

The MINISTER FOR THE NORTH-WEST: The control has been tried in several aspects. In New Zealand totalisators are working successfully, according to the information we have, but that Dominion is an island without adjoining States. The position there is different from that in the Eastern States of Australia where owners and trainers can easily take their horses from one State to another. The existing system may be successful in New Zealand, although I do not know very much about it.

Then again, in Tasmania—another island—licences have been granted to off-course bookmakers since 1932. It is evidently not of sufficient public interest to be taken up as an election issue, because we know that in the history of Tasmanian politics for many years, it would need only a slight swing of public opinion there to win an election. So, if a Government were unsuccessful on the issue of uncontrolled betting, it is quite logical that it would not survive. The very same thing could happen to this Government. If it is found that all the evils that Mr. Griffith has in mind—but has not told us—get out of hand, he will have no need to worry because his party will be in power within another 18 months. I support the third reading of the Bill.

HON. A. R. JONES (Midland) [3.31]: During the third reading stage of the Bill, we have an opportunity to change the views of those people who voted for this measure during the second reading stage; and I still think that sufficient of them may believe that it is not such a good measure as they first thought and will vote it out on the third reading. It is:

rather strange that the longer this debate has continued, the more we have had revealed concerning the reason this Bill was brought before the House. Also, more has been revealed as to what is the true meaning of a "non-party Bill."

I will not attempt to add to Dr. Hislop's remarks because I think he put the situation more aptly than anyone else could. If the members supporting the Government can feel very happy with themselves under his smarting words, their skins are tougher than I thought. I agree with most people that if this Bill is to be a good one, it will depend upon what the board of control directs; because, under the provisions of the measure, it directs very little.

The Bill does not even suggest whether the board shall or shall not issue a certain number of licences to a certain number of people; or whether it shall ascertain if a large section of the community requires a licensed bookmaker or premises in their community or not. It does not say whether licensed premises shall be open during certain hours. It does not say that the betting shops shall close if a race-meeting is being held within a certain distance of that shop. In fact, the Bill says very little. It is an open slather. I only hope that the members of the board will have more intelligence than those who framed this legislation, so that the people of Western Australia and the sport of racing can be protected.

I do not want to see racing wrecked, because I think that a number of individuals get enjoyment from it. Further, it is the means of livelihood for some people. It is a means of continuing to breed thoroughbred horses—which I consider are things of beauty—and of racing them before people who appreciate watching a good thoroughbred horse race. In many ways, too, it supplies some of the wherewithal of those who like either to take part in or follow the sport; or to breed train, and handle horses generally. I do not want to see the racing game put out of existence. But I rather fear that if some of the things that have been suggested are not done, racing will decline; because if we do not encourage people to go to the racecourse—

Hon. E. M. Davies: We do not want them to go to the racecourse. If it is immoral to bet in a shop, it is immoral to bet on a racecourse.

Hon. A. R. JONES: The hon. member is saying that, is he?

Hon. E. M. Davies: Yes.

Hon. A. R. JONES. The hon. member can say that, but I do not. I hope that the Ministers in this House will take to Cabinet, as a guide, the objections that have been raised and the amendments that have been suggested in this Chamber. When the personnel of the board is decided upon, they can be instructed by the Government as to what shall be done, because the Bill

leaves it wide open for the board to do as it likes. The Minister for the North-West has suggested that he can see where the pressure that has been placed on the members who have opposed the Bill has come from. He stated that he can see that possibly money has been spent on opposition to the Bill.

If another month could pass by during which we could consider the Bill, we might get to know a little more about why it was put forward by the Government. I say that because I consider that many members who support the Government are being misled. I do not say that of all of them. I wonder whether it would be possible to ascertain how many members of the party supporting the Government wanted this measure. I wonder how many fought against it in the meetings that might have been held to discuss the matter. I wonder whether the Premier was very strong or adamant for the introduction of the Bill. I have not seen the Premier in this House once while this measure has been debated, but I have seen several other members from another place in the House who apparently have shown great interest in the passing of this Bill.

So, like Dr. Hislop, I wonder what influenced the Government to bring this measure forward, because we still have no evidence that anybody wants it. Therefore, even at this late hour I am making an appeal to members opposite who have supported this measure, in the hope that they might still change their minds. When Mrs. Hutchison spoke to the Bill, I asked her if she would give us the viewpoint of the women, and what she would like done if she were bringing up a young family today.

Hon. R. F. Hutchison: I told you we did not bet.

Hon. A. R. JONES: Unfortunately the opportunity the good lady had to inform the 29 other members in this House of the viewpoint of women was not taken by her. She did not give us one instance of what she would like or what she would do if she were raising a young family. So even at this late hour I still appeal to the hon. member to take full cognisance of what has been said and what is likely to happen; and to remember that within the next few weeks we are to be the hosts to some 30 members of Parliament from South Australia. And just before they come here we are going to be more or less condemning them as being men without good balance and good sense, because we are going to condone something that they condemned after 12 years' experience.

Hon. A. F. Griffith: After 12 years of a Labour Government, too!

Hon. E. M. Davies: They will be taken to the racecourse.

The Chief Secretary: And the betting shops.

Hon. A. R. JONES: At least their visit will give us an opportunity to discuss at first hand their experiences of the legislation in their State and the why and wherefore of the subject; and if, according to their experience, this Bill does not do that which we hope it will do, we will have some further guidance when we discuss this legislation next year. I must still strongly oppose the measure, and I am hoping that some of those members who voted for the second reading of the Bill will now oppose the third reading as well.

