

board will feel that its work will be curtailed and that it will become more or less a rubber stamp. Mr. Watson, who is the supervisor at present, has a wide knowledge in regard to the duties he has to perform, and if the Bill is carried all that would be required of him would be to act as manager for the park and any major problem would have to be considered by Parliament.

In the past many notable men have served as members of the King's Park Road Board. Sir John Dwyer was a member for many years and today Sir Thomas Meagher, who served as a member for several years, is now president. The board has been in existence since 1896, the members at that time being as follows:—

Sir John Forrest, K.C.M.G., J.P., President.

Hon. J. W. Hackett, M.L.C., J.P.

Lieut.-Col. Phillips, J.P.

G. T. Poole, J.P.

A. Lovekin.

B. C. Wood, M.L.C., J.P.

At present the members of the board comprise Sir Thomas Meagher (president), Sir Joseph Totterdell, Mr. Watson (supervisor), Mr. Baron Hay, Mr. Smith (Under Secretary for Lands), the present Lord Mayor (Mr. Murray), Mr. Stow, who is a prominent business man in the city, and myself.

I have only been a member of the board for a short time but I realise the people of Western Australia are fortunate in having a board comprised of members who are such notable persons. I consider that if the board's powers are taken away, the park will not progress as it should and it will not be used for the benefit of the people generally.

Mr. Hutchinson: You will be able to clear out some of the weeds.

Mr. HEAL: I would like to see the member for Cottesloe up there on a Sunday morning, clearing out some of the weeds. The Minister has invited all members to make a tour around the park and if they accept this invitation, I have been informed that the members of the King's Park Board will make a point of being present at the park when this tour is made.

On motion by Mr. Mann, debate adjourned.

#### ADJOURNMENT—SPECIAL.

THE DEPUTY PREMIER (Hon. J. T. Tonkin—Melville): I move—

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

Question put and passed.

House adjourned at 10.59 p.m.

## Legislative Council

Friday, 26th November, 1954.

### CONTENTS.

	Page
Question : Water supplies, as to Commonwealth aid for Wellington Dam-Narrogin main .....	3275
Bills : Limitation Act Amendment, 3r. ....	3276
Soil Fertility Research, 2r. ....	3276
Canning Lands Revestment, 2r. ....	3278
Public Service Act Amendment, 2r. ....	3279
Bookmakers Betting Tax, 2r. ....	3280
Native Administration Act Amendment, 2r. ....	3280
Betting Control, 2r. ....	3280
Pharmacy and Poisons Act Amendment, Assembly's amendment ....	3296

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

### QUESTION.

#### WATER SUPPLIES.

*As to Commonwealth Aid for Wellington Dam-Narrogin Main.*

Hon. H. L. ROCHE asked the Chief Secretary:

(1) Has the State Government made any request to the Federal Government, or the Federal Treasurer, for any payment on work completed on the Wellington Dam-Narrogin main?

(2) If the approach has been made—

(a) When was it made?

(b) What was the reply?

(c) What amount, if any, was received?

(3) Has any approach been made to secure additional financial aid as a result of the high additional cost of the scheme. If so—

(a) When was the approach made?

(b) What was the result?

(4) Has the Federal Government been advised that the scheme is held up owing to the shortage of finance available to the State Government?

(5) What is the total estimated cost to complete the scheme from Wellington Dam to Narrogin?

The CHIEF SECRETARY replied:

(1) Yes. Requests for a recoup of 50 per cent of the actual expenditure are made monthly.

(2) On the 28th April, 1948, the Commonwealth Government agreed to share the cost of the agricultural areas, Great Southern towns and Goldfields water supply scheme (which includes the Wellington Dam-Narrogin main) on a £1 for £1 basis but not exceeding a maximum contribution of £2,150,000. To the 30th June,

1954, an amount of £1,141,561 has been recouped to the State by the Commonwealth Government. To the 31st October, 1954, an amount of £1,239,002 has been spent on the Wellington Dam-Narrogin main and appurtenances, of which £616,732 has been recouped by the Commonwealth Government.

(3) (a) The first approach for additional financial aid was made in June, 1950. Since then there have been several discussions with the Commonwealth on the subject at ministerial level and with responsible officers.

(b) The Commonwealth expressed the view that the claim would only be considered when the expenditure approached the approved total contribution.

(4) The scheme is not at present "held up," but it has been retarded and still is by shortage of loan funds. Strong representations have been made to the Commonwealth and also to the British Treasury.

(5) The total estimated cost of the Wellington Dam-Narrogin pipeline and appurtenances is £2,075,000.

#### **BILL—LIMITATION ACT AMENDMENT.**

Read a third time and returned to the Assembly with an amendment.

#### **BILL—SOIL FERTILITY RESEARCH.**

##### *Second Reading.*

**THE MINISTER FOR THE NORTH-WEST** (Hon. H. C. Strickland—North) [2.21] in moving the second reading said: Last year the Farmers' Union of W.A. approached the Minister and requested that the Government introduce legislation to create a fund to assist research work being carried out at the university.

The request received support from the outset, but legal difficulties prevented a Bill from being introduced earlier. Care has to be taken to ensure that legislation of this type does not infringe Section 46 of the Constitution Acts Amendment Act on the ground that a tax is imposed. For this reason it is necessary to avoid mentioning the amount of contribution. In addition the legislation must be completely free from Government control and contain no provision for compulsory contribution by any individual grower. The co-operation of the Australian Wheat Board in deducting the money assigned by growers and paying it into the soil fertility research fund which this Bill seeks to create, would play a big part in the ultimate success of the scheme.

As mentioned before, the scheme is voluntary, and a grower may of his own free will assign a contribution for the purpose of research work. It has been necessary to insert a provision in the Wheat

Industry Stabilisation Bill enabling the board to collect the amounts assigned and pay them into the special research fund. Every wheatgrower in Western Australia signs a bulk wheat receipt claim for payment, and it is proposed to ask growers to authorise the deduction when signing this form.

The Bill provides that the fund be vested in and controlled by trustees. These will consist of five persons—the president and two vice-presidents of the wheat section of the Farmers' Union, the director of the Institute of Agriculture and a nominee of the trustees of the Wheat Pool of W.A. The fund will therefore be controlled by interested persons only and will be free from any Government control. The Bill does not contain a maximum contribution, but the trustees will decide the actual amount growers will be asked to assign, and it is not proposed that this shall exceed one farthing per bushel. As it is too late to obtain signed authorisation for the 1953-54 harvest, collections will commence with the next crop if this measure is passed.

It is considered that this is a generous move by growers to help themselves, and there is no doubt that the substantial funds collected will assist the Department of Agriculture, the university, and the C.S. and I.R.O. in their research programmes, as well as benefit students at the university by keeping them up to date with problems of the land. I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

**HON. L. A. LOGAN** (Midland) [2.25]: I commend the Bill to the House, although it has one or two principles that are not quite right. This measure has to do with the collections from the primary producers themselves. As the Minister said, it is difficult to work out something that is on a voluntary basis and yet make it legal. This apparently is the only way to do it.