HON. L. A. LOGAN (Midland) [3.41]: It would appear that some members who supported this Bill are being severely chastised by others in the House. Dr. Hislop gave the Labour Party credit for something for which he had no right to give it credit. Apparently he had the idea that the Labour Party foresaw that some members on this side of the House would vote for the measure. If Dr. Hislop would like to go back through the debates for the past seven years he would discover how I have stood in regard to the matter; and therefore the members of the Labour Party would not require much intelligence to judge how a measure to control betting would be viewed by some members of this House.

I am still of the opinion that some members who are continuing to oppose the Bill are burying their heads in the sand in regard to the sordid conditions surrounding the s.p. betting activities today. When I quoted an instance illustrating those conditions, I am sure they were horrified. But apparently they are prepared to allow those conditions to remain. I stated in this House before—and I state again—that I, as a member of Parliament, am not prepared to agree to a continuance of the existing state of affairs.

Hon. N. E. Baxter: You would rather have anything. Anything at all!

Hon. L. A. LOGAN: I have to make a start somewhere, and I have been given the opportunity to do so by this Bill. If I did not take the opportunity through this measure, when would I get another opportunity?

Hon. N. E. Baxter: You should have supported the amendments that were proposed. You had the opportunity and you know it!

Hon. L. A. LOGAN: The majority of the amendments proposed would have killed the effect of the Bill. I am not supporting the Labour Party on this.

Hon. N. E. Baxter: Who are you supporting?

Hon. L. A. LOGAN: I am supporting myself. Probably I am very fortunate. Accusations have been made in this House from members on both sides as to what has transpired, but I can with all reverence say: "Thank God that nobody has

approached me from either side to influence my decision on this matter!" I might be fortunate in that respect, but it is a fact.

Getting down to the question of whether or not the electors want this Bill, I have not had representations from any one of my electors—except a lady—objecting to this Bill; but I have had many representations asking for some control. Where then is the urge against this Bill? Not one member who opposed the Bill mentioned that he had read the report of the Commissioner of Police.

Hon. A. R. Jones: He appears to be weak.

Hon. L. A. LOGAN: If that is the case, he should be brought before the Bar of this House and tried. I believe that the commissioner does not have the power he wants. If this Bill becomes law, and he does not carry out his duties, I am prepared to support any move to bring him before the Bar of the House.

Hon. N. E. Baxter: Then you will have him before the House very soon.

Hon. L. A. LOGAN: If this measure proves to be wrong, I shall be the first to admit it, and will do my best to alter it. But I am not prepared to put up with the existing conditions. Punting, wherever it may exist, does not differ. Mr. Simpson said that punting was selfish, and he has never said a truer word; because the punter wants to win at the expense of someone else, even though that person might be his best friend. All that matters to a punter is that he wins. Whether he bets through the totalisator, the course bookmaker or the s.p. bookmaker is beside the point.

Let us look at the totalisator proposition and the conditions that exist in New Zealand. According to a report, this is what happened to the racecourses there and to the attendances—

Distribution of this sum to racing and trotting clubs will be a worth-while contribution to their funds. Many clubs are carrying on at a loss and most clubs find it impossible to earn sufficient to provide the amenities on the courses.

Hon. N. E. Baxter: The reason is because there are too many clubs.

Hon. L. A. LOGAN: The reason is that the totalisators are taking the patrons away from the courses. Mr. Baxter mentioned South Australia, but not Queensland, where a Royal Commission has been appointed, and where a betting Bill has been introduced. He did not mention that betting legislation has been in operation for quite a while in Tasmania. Neither did he mention that our own Royal Commission in 1947 did not advocate the totalisator system in this State.

Hon. N. E. Baxter: The Royal Commission knew nothing about it.

Hon. L. A. LOGAN: I cannot help it if the hon. member has more knowledge than the Royal Commission! Mr. Simpson said that we have lost all opportunity of bringing in a totalisator system; but I suggest exactly the opposite. The amendment which I was successful in moving makes it mandatory for the board to inquire and report. Let us not forget that the board will include a representative from the trotting association and one from the turf club. It is mandatory for the board to report to the Government in 18 months on the possibility or otherwise of establishing totalisators.

Hon. N. E. Baxter: It is a poor sort of amendment. It means nothing.

Hon. L. A. LOGAN: We shall see if it means anything at the end of 12 months when the report is laid on the Table of the House. We shall see who is right.

Hon. N. E. Baxter: What can we do with the report when presented? The recommendations cannot be included in this Bill.

Hon. L. A. LOGAN: There will be every opportunity of making those recommendations into law. If the board recommended that some action should be taken, it would be taken. I know I was the only Country Party member in either House of Parliament who voted for the Bill. I realise my responsibility; but the decision is my own. I stand or fall by it.

Hon. F. R. H. Lavery: You still stand by it.

Hon. L. A. LOGAN: I do not need anybody else to tell me what to do, after my experience and knowledge of what goes on. Dr. Hislop endeavoured to become facetious. But this is what happens on Friday nights and Saturday mornings in some families living in the city: Three or four families meet every Friday night, and every newspaper obtainable is spread on a table. Over a few bottles of beer they study the racing form on Friday night. On Saturday morning one of the party rings up her friends to find out what they have decided to bet on. There is no hot dinner cooked for the children on Saturday and they have to put up with a cold meal.

Hon. A. R. Jones: In that case the idea of Dr. Hislop is a good one.

Hon. L. A. LOGAN: That goes on in the city under the telephone system which has been advocated by some members. I do not like the telephone system very much because it is a little too closely related to class distinction.

Hon. A. R. Jones: In any event they lose their money.

Hon. L. A. LOGAN: That may be so, but that is their concern. Surely they are entitled to bet if they wish! If the hon. member wants to go on a trip outside of

the State, that is his worry; and similarly, if a person wants to have 2s. 6d. each way on a horse, that is his own business.

Hon. A. R. Jones: The Labour Party has introduced the Bill.

Hon. L. A. LOGAN: I am not worrying which party introduced it. That does not matter very much. I am supporting it, and my action on this occasion has nothing to do with the Labour Party. There is every facility to bet today—

Hon. N. E. Baxter: There is not.

Hon. L. A. LOGAN: To my knowledge not one punter in the last 10 years or longer has been fined in the courts for betting. Therefore every punter is immune from the law. He knows that he can go along to the s.p. bookmaker down the lane and place a bet without fear of a fine. He knows he can go to betting shops in the country centres and not be picked up for betting. So why will this Bill increase betting to any extent? I cannot see how that conclusion is arrived at. In my opinion the Bill will prevent the big man behind the scenes from taking away all the cash on which he is not paying taxation.

Hon. A. R. Jones: You think the big operator will be taxed under this Bill?

Hon. L. A. LOGAN: He will be taxed more than he is today. What is more, if these big s.p. operators pay their just taxation, perhaps the taxation for the rest of the people will be reduced a little. That applies to most people; if everyone paid his just dues we could reduce the taxes by 20 per cent. I know of a bookmaker today who pays over £4,000 in taxation per year because the Taxation Department does not know how to assess his income. It is probably around £70,000. Under this Bill there will be an opportunity to check his returns, so that he will be compelled to pay his just dues.

Hon. N. E. Baxter: He may not put in any returns.

Hon. L. A. LOGAN: Does the hon. member think he can sell a lot of liquor and beer in a hotel without putting in any returns?

Hon. N. E. Baxter: One cannot.

Hon. L. A. LOGAN: Then in betting that cannot be done either.

Hon. N. E. Baxter: That is a different set-up.

Hon. L. A. LOGAN: It is not, because the taxation officials have a check on the turnover of the bookmaker.

Hon. N. E. Baxter: There is no relationship.

Hon. L. A. LOGAN: Of course there is! The bookmaker might be able to get away with a little, but not to any great extent. For seven years I have been waiting for someone to do something to improve the present sordid conditions in relation to

s.p. betting. I go further and say that had this or any other Government been game enough to introduce a Bill to stamp out betting altogether, I would have been behind the measure. I say that without fear or favour, because we could have altered our laws to make the penalty so high that people would not bet, and the Commissioner of Police would have been given legislation which he could uphold. But when the commissioner says he cannot uphold the law because it is not clear enough, surely it is time we did something about the law.

So let us not shut our eyes to what is going on; let us not turn a deaf ear to what the commissioner has asked for. Let us endeavour to do something about it. If all parties in this House have got together in an attempt to do something in that regard, we might have got some satisfaction; but unfortunately this Bill seems to have split members into two widely separated camps. Instead of getting down to a basis of co-operation and placing some Act on the statute book of this State to overcome the problem—

Hon. N. E. Baxter: You do not mean to tell me that there has been any move by the Labour Party to co-operate with any other party!

Hon. L. A. LOGAN: There were no moves on either side for co-operation.

Hon. N. E. Baxter: Yes there were.

Hon. L. A. LOGAN: On the one hand, a Bill was presented; and on the other, there was a move to kill it. Mr. Griffith attempted to have provision made for a referendum on this matter. I think that the Bill which was read a second time last night was the 80th presented to us this session. Did any member ask for a referendum on any of the issues in any of the other 79 Bills? Not one! Why should this one Bill be submitted to a referendum?

Hon. N. E. Baxter: It affects the people as a whole.

Hon. L. A. LOGAN: They all do that.

Hon. N. E. Baxter: Not to the extent this one does.

Hon. C. H. Simpson: They are doing it in Queensland.

Hon. L. A. LOGAN: It affects the people as a whole. I agree with Mr. Boylen that we are sent here to represent the electors; and if 80 members of Parliament cannot decide upon what is the correct thing to do, it is time they got out and somebody else did the job for them. Members of the Legislative Assembly are elected for three years, and Legislative Council members are elected for six years. Surely during their tenure of office they are entitled to legislate to the best of their ability, without having to run to the people and ask them what they think of this piece of legislation or that one!

What kind of extraneous matters would be brought into a referendum? We have seen what has happened before. I do not consider there is any need for a referendum on this issue. I content myself with observing that at this third reading stage of the Bill I have a clear conscience concerning all I have said and done in connection with this matter. If I am proved to have been wrong, I will be the first to admit it and the first to make amends. I hope I have not made a mistake—not only for my sake and that of the Government, but for the sake of the people of Western Australia. I will be one of the first to make sure that this law is upheld. If I find it is not being administered in the right way, I will immediately report the fact, and I trust that every other member will give the same co-operation.

Hon. A. R. Jones: To whom would you report it?

Hon. L. A. LOGAN: The Commissioner of Police.

Hon. A. R. Jones: What would he do?

Hon. L. A. LOGAN: If he is not doing the job, I will report to the Minister.

Hon. A. R. Jones: What will the Minister do?