There can be no doubt about the value of this fund and the research which the Institute of Agriculture is carrying out at the university to which it is applying the fund. Up to date the institute has operated mainly from the funds made available from the W.A. Wheat Pool. Research of this nature involves considerable expenditure on instruments for determining the nitrogen content of the soil, the soil action on the root, and the application of fertilisers after leguminous plants have been in the soil. To do this by way of field tests would take many years—perhaps five or six. But the Institute of Agriculture, if it has the proper means at its disposal, can probably reduce the period to no more than two or three years.

It is proposed that on the wheat warrant there shall be a special line for the wheatgrower to assign to the fund, this

amount of approximately one farthing. If he does not believe in applying the amount, he will cross out the word where it appears on the warrant. The money, of course, is deducted from his proceeds. Seeing that this will benefit the majority of the producers, I trust that most of them will see their way clear to assigning this money to the board.

Hon. C. W. D. Barker: Does this deal with salt encroachment?

Hon. L. A. LOGAN: Not this one. This deals with soil fertility which is being handled by the Institute of Agriculture at the University. We have heard for a good many years that the producers of this State are mining their country; they are not putting back into the soil what they take out of it. I have stated before that that might apply to some people, but not to all. Pasture groups have field days throughout the State—these have been held over the last ten years, particularly—and, as a result, the producer has been educated into realising that the land he is working has to be passed on to posterity. It is no good his mining it and getting his cut out of it, and then leaving it so that no one else can get a living from it.

Through the good offices of the Department of Agriculture, the producer has been taught to endeavour to do something to retain or build up the fertility of his land. To do this by field tests, takes time. This fund will enable instruments to be purchased that will permit of the professor and his scientific research officers shortening the period considerably. I hope that the augmentation of the fund, by a levy on the producers themselves, will enable the scientific experts to produce excellent results for the producers of Western Australia.

HON. L. C. DIVER (Central) [2.30]: I rise to support the Bill, although I do not altogether agree that the wheatgrower should be the only person to make contributions to enable research to be carried out into early maturing legumes. This work is being done in order to build up the fertility of the soil, and to enable the baking strength of our wheat to be improved, so that people will be able to buy better loaves of bread. It will also assist the milling industry in overcoming many of its difficulties; and why the producers of wheat should be the only ones called upon to contribute to the fund, is hard to understand.

I thought that the contributions would have been on a £ for £ basis; and that for every £1 raised by the wheatgrowers of this State, the Government would undertake to find another £1 on behalf of the consumers. The producers of barley and oats must also be taken into account. It is only a matter of time when new varieties of legumes will be evolved for

these areas; and, as a result, the growers of barley and oats will derive a benefit from the work now being carried out at the institute. But there is no provision in this Bill for those growers to make a contribution. I hope that in the future they will be called upon to take some part in providing the necessary funds.

The money will be contributed on a voluntary basis, under the system referred to by the Minister. Our Constitution will not allow a compulsory levy to be made. Unfortunately, in the wheatgrowing industry, as in many other industries, there are individuals who will not make a sacrifice; and yet, because we live in a democracy and until such time as a vote is taken, they are entitled to all the benefits that are derived from research. Before we finally agree to this Bill, I would like to see the warrant which is to be issued. I understand that provision will be made in the warrant for the deduction of a farthing a bushel, unless the producers strike out certain words. I would like to see the type of print that is used. I think the warrant should be in a fair print, and in a type that is obvious to all farmers. We do not want to have any farmer making a contribution unless he is absolutely clear about what he is doing.

Hon. Sir Charles Latham: You suggest that that wording should be in italics?

Hon. L. C. DIVER: Yes, so that farmers' attention is drawn to the fact that there is some provision which can be struck out; and if that is done, he is not forced to contribute. Some business houses make a practice of putting the conditions of sale in small print. They get away with it on the first occasion, but not on the second. As an active farmer, I want this scheme to be a success, and I do not want 50 or 60 per cent. of my fellow farmers resenting the fact, in subsequent years, that they have contributed to the scheme without being aware of it.

I would like to see the warrant tabled in the House before the third reading is agreed to. I want to have a look at it before we agree to the measure; and if the wording is not in italics, I think a small slip of paper should be attached to the warrant, which will draw the attention of farmers to the fact that the contributions are on a voluntary basis.

HON. A. R. JONES (Midland) [2.37]: If it were not so important for experimental work into soil fertility to be proceeded with as quickly as possible, I would recommend to members that this Bill be defeated, because everything is being left to the people who are conscious of the responsibility that rests on their shoulders and on the shoulders of every farmer in the State. Members from the agricultural areas have recommended that more money should be made available by the Government for research work. But it

seems rather strange that producers, who are taxed to the limit, who have been so taxed over the last few years, and who have paid many millions of pounds into the coffers of the Commonwealth Government by way of income taxation, should be called upon to contribute for work such as this. Our State Government has received its fair share of the money so paid by way of taxation. But how much is the Government making available to this industry, which carries Western Australia; and, in fact, the whole of Australia?

The Minister for the North-West: Through the railways, a few million pounds.

Hon. A. R. JONES: We are not talking about the railways.

The Minister for the North-West: You asked how much the State Government had contributed to this industry, and I said a few million pounds per medium of the railways.

Hon. A. R. JONES: We are talking about research into soil fertility.

The Minister for the North-West: You wanted to know what contributions the Government had made.

Hon. A. R. JONES: I am talking about the Department of Agriculture and the C.S.I.R.O.

The Minister for the North-West: I hope "Hansard" has it all down so that you will be able to read what you said.

Hon. A. R. JONES: Whatever research is done and whatever good results are achieved will be of benefit to all the farmers of Western Australia; and, in fact, to the whole of the population of Australia. In that case, why should any Government ask a person who has paid his taxation—heavy taxation too—to agree to a Bill such as this? It means that only those who are long-sighted and generous enough will pay into this fund.

Hon. C. W. D. Barker: It is for their benefit entirely.

Hon. A. R. JONES: There is nothing to say that anybody will subscribe to it.

The Minister for the North-West: It is on a purely voluntary basis.

Hon. A. R. JONES: The Bill has been submitted in the hope that a great number of wheat farmers in this country will make money available to the fund; and I have no doubt that they will. But the point that annoys me is that the same old few will go on making contributions. It is not hard to visualise the few who will make those contributions. We have men like Mr. E. H. B. Lefroy, who has already made money available for work of this nature. He has put a lot of his own time into it; and only last year he gave £1,000 towards the purchase of machinery to help the board. As a result of the levy on the wheat he produces, he will pay a large sum

towards the fund. Yet the man alongside him might not contribute a penny piece towards the fund but will still be entitled to any benefits derived from it.

While I support the Bill, I do so only because I believe that research work on soil fertility is so important to Western Australia and to the whole of the farming community. It is the Government's responsibility and not the responsibility of the producers on a voluntary basis. If the Government cannot see its way clear to ask all the farmers to contribute, it is a pretty weak Government. I do not think that only a few should be expected to contribute; and I support the second reading with many regrets that this contribution is not to be made on a nation-wide scale, and that it is being left to the few to carry the burden.

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

## **BILL—CANNING LANDS REVESTMENT.**

### *Second Reading.*

**THE MINISTER FOR THE NORTH-WEST** (Hon. H. C. Strickland—North) [2.43] in moving the second reading said: This Bill relates to the resubdivision of certain lands in the Canning district and to certain rights, roads and reserves in that district, and other purposes.

Hon. A. F. Griffith: Does it deal with the land which has just been resumed by the Government?

The **MINISTER FOR THE NORTH-WEST**: The hon. member, if he can recollect which particular land is affected, can ascertain whether it is mentioned in this Bill. The State Housing Commission acquired, during the years 1946 to 1951, by private negotiation and resumption, two large areas of land west of Albany Highway and north of Fremantle-rd., which are now known as Millen and Bentley Park Estates. After acquiring the area, the State Housing Commission conferred with the Town Planning Board, the City of Perth, and the Canning Road Board, and planned a re-subdivision of the whole area into suitable blocks, providing for new roads in appropriate positions. Under pressure of urgency, building operations were proceeded with, and homes have been provided for a large number of people. In the Millen estate about 180 houses have been completed, and approximately 200 houses are in course of erection. In the Bentley Park estate, 140 houses have been completed, and 100 are now being constructed.

To straighten out certain legal matters, it has been found necessary to introduce this Bill. The majority of the land had been previously subdivided, but it was

considered necessary to resubdivide in conformity with modern town planning requirements. This involved the obliteration of various surveyed roads and rights-of-way in favour of new roads in better positions. Certain reserves and portions of reserves were included in the area acquired, but provision has been made in the resubdivision for adequate reserves for the same purposes. Some of the land acquired by resumption under the Public Works Act of 1902, prior to the coming into operation of the Public Works Act Amendment Act, 1953, was affected by the provisions of Section 15 of the Public Works Act, 1902, which provided that, upon resumption of land, the rights of the owner in the lesser minerals were not taken. The Bill provides for the revestment of the whole of the land, together with the lesser minerals.

Provision is made in Clause 5 for the revestment of two narrow strips of land which had been left along the external boundaries of land in two old private subdivisions. This was an early-day procedure which had the legal effect of barring adjoining holders from making use of the roads in the adjoining subdivision when also subdividing their land. These narrow strips remain the property of the original owner who ceases to be further interested after he has disposed of the lots in the subdivision.

Clause 6 refers to an area which is held in fee simple by the City of Perth, which acquired it by transfer, free of any Crown trust. It could not, however, be transferred to the State Housing Commission in the usual manner, because the City of Perth had executed a declaration of trust acknowledging that it held the land in trust for the purpose of recreation for the people. It is therefore necessary for the Act to provide for revestment of this land. Ample provision has been made for a recreation reserve in the new subdivision.

In Clause 7 provision is made for the obliteration of certain road widenings which are unnecessary, as the old road adjoining the lots mentioned has been closed and the streets to which the lots have frontages have been extended westerly through the adjoining new subdivision, removing the need for corner truncations, the land in which is to be reincluded in the contiguous lots.

Clause 8 provides for a slight deviation of Braebrise-rd. near its intersection with Fremantle-rd. Some of the new lots in this vicinity have not been referred to in this Bill, having been excised from the plan, as the State Housing Commission has not finalised the acquisition of the land.

Clause 9 will facilitate the dedication of the various new roads which have been provided in the resubdivision, thus ensuring a continuity of legal access following the closure of the old roads. The whole of the land in the Millen Estate has been made the subject of Lands and Surveys

original plan No. 6139 and thereon numbered as Canning location 1274. The land in Bentley Park Estate has been numbered as Canning location 1275 as shown on original plan No. 6140.

It is proposed to issue to the State Housing Commission Crown grants for Canning locations 1274 and 1275. The resubdivision of the locations will be shown on Land Titles Office plans 6412 to 6424 inclusive and 6531 and diagram No. 18217. Plans are submitted indicating the areas involved and also the manner in which they have been subdivided. I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

On motion by Hon. A. F. Griffith, debate adjourned.

## **BILL—PUBLIC SERVICE ACT AMENDMENT.**

### *Second Reading.*

**THE CHIEF SECRETARY** (Hon. G. Fraser—West) [2.50] in moving the second reading said: This Bill is introduced as a result of a request from the Civil Service Association that a Public Service Board of three members replace the present system of a Public Service Commissioner. The Government believes that the proposal contains considerable merit and is making a thorough investigation of the matter, including an examination of the systems in other States. It will not be possible for the examination to be completed in time for legislation to be presented this session, but it is intended to introduce the necessary Bill next year.

The present Public Service Commissioner, Mr. Taylor, intends to retire on the 28th February, 1955. The Public Service Act makes no provision for a temporary appointment of commissioner, except in the case of illness, absence or suspension. As the Act now stands, the Government would have no alternative but to appoint a Public Service Commissioner for the full period of seven years. The Solicitor General has advised that any condition in such an appointment requiring the appointee to relinquish his office earlier, on the appointment of a board, would have no force in law.

The Bill, therefore, seeks to enable the appointment of a Public Service Commissioner, on the retirement of Mr. Taylor, for a term extending not beyond the 31st December, 1955, by when it is hoped legislation providing for a board will be passed and the board appointed. If such legislation is not passed next year, the present provisions of the Act will again apply and a Public Service Commissioner will be appointed for a term of seven years.

It is realised that there are objections to a temporary appointment; but, unless this Bill is agreed to, the Government must next year appoint a commissioner for seven

years, which will automatically defer the proposal for a board until the expiration of that period. The Civil Service Association has concurred in the introduction of this Bill, and I am informed that the proposal for a Public Service Board has the definite support of the Public Service as a whole. I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

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

## **BILL—BOOKMAKERS BETTING TAX.**

### *Second Reading.*

**THE CHIEF SECRETARY** (Hon. G. Fraser—West) [2.54] in moving the second reading said: It might be a bit presumptuous of me to introduce such a Bill at this stage.

Hon. L. A. Logan: Do you think it is a bit optimistic?

**THE CHIEF SECRETARY:** I was always an optimist. However, I will place the Bill well down on the notice paper so that it will not be reached until such time as a decision is given on the Betting Control Bill. What happens after that will depend on that decision.

As I explained when introducing the betting Bill, a separate measure is necessary to authorise the striking of a tax of 1½ per cent. on money paid or promised as a consideration for bets made by bookmakers. Clause 12 of the Betting Control Bill requires bookmakers to make full and true returns of amounts of money paid or promised as the consideration for bets made by them, and also requires the bookmakers to pay betting tax on those amounts at the rate imposed by this Bill. The tax could not be imposed by the Betting Control Bill because, as members are aware, Section 46 (7) of the Constitution Acts Amendment Act, 1899, renders necessary a short and separate complementary Bill actually imposing the tax. I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

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

## **BILL—NATIVE ADMINISTRATION ACT AMENDMENT.**

### *Second Reading.*

Debate resumed from the 23rd November.