Hon. L. A. LOGAN: This House is the master of its own destiny. If 16 members insist that the Commissioner of Police should be taken to task, the Minister must take action. If 26 members of another place are similarly insistent, action must be taken. Members have it in their own hands to see that law and order are maintained. We are giving the commissioner a law that he can maintain. Whatever party may attempt to do this job, let it be done the right way. If we think during the next 12 months that amendments should be made to the measure, we will be entitled to make them. Let us endeavour to make sure that this business is kept on the highest possible plane. Then we shall be able to say we have done something for the people.

HON. SIR CHARLES LATHAM (Central) [4.5]: I dare say those who have been successful in having the Bill brought to the present stage are congratulating themselves. I listened carefully to the speeches made, and particularly that delivered by Mr. Logan. Having had a look at the history of attempts to prevent gambling, I would say that if those who have proceeded this far with the Bill are feeling very pleased with themselves, it must be because they think they have accomplished something that the Imperial Government has not been able to achieve for six centuries. During the second reading debate, I told members that attempts were made in the 14th century to remedy the evils caused by gambling. Since those days gambling has become

worse, and more vicious kinds have been brought into existence; and no means have been found to prevent them. This Government, and those supporting it, have decided to license betting and make it lawful. If it is possible to cure a social evil by making it legal, then I have had to live to 70 years to learn it.

The Minister for the North-West: Reduce, not cure. Control.

Hon. Sir CHARLES LATHAM: This Bill will make it worse. The only opportunity we have had in Australia of testing this matter was that afforded by South Australia, and the Government there found out what actually took place. There is less gambling there now than there has been for a long time. Reference was made by Mr. Logan to what was done in South Australia and in Queensland, but he did not finish the story of Queensland. Of course, Queensland has passed legislation authorising certain things to be done. But, regarding this as a social evil, Queensland has said that it will ask for endorsement of its proposals by the people. Some of us are asking for that in this State. That is what the hon. member did not tell us about Queensland, and in that respect he misled the House. Queensland said it would pass legislation, but intended to divide the State into four zones, in each one of which a referendum would be conducted.

In New South Wales there is another social evil—that of over-indulgence in alcohol. The taking of one or two drinks does not constitute a social evil; but when people spend the whole of their earnings in the bar of a hotel, the practice of drinking does become an evil. What did New South Wales do? It did not make any alteration without first going to the people and obtaining authority from a majority. That is what some of us wanted to do concerning betting, but we were prevented. I suggest that this Bill is being hurried through in order that advantage may be taken of the social events fixed for Christmas. That must have been in the mind of the Government.

The Minister for the North-West: No.

Hon. Sir CHARLES LATHAM: It must have been.

The Minister for the North-West: It was not.

Hon. Sir CHARLES LATHAM: In another place, the gag was applied.

The Minister for the North-West: Not on this Bill. In connection with another debate.

Hon. Sir CHARLES LATHAM: We sat here till 2 o'clock this morning because members were in a hurry to get the Bill passed.

The Minister for the North-West: No, because you opposed everything.

Hon. Sir CHARLES LATHAM: We have a right to express our opinions. While I may have some quarrel with the action of the Government, I do not complain about its expressing its opinions, so long as they are worth while. Mr. Logan said that the Commissioner of Police could be brought to the Bar of the House. I can picture the commissioner with all his regalia, standing at the Bar of the House, but this Parliament cannot bring him here.

Hon. L. A. Logan: Mr. Watson suggested that.

Hon. Sir CHARLES LATHAM: The hon. member suggested it.

Hon. F. R. H. Lavery: Mr. Watson suggested it by interjection.

Hon. Sir CHARLES LATHAM: No member of this House can bring the commissioner to the Bar—and neither can the House itself—unless he does something against the Parliamentary Privileges Act, and he is not doing anything and has not done anything of that kind. The hon. member asserted that the commissioner has no power. Yet it is not very long ago that he complained because the commissioner's officers were doing too much in Geraldton and too little elsewhere.

Hon. L. A. Logan: He said he had not the power to stop it. Read the report.

Hon. Sir CHARLES LATHAM: If he exercised power in Geraldton, why could he not do so at Collie?

Hon. L. A. Logan: Read the report and you will get the answer.

Hon. Sir CHARLES LATHAM: I have done so. I did not read it a second time to the House, because I did not want to fatigue members after Mr. Logan had given a full explanation. The commissioner only showed weakness. He simply revealed that his men were not prepared to carry out the law. That has been the trouble in this State. It is not that the law has not existed, but that it has not been given effect to. If the Government had introduced a Bill a little while ago to tighten up the law, and had inserted some of the conditions for registered betting places that appear in this Bill, we would have supported it. There is no reason why a piece of land should not be declared a place where betting cannot take place instead of the Traffic Act being used for the purpose of prosecuting people who bet. If there is anybody to blame for the existing conditions it is the Minister and the Government. I am not talking about the Chief Secretary. He is as free of blame as I am.

The Chief Secretary: Thanks very much.

Hon. Sir CHARLES LATHAM: But if he were the Minister for Police he would not be blameless. After all it is the Minister

for Police who has the power. I was chided because I belonged to a Government that took no action in this matter. But it was not my business to take action in Cabinet. Had I got up and expressed my views on the matter I would have been told to look after my own affairs. And I was busy enough. Authority in these matters is delegated to the Minister for Police and he has the responsibility. I previously explained that policemen are leaving the force because they are unable to carry out the law; because they are prevented by their senior officers from doing so.