**HON. L. A. LOGAN** (Midland) [2.55]: As I stated when speaking to the second reading of the Native Welfare Bill, I consider that all the returned servicemen, irrespective of colour or caste, should be automatically entitled to citizenship rights. Accordingly I commend Mr. Roche for introducing this Bill in order to give effect

to that principle. The Minister has gone somewhat further by the amendments he has on the notice paper. I have not given them much consideration at the moment; but no doubt we may be able to add something to Mr. Roche's ideas. If a man is good enough to serve his country, it should be right and proper that his wife and family should also be given every consideration in relation to citizenship rights. Whether this could be applied without the State as well as within it would probably need some further consideration. But Mr. Roche's idea is a step in the right direction, and I commend the Bill to the House.

**HON. A. R. JONES** (Midland) [5.57]: I rise to support the measure. This is one aspect to which we have all referred over the last few years, but on which none of us has done anything up till now. Like Mr. Logan, I feel Mr. Roche has done something worth while by introducing this measure, and I sincerely hope it will receive the support of the House.

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

## **BILL—BETTING CONTROL.**

### *Second Reading.*

Debate resumed from the previous day.

**HON. J. D. TEAHAN** (North-East) [3.0]: I am satisfied that no member of this Chamber considers that facilities should be granted to permit betting to increase. Representatives of the churches have expressed their opinion, which they are quite entitled to do on any question affecting the moral welfare of the community. That is part of their function; but whether we adopt their views is another matter. It is only right that we as members should consider the views of all parties.

A certain dignitary at Kalgoorlie told me on one occasion, "Whenever I have any big question under consideration, I generally form my own opinion first of all and I never fail to ask my wife what she thinks; but I always go back to my own opinion." That might apply to members here.

Six years ago a Royal Commission was appointed to inquire and report upon the question of off-the-course betting. The very fact that a Royal Commission was appointed shows that the question was a fairly hot one at the time, because no Government appoints a Royal Commission unless it be on a worth-while subject and there is a public demand for it. Consequently I take the view that the question of off-the-course betting was so pressing at the time that the Government thought it advisable to have an inquiry by Royal Commission.

It has been said that, in those States where off-the-course betting has been legalised, it has increased. Well, off-the-course betting has increased in this State, and in my opinion will continue to increase; and I would say that there are three factors mainly responsible for its increased popularity. The first is that the people now have much more leisure; the second is that money has been a little more free since the days of the depression.

The third factor in whetting the appetite of people for betting, I consider, is the broadcasting of racing news by the A.B.C. Some people who normally would take no interest in racing and betting are apt to have their appetites whetted by hearing in their homes broadcasts of impending racing fixtures, of which they are given the various details associated with racing and have the excitement caused by the actual running of the horses. Probably this gives some people for the first time in their lives an urge to become bettors. Consequently I say that broadcasting is probably the greatest contributing factor to the increase in betting off the course.

I have spoken to a number of people about the broadcasting of the races, and they have told me that if they did not hear the description of the running of the races and have the excitement associated with it, they would probably not make any investment. This has created a difficulty for the State. The Federal authority may be said to cater for this appetite for betting by spending a great deal of money on broadcasting; and, having created the appetite, it has practically said to the State Governments, "You are given the job of restricting betting, although we are giving the urge to betting."

Further, the Federal authorities provide all the telephones desired to facilitate betting. One member stated that, if a telephone were used for illegal betting, the phone might be disconnected. If records could be obtained covering the last seven years, I doubt whether we would find that this had happened in one case. I say, therefore, that the Federal authority is giving all the urge that can be given to encourage what has been described as a social evil but perhaps might more correctly be described as a social problem.

Many people have remarked to me that as I was a member of the Royal Commission, I must have gained quite a lot of information about s.p. betting. The amount of information thus gained was not great for this reason: The terms of reference specially debarred the commission from recommending provision for off-the-course betting by the licensing of betting shops; and as we were not permitted to recommend such a system, evidence was not taken for or against it. It is true that

some evidence along those lines was accidentally given, but there was no direct evidence, so members of the commission did not gain information on that phase such as might have been desired.

I am not a betting man, and I do not patronise betting shops; but amongst the lessons I learnt as a result of sitting on that Royal Commission was that there was a very strong desire by a large section of the community to bet on horse-racing. Furthermore, this desire was recognised by practically all witnesses. Speaking from memory, I think I am right in saying that even some of the ministers of religion who gave evidence before the Royal Commission admitted that there exists in the community a great desire and a great appetite for betting.

Another point that surprised me at the time was the extent to which people would go in order to satisfy the desire to have a bet, even though betting were illegal. Consequently we studied the places where illegal betting was being carried on in other States—in attics, in cellars and in the strangest of places. There was always a place arranged for the following Saturday where people could make a bet. If people desired to bet, there was always somebody to accommodate them. When people will go to that extent to indulge in betting, there must be a very strong desire in them.

I have no wish to condemn the Federal authority entirely in the matter of broadcasting racing news; but when so much prominence is given over the air to racing, it must create in listeners a desire to indulge. This applies to other broadcast programmes; they are continued only if the people want them. The moment any programme becomes unpopular, it is discontinued.

It can be accepted as a fact that the desire to gamble is a characteristic of Australians, Britishers and, in fact, of all human beings. One might say that they have almost a betting instinct. As far back as legislation goes, laws against gambling have been enacted. Legislation was passed in England in 1388 against gambling, not because it was regarded as a social evil, but because the Government of the day feared that the young men were not devoting sufficient time to military exercises. Consequently the time available for gambling was curtailed.

Later on a further law was passed to restrict gambling, on this occasion mainly to limit the amount that could be lost by any one person at a particular session. Thus, in the early stages, the question of whether gambling was a moral evil did not enter, but it was an endeavour to channel the activities of young people in another direction.

Dealing with shop and street betting, the Royal Commission said—

This pernicious system is particularly rife in the metropolitan area where it no doubt reached full development from the time in 1945 when the courts in that area began to award imprisonment for obstructing after a number of convictions.

Following two or three convictions, imprisonment was the order of the day.

During the course of our inquiry, it has been only too apparent that such steps as have been taken by the police over the past 10 years, which is the only period as to which we have taken evidence, have been entirely ineffective in stopping or reducing illegal betting or even preventing its increase.

That is very important. Even though rigorous steps had been taken and fines and imprisonment imposed, they had proved entirely ineffective in stopping or reducing illegal betting or even preventing its increase. All of this emphasises the fact that there is a desire and an appetite for betting that must be satisfied.

Referring to the fines and penalties imposed for off-the-course betting, the commission said—

The statistical review is of interest principally in demonstrating that the efforts of the police and the penalties imposed have been entirely ineffective as a deterrent to illegal betting.

We are satisfied as a result of this evidence, and also as a result of our own observations—

That is important—"the result of our own observations"—

that there is a substantial demand for off-the-course facilities in this State and that such demand is increasing.

The commission took evidence in the metropolitan area and at Collie, Bunbury and Kalgoorlie; and, over a period of several months, visited many places that were said to be betting places. From our own observations, I repeat, we were satisfied that there is a substantial demand for off-the-course facilities in this State and that the demand is increasing.