The two weakest States, Tasmania and Western Australia, have this sort of legislation. New South Wales, Victoria and Queensland have not adopted it, because they know very well what it would cost. But this State, which happens to be one of the junior members of the Commonwealth, is prepared to accept this responsibility and think that something very good will come out of it.

I want to see something done. I suppose that some people are born to be gamblers. I dare say gambling takes place in schools. My memory goes back to my marble days. I think I have heard of betting even on marbles. I am sure that children who indulge in that form of gambling inherited the tendency from their parents. Now, under this measure, young Johnny will be sent along to a registered bookmaker with a letter containing £1 to be put on a horse.

Hon. E. M. Davies: The regulations will prevent that.

Hon. Sir CHARLES LATHAM: There have been regulations to prevent a lot of things—including gambling—today, yesterday and other yesterdays. But have they been given effect to?

Hon. E. M. Davies: There has been no regulation governing s.p. betting.

Hon. Sir CHARLES LATHAM: Not s.p. betting, but gambling.

Hon. E. M. Davies: There is gambling on the racecourse.

Hon. Sir CHARLES LATHAM: That reminds me. One member stated that bookmaking on the racecourse was illegal. If he will turn to page 338 of the 1946 Statutes, he will see that—

The Committee may, in their discretion, from time to time register any person to carry on the business of a bookmaker on the Association racecourse lands and grounds (hereinafter called the "racecourse"), in such place or places as may from time to time be set apart for the purpose by the Committee.

Will the hon. member say they do not license bookmakers?

Hon. E. M. Davies: That does not alter the fact that it is still a gamble.

Hon. Sir CHARLES LATHAM: As I said the other afternoon, if the question were taken to the High Court, it would say that the very fact of taxing betting tickets would legalise it. It is a peculiar way of legalising anything, but that is what it is; and I think the Minister realises that.

I suppose some members will feel a Christmas gratification at having accomplished something so far as the Bill is concerned, but I shall look on this Christmas with remorse if the Bill is put into effect before the holidays. Let us not hurry about this matter, but take time over it so as to keep the whole question as clean as possible. All this will do will be to encourage people to bet. Members would not like to be seen going into a gambling den, even if it were registered. This will add a legal touch to betting so that a man will feel that he can hold up his head when he does his betting, which today we regard as a social evil. Yet we will make the position so attractive that members of the public will, when they bet in this way, hold up their heads and feel that they are doing something they are entitled to do.

There are men and women in gaol today as a result of gambling, yet we are going to make it easier for people to spend money that they have taken illegally. Here I refer to those who misappropriate funds. I know a number of men who were good-living citizens until they got this disease, which they could not resist. They put £1 on a horse, and then £2 in order to get the £1 back, until they were betting in thousands. I hated to see pawnshops—thank goodness, they have gone from most Australian cities—where three balls hung out in front of the buildings. Now we will have something to invite people into betting shops. This will always have my opposition, because I believe I am here to protect the weak and help the strong. I hope that my actions in this House will never be such as to bring degradation on any man, his wife or family.

THE CHIEF SECRETARY (Hon. G. Fraser—West—in reply) [4.20]: I thank those members who have taken part in the debate. At least they have shown that they are interested in the proposals that have been put before them. I appreciate a man putting up a case that he believes is correct, whether it is for or against what I think. I do not mean that I would like these debates to occur on all third readings! I realise, however, that this is a rather unusual occasion, and that one must expect unusual procedure. I am not going to attempt to reply to all that has been said, but only to one or two remarks. I thank Mr. Baxter for speaking about the principles of the Bill. He said he was opposed to them. He is opposed to the principles of the Bill, but he is prepared to support something—illegal betting—in which there is no principle.

Hon. C. H. Simpson: How can you support no principle?

The CHIEF SECRETARY: Mr. Baxter is doing it; he is showing us how. I cannot understand Mr. Diver's logic. He said he regretted that this was to become law because it would ruin the horse-breeding industry, or words to that effect.

Hon. L. C. Diver: That is so.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: Yet he is prepared to put on the statute book a measure to provide for the establishment of a tote. The hon. member's point is that whether we have a tote or registered s.p. bookmakers, people will not go to the racecourse.

Hon. N. E. Baxter: You have not the slightest idea of the fundamental difference.

Hon. L. C. Diver: After all I have said, you do not comprehend.

The PRESIDENT: Order! I ask the Chief Secretary to address the Chair.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: Mr. Diver said this would kill the horse-breeding industry, but at the same time he was prepared to support a proposal which would mean the establishment of a tote off the racecourse. I would like him to tell me the difference between the two in connection with the point that people who bet in either place will not go to the racecourse. I cannot see his logic. If he wanted to ban s.p. betting altogether, whether on the tote or otherwise, there might be some logic in his argument, because he would force people to go to the racecourse in that way. But he is going to provide an off-the-course facility; and, whether it is a tote or a bookmaker, it will do the same injury, if any, to the horse-breeding industry. But all members have overlooked the fact that when the Bill becomes law it will be the greatest filip to racing that has ever occurred.

Hon. H. K. Watson: That is nonsense!

The CHIEF SECRETARY: As a result of the Bill, the racing-clubs will get something out of every £1 that is bet off-the-course. Today they are getting nothing. They will still have all the present sources of revenue that apply on the course. They will get the 20 per cent. that they receive from the winning bets tax.

Hon. C. H. Simpson: Are you not abolishing the winning bets tax?

The CHIEF SECRETARY: Yes, but this measure will give them 20 per cent., just as they are receiving it at present. The racing-clubs will get the revenue they receive now and, in addition, 10 per cent. of the money that is bet away from racecourses. Today they are getting nothing from that source. From the financial point of view, this will be a godsend to the racing fraternity. During the debate, no member, when dealing with Tasmania, said that

racing had been ruined there because of the starting-price betting shops. But this system has only been operating in Tasmania for 22 years! According to my information, racing was never more flourishing in Tasmania than it is today. That is a living example of what has occurred in regard to s.p. betting, from the angle that the hon. member dealt with it. I congratulate Dr. Hislop. He threw a bouquet at me on this matter.

Hon. L. Craig: Mind it does not have a brick in it!

The CHIEF SECRETARY: I throw one back to him. His was a skilful speech, full of sarcasm, which did not improve the position in any way.

Hon. J. G. Hislop: It was not meant to.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: I accept from him the congratulations that he offered the Government for bringing the Bill down. The hon. member placed us on a high altitude, and I am only sorry we cannot live up to what he said. I forget the hon. member's actual words in regard to the Bill, but he mentioned something about a scientific approach.

No attempt was made by any section of the community to get the Government to introduce this Bill, and no pressure was brought to bear. Members of the Government are not blind, deaf or dumb. They know what has been going on in this State for many years, and they decided that something should be done to rectify this feature of our life that is a blot on the State today. We discussed the matter and then appointed a sub-committee which, for some months, investigated betting from every angle throughout Australia. As a result, this committee recommended to Cabinet that the Government introduce a Bill on the lines of the one before us. We introduced this measure, taking a risk as to whether it would be passed. Mr. Logan said he was not approached to support the Bill, and neither was any other member. We honestly believe this is the method by which to tackle the problem. As I mentioned when introducing the Bill, we decided to give Parliament an opportunity to say something on the matter.

I cannot understand the logic of Mr. Griffith when he speaks about forcing the measure through because we have the numbers. Does not every Bill that is passed through Parliament, irrespective of whether it is a Government or a private measure, go through by weight of numbers? I cannot see how anyone can say that because the weight of numbers is in favour of a Bill it is being forced through.

Hon. A. F. Griffith: I said it was forced through another place; and you know it was.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: The hon. member shows how truthful he is when he makes that statement. He said it was

dealt with there in three days. The truth is that the second reading was moved on the 9th November and the third reading on the 23rd November; a little different to three days!

Hon. A. F. Griffith: When did it pass the second reading stage?

The PRESIDENT: Order! The hon. member can consult "Hansard".

The CHIEF SECRETARY: That is how much the Bill was rushed through. Has it been rushed through this Chamber? Has any member here been denied the right to speak at any stage of the debate?

Hon. R. F. Hutchison: Yes.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: That is so. I denied Mrs. Hutchison the right to speak because I caught the President's eye before she did when I started to reply to the third reading. But has any member any complaint that he has not had ample opportunity to discuss the Bill?

Hon. J. G. Hislop: We would not blame you if you rushed through this speech.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: I am trying to do that, but I realise that some people are feeling uncomfortable and would much prefer some other Bill to be dealt with at this time.

Hon. N. E. Baxter: Do not kid yourself!

The CHIEF SECRETARY: The charge of rushing the Bill through cannot be substantiated. I had better not comment on another place, because I might be out of order; but in this Chamber every opportunity has been given to members, either at the second reading stage, the committee stage or the third reading stage, to discuss the Bill. Complaints have been made that the Government would not accept amendments. Is that unusual? A sub-committee of Cabinet prepared this measure and its members were satisfied that this was the best method of handling the problem. Is there anything wrong, as the Government's representative in this Chamber, with my refusing to accept amendments which were considered to be not in the best interests of the Bill? When Mr. Simpson was in charge of the House, he did the same thing. It is left to members of this Chamber to say whether amendments will be accepted or not. I cannot understand these charges about forcing the Bill through and the Government's not accepting amendments.

Hon. C. H. Simpson: But this is a non-party Bill.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: It does not matter what sort of Bill it is; the same thing applies. If the sponsor of a Bill does not think that an amendment should be accepted he will oppose it. It is then up to the members to decide whether the amendment will be accepted. I desire to thank

members for the manner in which they have discussed the Bill. I have not agreed with many of the suggestions put forward but at least I thank members for having taken sufficient interest to point out what they thought would be to the advantage of the measure. At present it looks as if the Bill will go through in much the same form as that in which it was introduced into this Chamber—Only minor amendments were made to it. I am hopeful that many of the remarks about the Bill being a successful measure will prove to be factual. I believe they will be; and I think that the people of this State, notwithstanding a number of claims that it will be a failure, will be well satisfied that something has been done to correct what has been for many years an outstanding evil in this State.

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

Ayes	15
Noes	11
Majority for	4

Ayes.

Hon. C. W. D. Barker	Hon. F. R. H. Lavery
Hon. L. Craig	Hon. L. A. Logan
Hon. E. M. Davies	Hon. J. Murray
Hon. G. Fraser	Hon. H. C. Strickland
Hon. J. J. Garrigan	Hon. J. D. Teahan
Hon. W. R. Hall	Hon. W. F. Willesee
Hon. E. M. Heenan	Hon. R. J. Boylen
Hon. R. F. Hutchison	(Teller.)

Noes.

Hon. N. E. Baxter	Hon. Sir Chas. Latham
Hon. L. C. Diver	Hon. C. H. Simpson
Hon. Sir Frank Gibson	Hon. J. McL. Thomson
Hon. C. H. Henning	Hon. H. K. Watson
Hon. J. G. Hislop	Hon. A. F. Griffith
Hon. A. R. Jones	(Teller.)