I remind members that it was in the year 1948 when we found that a substantial demand existed. The members of the Royal Commission were a highly placed magistrate of Victoria, Mr. McLean, who had conducted a number of Royal Commissions and, incidentally, a man who did not indulge in betting. The others were Mrs. Isobel J. Johnston and myself.

Having come to the conclusion that this demand exists and is increasing, the next question is: How shall the demand be dealt with? I should say that there are

three ways. The first is to try to suppress it, and that has proved a failure. We all know that no matter what penalties are imposed, whether by way of fine or imprisonment, off-the-course betting still flourishes, and I do not think that any member would claim that it could be suppressed or eliminated.

Another way is by adopting off-the-course totalisators. A great deal of evidence was taken by the Royal Commission about totalisators, from technicians, from the Deputy Postmaster General and also from the representatives of private companies interested in providing totalisators. I think the latter evidence may well be discounted. The companies had a personal interest in it—one of gain—and the evidence tendered should be regarded probably with a certain amount of suspicion.

There are many scattered areas that could not be catered for by totalisators owing to the huge distances in Western Australia—places like Leonora, Laverton, Port Hedland and Wyndham. I do not say the system would not work at Bunbury, Albany or Kalgoorlie, but that would be a shandy-gaff arrangement, with part of the State covered by totes and the rest go-as-you-please. After having taken hundreds of pages of evidence on the subject of totalisators, the Royal Commission commented on off-the-course totalisators, as follows:—

In the second place, the geographical situation in New Zealand is vastly different from that in Western Australia. New Zealand is far more compact. Its distances are short; its communications are good, and the decentralisation is marked, so that there are many towns whose population would economically justify the establishment of a branch of the totalisator. Now, Western Australia is a State of vast distances, poor communications, and is intensely over-centralised. We are satisfied that no State would present greater difficulties in the establishment and operation of such a scheme than Western Australia.

They are the comments of that Royal Commission, and they were not made lightly, but after many weeks of consideration following the taking of a great deal of evidence on the subject. If we are satisfied that we cannot suppress gambling and that totalisators are not practicable here, the third method of approach is betting shops. For the information of those who advocate the totalisator, I might add that whether a man bets on the totalisator or with an individual, the gamble remains, and so the social or moral evil is not removed by the totalisator. South Australia has been held up to us as an example of the total failure of betting shops; but the evidence that



I have obtained over a considerable period shows that the system failed in South Australia because the authorities in that State started off wrongly by allowing the establishment of glamour shops.

Hon. H. Hearn: They soon fell from being glamorous.

Hon. J. D. TEAHAN: They were too glamorous. Written across the front of the shops were the words, "Betting Parlour"; and the efforts of those who conducted the premises were to make their own place more attractive and comfortable than that next door or up the road. Right from the outset, that created a greater tendency on the part of people to congregate in betting shops, and so they were condemned to failure from the outset.

Can it be said that, having wiped out the betting shops, South Australia has done away with betting? Any visitor from South Australia will tell, or anyone who visits that State will find, that nearly every milk-delivery boy or bread-carter there is an agent for some bookmaker, with the result that one can always place a bet in South Australia. People bet there as freely as they do here, and perhaps to an even greater degree.

We have had evidence from Tasmania of varying purport; but from what I have heard, the system there has proved successful, and the fact that it has remained in existence from 1932 to 1954 would tend to show that there is not too much wrong with it. I have here an article from "The Australian Journal," of the 1st September, 1954, which, commenting on the Tasmanian set-up, speaks of the freedom to bet in Tasmania, and says—

This freedom, however like the extended drinking hours of the more enlightened States, does not seem to lead to the excesses and tragedies which opponents of the liberty undoubtedly forecast and which less biased observers could have perhaps reasonably anticipated. No ruined punter has yet staggered out of a licensed betting hall—or bookmakers' club as it is called—and blown out his brains in the gutter. On the contrary, everybody seems to be content with the system which permits a bookmaker to conduct off-the-course betting—under strict control, of course—without having to skulk at the rear of an outbuilding ready to flee any moment before a police raiding party, and which allows anybody to back his fancy without making himself a partner in an unglamorous conspiracy against the laws.

And above all it completely removes the ever-present suspicion of police graft, which becomes hot when the s.p. bookie is observed carrying on his furtive operations free of the attentions of the gaming squads.

Where in other places the off-the-course bookmaker is regarded as something that crawls under logs, in Tasmania he may hold his head as high as any legitimate business man.

Further—

What really surprises the visitor to the clubs, especially the larger ones, is the absence of noise. It is so quiet you can almost hear people figuring out their transactions or hear their whispered prayers rising to the god of chance. The silence is primarily due to the fact that bookmakers are not permitted to call the odds, which is just as well, for if twenty or so bookies started to attract customers in the usual raucous manner, the roof would surely lift and sail away.

Another reason why the silence is so intense is that no wireless receiving sets, other than those approved by the commission which administers the Act, can be installed or kept on the premises, and all wireless receiving sets so approved must have attached to them such amplifiers which meet with the commission's approval. As a result, a broadcast race is heard as a muted accompaniment to a stage act which could be performed without it anyway. Because nobody, least of all the bookmakers, seem to take much notice of it.

To continue—

As suppression inevitably finishes up creating other evils, the States which have not legalised off-the-course betting could profit by studying the effects of bookmakers' clubs on the social life of Tasmania. They would find that, by recognising the right of man to have a bet without going to a race meeting, they are at least removing the resultant evils of an illegal condition. The same state of affairs exists with restricted drinking hours; they only force men into plonk shops serving cheap wine, which put them on skid row in very quick time.

The final comment—after a statement that music is not allowed in the shops, and that neither noise nor liquor is permitted, and that children are debarred from entering the premises under heavy penalties for those that might take them there—is as follows:—

Control is therefore so strict, clubs could never become dens of iniquity; they will always be straight, open places in which anybody can lay a bet whenever the fancy takes him, subject only to the hours of business.

An amendment has been suggested to limit this legislation to a period of three years, and in my opinion that is important. I was one of those who listened to Mr. Woolacott, the reverend gentleman from

the Eastern States; and if he had one strong argument in his barrage, it was that, having established betting shops, we would find vested interests being created which could never be restrained. Is there not a vested interest created already? If the present illegal set-up continues, will not there grow up a vested interest which might be very hard to curb or remove?

I give this reverend gentleman the credit for having mentioned that aspect, and I think the three-years term is the answer in that regard, because it would prevent vested interests becoming established. If at the end of the three years, the public were dissatisfied with what had taken place, there would be such an outcry that the legislation would not be re-enacted. With that ever-present factor, those conducting the betting shops would be inclined to police themselves or, if a bookmakers' association was set up, it would see to it that the premises were not glamour shops, and that nothing untoward occurred in them, so that they might create such a good impression that at the end of the three-year period the measure would be re-enacted.

Hon. E. M. Heenan: As the land agents have recently done.

Hon. J. D. TEAHAN: Yes. That would provide against the objection raised by the ministers of religion. I am not a betting man, but I have been surprised at the great deal of pleasure that many people, particularly elderly people, get from betting in small amounts. Perhaps as one grows older, one's friends become fewer and available avenues for pleasure grow fewer, with the result that one seeks something else to supply a little excitement. Who is to find fault with that? I certainly cannot. I believe the losses or gains of such people in a year would not be great. Most of them would bet in sums of perhaps 5s. or 10s., and their total losses over a year would probably be not more than £10, which would be little enough to pay for their pleasure. They would pay that much to attend picture shows or concerts, and apparently the betting supplies the outlet these people want.

There is this to be said about the present set-up—I believe it is the greatest factor against it—that everybody speaks of its attendant evils. The worst feature is the task that has to be performed by the Minister for Police or the Commissioner of Police. Why should one police officer restrict betting to a narrow street corner in his town, and yet another officer at some other centre, who is more lax, allow s.p. betting to be conducted practically on every corner? In other words, the control of betting is left to the whim and fancy of the police officer stationed in each district. I am not complaining about the police officers, because they do a good job.

During the debate that took place on Sunday liquor trading a few years ago, this same argument was used for the passing of legislation to permit drinking on a Sunday. For example, previously a drink could be obtained in, say, Moora, which is in Mr. Simpson's electorate, because the police officer there permitted it; and yet further north, perhaps at Three Springs, the policeman would not allow it. Upon that argument, legislation was passed to make it lawful for a person to have a drink during certain hours on a Sunday. We know that now at, say, Busselton or Bunbury, one can have a drink during specific hours; and that is far better than to have the control of liquor trading left to the whim of the various police officers. The same principle applies to s.p. betting: the control of it is left to the whim of the police officer who is stationed in the area concerned.

*Sitting suspended from 3.33 to 3.50 p.m.*

Hon. J. D. TEAHAN: To sum up, as most of us are dissatisfied with the present set-up, I am strongly in favour of this Bill to regulate and control betting and bookmaking on horse-racing. I am hopeful that the situation would be improved by the passing of the Bill. I visualise that the betting shops proposed to be set up will be similar to those in existence on the Goldfields. Mr. Logan has referred to them. He was a stranger and visited them recently, but saw very little to cavil at.

I live quite close to a betting shop and I can honestly say that I have never seen anything objectionable taking place in it. I have not seen any drunkenness about the shop, and I have not seen women frequenting it. I have occasionally seen a woman in it. I can say that I have not seen s.p. bookmakers betting with children. They are almost their own police. If the betting shops it is proposed to establish in other parts of the State will be anything like those in Kalgoorlie, then we will not find any fault with them. I go so far as to say that those who conduct the shops in Kalgoorlie are persons to whom character references can be given. That does not happen by accident. I know quite a number of these s.p. bookmakers. They are men of character with no blemish.

As is to be expected, they are usually men of a generous nature. When I was the Mayor of Boulder, or chairman of a charitable organisation, I knew where to go to find funds. When I wanted a chair for a crippled child, a wireless set for the aged pensioners' home on the Goldfields, or the rail fare for some person who could not afford to go for a holiday, I knew where to find the money. I went to the owners of the s.p. shops. I have never had to ask in vain. In every case I got the money, and I got it anonymously. They did not give it with any ulterior motive. It was not given as an advertisement for the shops.

If this Bill is passed and betting shops are established throughout the State, we will have very little to say against them. In three years' time, when this legislation comes up for review, we will agree that they are far better than the present set-up in the metropolitan area. I am told that what takes place in the metropolitan area is a shambles, and I believe it. If controlled betting shops can be established similar to the ones I have mentioned, everyone will be happy with them. I support the second reading.

**HON. J. G. HISLOP** (Metropolitan) [3.55]: I must first of all, without any desire to be offensive in any way, congratulate the Chief Secretary on his clever speech when introducing one of the most controversial Bills we have had in this House for a long time, because he skated and glossed over most of the controversial points. If I could ever bring in a Bill of this sort, leaving myself open to so little odium, I would be indeed satisfied. Any one introducing such a Bill would be likely to bring about him a real storm of abuse. This Bill has created a great deal of public interest, and I have not received so much correspondence regarding any other matter as I have on this; nor have I ever been approached by such a large number of people of varying interests.

One or two things which the Chief Secretary said did give me food for thought. I was led to believe that the efforts of the churches to raise their voices against this Bill were the efforts of a set of people who were narrow in their views. In the past, countries have degenerated when their people became materialistic rather than spiritually-minded. It looks at the present moment as if this State is certainly placing the material side first. It is good to have groups, such as ministers of religion and church organisations constantly to remind us of the need for something other than the material side of life. I emphasise that such groups very often see, just as I see, the effects of excesses in any type of living, upon the families which have to bear the result of those excesses. When such excesses occur, to say the least, the victims are to be pitied.

In his speech, Mr. Logan made a statement which rather shocked me; because if I read him aright, he meant to imply that if a man wished to spend a couple of pounds on betting, it was not our concern. In the past very often this question has been asked: "Am I my brother's keeper?"; and there was a time in this world when it was recognised with the rule of law that a person was not his brother's keeper. But as the world progressed, times changed; and to a large extent today, we are our brothers' keepers. We are called on to make provision for people in all sorts of situations if those people or their families

reach a state of destitution. These days we are certainly being asked to care for such persons.

In looking at the Bill, we must consider the moral side. We were asked if we were satisfied with the present set-up. I for one would say that I am not. I believe the present set-up could quite easily corrupt our authorities.

**Hon. Sir Charles Latham:** From all accounts it has; that is, if we believe the statements made.

**Hon. J. G. HISLOP:** Last night we heard some extraordinary statements and charges against the Police Force; and it led me to the belief that the police could do more, but were hampered by the absence of power. Mr. Logan also made a statement about the law, and about the commissioner finding it difficult to adjust the law to local standards. I have never understood that any law had to be adjusted to local standards. Any commissioner who adjusts a law to local standards is failing in his duty.

**Hon. L. A. Logan:** See the commissioner's report!

**Hon. J. G. HISLOP:** The interjection gives me a chance to ask who does control the law. Does the commissioner control it according to local standards; or does the Minister inform the commissioner how he wants the law carried out?

**Hon. E. M. Heenan:** According to your argument he should arrest all the people who bet at the racecourse and at trotting meetings.

**Hon. J. G. HISLOP:** If that is the law, I have no objection to its being carried out.

**Hon. E. M. Heenan:** Do you not think it would be absurd?

**Hon. J. G. HISLOP:** Then make it absurd! That is the law as it exists today.

**Hon. E. M. Heenan:** That is why we are trying to alter it.

**Hon. J. G. HISLOP:** That gives nobody in authority power to alter the law to fit local standards. I believe that the real onus comes back not only to this House and another place, but to Ministries in general. In introducing the measure, the Chief Secretary said—again I have nothing actually to quote, but I think I remember correctly—that Governments were very loth to give up a tax once it had been imposed. I agree with that. I believe that, in the past, Governments of both complexions have regarded betting as something they could pass lightly by, because it produces good revenue. That is a very serious state of affairs, and one that calls for criticism.