Question thus passed.

Bill read a third time and returned to the Assembly with amendments.

BILL—PARKS AND RESERVES ACT AMENDMENT.

First Reading.

Received from the Assembly and, on motion by Hon. E. M. Davies, read a first time.

Second Reading.

HON. E. M. DAVIES (West) [4.40] in moving the second reading said: This Bill is designed to add a new subsection to Section 5 of the principal Act and deals with a reserve known as King's Park. This reserve was granted in two sections: the first when Frederick Weld, on the 6th August, 1871, resumed certain land; and the second, in 1890, in which year Lord Forrest resumed another portion—making a total of 995 acres. Over the years that reserve has been recognised as a natural park and has become the heritage of the people.

One must give credit to the earlier statesmen who were sufficiently farseeing to realise that the capital of Western Australia, and indeed the State as a whole, would expand so greatly that it would be necessary and of such great advantage to the people to have a natural park in close proximity to the City of Perth. So those who, over the years, have been able to take advantage of this reserve express to those early statesmen their great appreciation of the foresight they disclosed in resuming land for this purpose.

From time to time, as we all realise, great pressure has been brought to bear for the purpose of alienating certain portions of the reserve. In 1897 a certain section was granted to Hale School in exchange for land now occupied by the Observatory. Also in 1897 tennis courts were built on the reserve and bowling greens were established in 1903. Since that time no further land has been utilised for such purposes. Unfortunately, of recent date we have heard a lot of talk and rumour of the possibility that certain other areas of land will be used for other purposes.

This Bill has been introduced to take away some of the responsibilities from the body known as the King's Park Board. The responsibilities thrown upon this board are great, because it has to decide whether or not a part of the reserve under its jurisdiction shall be used as a site for the purpose of establishing an aquatic centre or other structures which may be used by members of the public upon payment of a fee.

Hon. H. K. Watson: This simply refers to an aquatic centre or an orchestral shell.

Hon. E. M. DAVIES: That is so.

Hon. H. K. Watson: What about a betting shop?

Hon. E. M. DAVIES: One would think the hon. member's mind would rise higher than that when talking of King's Park. I do not imagine that anybody would be prepared to alienate land for that purpose.

Hon. H. K. Watson: You would be surprised where they would allow it.

Hon. E. M. DAVIES: However, I want to say that portion of this measure provides that should any contingency arise which calls for a decision in relation to an aquatic centre or other structure, the decision shall be arrived at by both Houses of Parliament, and that the King's Park Board shall be relieved of the responsibility of making it. In short, that means that both the Legislative Assembly and the Legislative Council must first agree before an aquatic centre or an orchestral shell is allowed to be constructed in King's Park.

The Parks and Reserves Act at the moment provides, among other things, that the board shall otherwise improve or ornament such parks or reserves and do all such things as are calculated to adapt such parks and reserves to the purposes of public recreation, health and enjoyment. That is a very embracing authority, and it is a great responsibility for the board to be able to do anything to the park for the purposes of public recreation, or what it feels is public recreation. The King's Park Board is fully cognisant of its authority, for in the by-laws approved by His Excellency the Lieut.-Governor on the 18th June, 1943, we find by-law 2 which reads as follows:—

The Park shall be open to the public continuously, but the board may close any road or footpath in the park or any other part or parts of the park for any period or purpose at any time the board may think fit by notice posted on such road or footpath or such part or parts of the park.

We find that permission is also given to erect obstructions etc. and by-law 16 grants permission to any person authorised in writing by the board to make an erection or obstruction of any kind whatsoever, or make an enclosure of any part. By-law 12 gives the board the 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 that the King's Park Board is well aware of its almost complete power in relation to King's Park, because its by-laws are framed in conformity with powers conferred on it under Section 5 of the Parks and Reserves Act, 1895-1947. I only mention this in an endeavour to show members the authority vested in the board and to dissuade those who may erroneously think that parliamentary approval is necessary before the King's Park Board can grant approval for the park or any part thereof to be utilised as the site for the erection of an aquatic centre or like structure.

It appears that the board has been asked to make a decision—a very momentous decision to my mind—in relation to those powers, because we find the following appeared in "The West Australian" of the 22nd September, 1954:—

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.

How easy or how difficult that decision was to arrive at, I do not know, but it could have been arrived at by a committee, for Section 6 of the Act confers the same powers on a committee as the Act does on the full board. In effect the board delegates its full powers to a committee, and such board or committee, under Section 11 of the Act, decides by a majority vote. Personally I feel that such a decision affecting the whole structure of basic principles associated with King's Park should not be quickly made, and ample publicity should be given to negotiations on the subject before agreement is reached. If and when this reserve is to be allowed to be the site for an aquatic centre or similar structure the decision should be made by the highest authority in the land; namely, this Parliament. In my opinion, the construction of an aquatic centre or similar construction in King's Park is a complete departure from the generally accepted theory of the public who feel, rightly or wrongly, that it is a reserve which should be retained in a state of nature depicting to future generations the Western Australian bushland.

For many years King's Park has been an area of which the public is intensely proud. It is the only park of its type in the world, and visitors from all parts of Australia and the world have marvelled at its natural beauty. They have openly expressed admiration for the foresight and statesmanship of the founders of such a scheme. Our King's Park is known the world over and there are many who are envious that a similar reserve does not exist in their land. They have their swimming pools and their bridges, and a host of beauty spots which are not found in this State. But the beauty lovers enthuse over King's Park; over our kangaroo paws, our orchids, our flowering gums, and over the natural beauty and marvellous setting of the park.