**The Chief Secretary:** I was referring to the winning bets tax.

Hon. J. G. HISLOP: I agree; the statement is quite correct. It leads me to the point that the New Zealand measure brought in to the Government last year the enormous sum of £1,700,000. If this Bill should bring to the Government a larger sum of money than it now receives from the winning bets tax, I cannot see any Government, in three years' time, being willing to remove this betting control, or give up the money that may come to it as a result. Therefore the suggestion of making this a three-year measure seems to me to be just a sop to the public, and a sop that I do not think will ever do more than hold water. If the measure brings in the money it is expected to produce, the Government will plan its budget in accordance with the anticipated income. Any attempt by private individuals to alter the measure will meet with very poor success; and any effort on the part of the Government to alter it will be made with a view to maintaining the amount of money accruing from it.

What interests me when considering the New Zealand system is this: When one reads a directors' report of a business, one finds that the directors have the idea of pointing out what success they have met with during their term of office. This totalisator agency board of New Zealand submits a report in exactly the same way as a directorate, and in the happy frame of mind that its business has succeeded. It is quite understandable that in the first couple of years its profits very largely increased, because it would have taken business away from the s.p. bookmakers and passed it eventually to the totalisator. But a rapid gain from 1953 to 1954 was something which immensely pleased the board, because it warned that it was not likely that a similar rate of increase could be expected in future years.

Hon. Sir Charles Latham: They may have completed their depots by the end of that period.

Hon. J. G. HISLOP: That may be so. Furthermore, in order to make this betting attractive to individuals, the board introduced a form of doubles betting. I do not know whether it exists here, but it is quite new to me. It is called the off-the-course substitute system. If one takes a doubles bet and the second leg is scratched, one is given automatically an off-the-course substitute for the second leg and this substitute has a winning percentage of 23.3. This is a means of inducing people to bet, and I am certain that it is what will happen with the institution of legalised betting in this State.

If the Bill is passed there will be a considerable increase in betting. To some degree, all persons have baser instincts which most of them control so long as the exhibition of them would be against the law. But if that restraining influence of the law be

removed, those baser instincts are enlarged more freely and without a guilty conscience.

Hon. E. M. Heenan: What would you do with the racing clubs and the trotting associations?

Hon. J. G. HISLOP: When I was in Tasmania I saw for myself the betting hall which was described by Mr. Watson; and having spent an hour in the place, watching what was happening, I made a vow that when I returned to this State I would raise my voice, and cast my vote against any measure that would tend to bring about such a state of affairs here. It was quite a large hall at the back of a hotel in a side street. Around the hall were cubicles in which were sitting bookmakers, of whom there must have been 25 or 30. They all had boards displaying prices in respect of local races, and races on the mainland, and all were shouting the odds. The wireless was blaring the news of events, and a bell rang a few minutes beforehand telling the public to be quiet while the news came over the air. Men, women and adolescents were there, literally in hundreds, and the atmosphere was thick. The courtesy displayed was nil as people pushed past one another to a bookmaker offering slightly better odds than the one they had just left. To me it was sordid, and it was unpleasant to see such a number of people spending a bright Saturday afternoon in such poor atmospheric and non-cultural conditions.

Hon. E. M. Davies: Was it open after one o'clock?

Hon. J. G. HISLOP: So far as I remember, it was open while the racing was on.

The Chief Secretary: They close during the running of local races.

Hon. J. G. HISLOP: This one in Tasmania was open the whole of the time that races were being run, because the results came through while we were in the place.

The Chief Secretary: They must have been mainland races.

Hon. J. G. HISLOP: What distressed me was that in another place someone in authority in this Government made the statement that the Tasmanian system was working well. I hope we will never see such a state of affairs here. I am telling members what I saw with my own eyes when I was over there with the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association group and we were all taken to see what took place. That was two years ago.

Statements have been made that the newspapers are catering for the public in the matter of racing because it is a public need. I do not believe that the fact that the newspapers are catering for betting is a reason why it should be legalised. Newspapers cater for a whole lot of things, of some of which many of us do not approve.

Many people would like to see the newspapers and the wireless stations cut down considerably the amount of space and time set aside for the field of sport, and particularly racing, because by this means people are induced to take an interest in racing and are given an incentive to bet.

The mere fact that obscene literature and magazines of the most extraordinary type are published might make us utter the statement that the people producing them are catering for a public need. So, in that case Governments say, "We will have none of this. We will make it illegal." But here we have something that is regarded as a public need; and so the Governments say, "We will make this legal." I do not see any difference between the two. They are both matters of social usage and abuse.

The Chief Secretary: We are taking the same action in relation to both—we are seeking to control them.

Hon. J. G. HISLOP: The Chief Secretary referred to Port Pirie as having a betting shop. If my information is correct, it is the only licensed betting shop in South Australia.

The Chief Secretary: I said it was the only town that had a betting shop.

Hon. J. G. HISLOP: I understand it was established before the need to prevent this sort of thing was recognised by the public of South Australia. Since then no betting shop has been licensed in a town. That speaks volumes for the opinion of the people in a State which had experience of betting shops for many years.

There is not much need to stress the things that could happen as the result of the passing of this measure. It is a matter of opinion as to how one should vote. Those who support the second reading will not incur my wrath, and I will not think any less of them, because I believe they will take that action honestly and sincerely. If I vote against this Bill, it will be because I honestly believe it is not in the moral interests of the public; and that it will not serve the community in any way. I do not believe it is a colossal industry—this betting industry. But I believe it is a colossal organisation that neither toils nor spins, and is of no economic value to the community. For those reasons I trust we shall never see betting shops established legally in this State.

The Chief Secretary: Would you suggest something else?

Hon. J. G. HISLOP: If we are to have anything at all, I would rather see the human element eliminated. I would rather see a totalisator, which does not call for the meeting together of a mass of humanity struggling to get from one bookmaker to another.

The Minister for the North-West: Why would that not be so?

Hon. J. G. HISLOP: Because a totalisator is an inhuman rather than a human machine. I am sure it would have a better effect generally. However, I would still disapprove of a totalisator, because I believe that it, too, would increase betting; and I do not believe that to increase betting is in the interests of the moral or economic welfare of the State.

The Chief Secretary: Very often, it does not give money back even when one has had a win.

Hon. J. G. HISLOP: It probably might be better if that were so, because one is only tempted by winning to put more money back on to other events, and thus lose it. I have little more to add. My vote will be recorded against the measure. If it does pass the second reading, I hope that serious amendments will be made to it. I would like to see it amended so that the position with regard to youths attending betting shops will be more stringent than it is in South Australia. Mr. Logan said that under this Bill there would not be the tendency for youths to be seen in betting shops that there was in South Australia. A comparison between the two provisions shows ours to be so weak and open as to be likely to lead to greater abuses than existed in South Australia. When one reads the words of those members of Parliament who voted for betting shops and then recalls that years afterwards, having seen their folly, they apologised to the public for having voted in favour of the establishment of betting shops, one must surely learn a lesson.