To allow King's Park to be used in any one part for a purpose other than as a park would be to set a precedent which would culminate in its ultimate beauty being destroyed. Mistakes have been made in the past, but the Bill does not attempt in any way to interfere with previous annexations; it only seeks to prevent a repetition of anything of the kind in future without the authority of both Houses of Parliament.

The Bill was slightly amended in another place. An amendment was placed in the measure which reads as follows:—

- (c) effect or construct, or permit to be effected or constructed, to, in or on King's Park any other structure, device, or fixture for the purposes of public recreation, and from which members of the public may be excluded except upon payment of a fee, unless the consent of the Governor-in-Executive Council has first been obtained.

That means that, apart from the structures already mentioned in the Bill—which it may be necessary to alter and for which Parliament's approval is necessary—there may be others for which the approval of the Governor-in-Council is sufficient.

This is one of the finest natural parks in the world, situated as it is close to Perth; and it would be a pity if any of the land in that reserve were utilised for the purposes mentioned during the explanation of the measure.

It may be necessary to have another small amendment in the Bill, and I understand this has been arranged for. This will make provision to protect the natural flora growing in the reserve. The Bill is not an attempt to prevent the King's Park Board from carrying out minor alterations to the park, but it is to protect the board against certain pressure that has been brought to bear for other types of facilities. This area was left as a heritage to the people, and it should be used for no other purpose. I feel we should respect the views of the early statesmen and keep the reserve a natural park in order that we may show people our natural bushland. It would be a shame to utilise it for the purpose for which I understand it is desired. I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

HON. N. E. BAXTER (Central) [4.55]: There are a few matters in this Bill that require serious thought. First of all we must see whether by passing this measure we will not be passing a vote of no confidence in the King's Park Board. I admit that we have to be careful in these things, but if members look at the drive through the main gates at King's Park, they will appreciate just how much the board has done to beautify that area. We also have established there, the King's Park Tennis Club; and during the last few years the area around that part has been cleaned up, and to drive through it today is a much greater pleasure than was the case a few years ago.

At the Thomas-st. end of the park, however, we find a very dismal picture. I am sure all members will admit that. All we

see there is the poor old dismal Australian bush. It is not a very prepossessing spectacle to drive along that part of the park and view the sight presented. I do not know whether we are wise to say to the board that it shall not make any improvements to the park.

Hon. E. M. Davies: It can do it by Act of Parliament.

Hon. N. E. BAXTER: I am not too sure whether that is right. The board has a great responsibility to protect the flora that grows in it and to retain that area as a natural park. Surely we ought to give it that much discretion! Surely we ought to know that it would not destroy the natural flora without having the betterment of the park in view! I am confident the board has at no time destroyed the flora of the park, and I feel sure that at all times it endeavours to maintain it as a natural park. If the board were to provide for an aquatic centre or an orchestral shell it would no doubt do so where the flora was not good, and where the establishment of these facilities would improve the park.

Up to date the board has done a good job, and I have every confidence that it will continue to do so in the future. It is going too far to say that all matters must be referred to Parliament. If I remember aright we have had several Bills giving power to various boards to do certain things without first having to refer them to Parliament. Yet, when the King's Park Board wants to do something to beautify the park it must first refer the matter to Parliament. For those reasons, I cannot support the Bill. If I thought the board would willy-nilly do anything that would destroy the natural beauty of the park, it would be a different matter, but any board consisting of responsible citizens of the State would take care to do the right thing by the park and preserve its natural beauty.

On motion by Hon. C. H. Henning, debate adjourned.

BILL—STATE GOVERNMENT INSURANCE OFFICE ACT AMENDMENT (No. 2).

Report, etc.

Report of Committee adopted.

Bill read a third time and returned to the Assembly with amendments.

BILL—BOOKMAKERS BETTING TAX.

Second Reading.

Debate resumed from the 26th November.

HON. C. H. SIMPSON (Midland) [5.3]: This Bill contains the machinery to permit a tax to be collected in accordance

with the provisions of the Betting Control Bill which has now been passed by this House. There can be no objection to the measure because it gives expression to a wish that was endorsed by a majority of members. I do not consider that it calls for any debate or comment. It is just a machinery Bill, and on that understanding I support the second reading.

HON. A. F. GRIFFITH (Suburban) [5.4]: We must support this Bill because it is a machinery measure to give effect to the Bill passed earlier this afternoon. I should like to take this opportunity of saying to the Chief Secretary that on the other Bill, which was necessarily introduced before this one, he told us that the debate in another place occupied from the 9th to the 23rd November. While that is correct, I would point out that he misled the House as regards the second reading, which occupied only two days. The second reading of the Bill was moved at 8.31 on the evening of the 9th November and was passed at 5.19 a.m. on the 11th November. There is no occasion to speed the passage of this Bill as there obviously was in the case of the other Bill.

THE CHIEF SECRETARY (Hon. G. Fraser—West—in reply) [5.6]: When I was dealing with the passage of the Bill through another place, I was not referring to the second reading or to any other stage. The dates I gave were correct. The second reading was moved on the 9th November, and the third reading was passed on the 23rd. I do not know how long each stage occupied; I was only aware of the whole period, and there was no intention on my part to mislead.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

House adjourned at 5.7 p.m.