HON. A. R. JONES (Midland) [4.17]: I believe a vote should not be taken on the Bill until each member has expressed his views. There are certain points upon which we all agree. The first is that the conditions existing are far from being satisfactory, desirable or necessary for the welfare of our State. The second is that we should not encourage betting to any further extent. If possible, we should limit it to the minutest possible degree. I also believe that we have the thought in our minds that betting in excess is no good to any community. In fact, whether it be betting, drinking or anything else that is in excess, it is no good to the community or to any person in the community.

The members who have spoken have said quite frankly that they are not at all happy about the conditions that now prevail, and they do not want to see betting increased. So I believe we have some common grounds, whether we vote for or against the measure. What we ultimately do when we make our decision and record our vote can be influenced only by the many factors which we hear discussed during the debate.

The first thing I ask myself is: Who are those who oppose the Bill? When we take into account the people who have openly

expressed their objection to it, we find they comprise many people in a number of walks of life. We have the united church bodies, the business heads, and the banking heads. Any one of these people will open up a discussion on the betting Bill and will inquire what would be the likely repercussions if it is passed. They are concerned about the welfare of our people, particularly the younger generation.

While I suppose we can concede that those of us who reached maturity some 20 or 30 years ago might have gone to the dogs and so are irredeemable, I believe we have an obligation to carry out. I recall a vigorous old gentleman of 80 years of age who had been a heavy drinker all his life. He used to go to sports meetings and race meetings and have a few drinks, and would invariably throw his coat on the ground and challenge someone to tread on it. We all know what that means! He would get himself into a horrible mess before he got home. He used to condemn drink. He said that every young man should sign the pledge. Someone asked him why he did not sign it; and he said, "I am too old now." Possibly that applies to those of us who reached maturity some time ago. We should think of this old man and try to preserve the young people from following in our ways.

Who is asking for the Bill? Very few people are asking for it. The Commissioner of Police in his report has asked that something be done to relieve the present position, and I do not blame him. I have seen what goes on in Geraldton. Some 12 months ago I was holidaying there, and I was disgusted with what I saw outside the hotels each Saturday afternoon. So disgusted was I that I made certain that I got my children away from the hotels and down to the beach where they could not see what was going on. I believe that had a Bill come forward a couple of months later I would have been of the opinion that Mr. Logan expressed last night; I would have supported any reasonable measure rather than agree that what was then operating should continue. However, I had not then inquired into what was occurring in other States, so I believe I have the right to change my mind. But I still condemn what goes on today.

Among the people who are asking for the Bill we find the Commissioner of Police. I believe there should be some change in the present conditions as they apply to him. The correct thing to do would be to amend the Police Act so that he could ask his officers to perform a duty which, as was pointed out last night by Mr. Logan, is not ridiculous, as is the present one, where they put men on a traffic charge for betting.

The only other people who are asking for the legislation, or hoping that it will be passed, are those members of the Government who, I have no doubt, have given

the matter serious consideration, because they would not introduce a Bill without doing so. In addition, a few of the present s.p. bookmakers would like to see it passed.

The Minister for North-West: All I know are against it.

Hon. A. R. JONES: That may be so. The few wanting it would be those with sufficient capital behind them to feel that if an organisation were set up, they could play a prominent part in the ownership of betting shops throughout the State. The smaller man would be a little dubious about the passing of the Bill, because he might feel he would not be in the race to receive a licence. Very few people are asking for the Bill. No member who has spoken in favour of it has told us of any other people who want it. The Chief Secretary said only 3,000 demonstrated against it at a meeting held on the Esplanade. When the debate on the Bill was going forward in another place, the gallery there was filled with many people; and who were they?

The Chief Secretary: A good mixture.

Hon. A. R. JONES: I noticed that there were a few bookmakers and possibly a few s.p. operators, and the balance of them were members of the organised party of the united church bodies. I did not see a horde of punters coming in to support the Bill. I wonder why? We do not see demonstrations of that kind if the people really want something. When the workers want something they put up a good show in support of it. They will make any sort of a demonstration provided it is within the law. They will march, carry banners, organise thoroughly, and go on strike to gain their ends. As a result, the rest of the people know that there is some definite strength behind their movement. So, if we accept the theory put up by the Minister that only a few people demonstrated against the Bill, we should accept the theory that none at all demonstrated for it.

The Chief Secretary: The only difference is that the churches, like the workers, are organised, but the punters are not.

Hon. A. R. JONES: The punters never will be organised.

Hon. A. F. Griffith: So, because they are not organised, you take up their fight for them.

Hon. A. R. JONES: I have asked myself who else is asking for this legislation to be passed, but I can find no one; and no member has told me of anyone else. I have to conclude that only a very few people want the Bill enacted.

The Chief Secretary: That is not the point. The point is that something wrong is going on, and the Government wants to correct it.

Hon. A. R. JONES: In our deliberations on the Bill we have first to consider the effect it will have on the morale of our people, and we must remember that the morale of our people affects the success of our State. It is a well-known fact that no matter what a venture may be, if the morale of the people concerned in it is low, the venture does not succeed. If we want our State to succeed, then we must see that our morale is kept high. That should be our first consideration. If we are going to pass legislation which will make it easy and legal for a person to carry on the form of gambling that he indulges in at present, and for many more to be included so that it is accepted throughout the community as something which will encourage gambling tendencies, then I venture to say that the young people, as they grow up, will follow in the footsteps of those who set the example.

Home training plays a big part in forming the character of young children, and youths in their adolescent stage. If the home training does not lead them in the right direction, and the right example is not set, we cannot expect a good type of youth, other than in exceptional cases, which would be about one in 50. If, as a Parliament, we do not set an example, how can we expect the home life and the morale of our young people to be as good as they should be? If we make it easy for people to bet, and if betting is accepted by the Government as lawful, we will be lowering the morale of the whole community. In many cases, if this Bill is passed, people will be spending money which they cannot afford.

Hon. J. J. Garrigan: They do it on the racecourse.

Hon. A. R. JONES: I consider that a person is entitled to his sport. Members who support the Government have said, "Why deny anybody his sport? Why deny the worker the right to have his sport and relaxation?" I have always played and followed sport; and until I leave this earth I shall follow and play some form of sport, even if it be bowls in later years.

Hon. E. M. Davies: They do not bet on bowls, do they?

Hon. A. R. JONES: I believe that everybody should take an interest in sport, and play it wherever possible, for many reasons.

Hon. J. J. Garrigan: Racing is a sport.

Hon. A. R. JONES: I believe sport is clean, open exercise, and helps people to build good, strong, healthy bodies. I believe it helps to improve our minds, makes us rely on our fellows, and makes us appreciate the other chap's way of thinking. In other words, it is a good character-builder. Some people consider that horse-racing is a sport.

Hon. J. J. Garrigan: It is the sport of kings.

Hon. A. R. JONES: It is recognised as such; but I do not think our kings, when they indulged in horse-racing, thought that so much gambling would be centred around it in future years. Let us agree that it is a sport, and allow people to take part in it. If they go to the racecourse, they are going out in the fresh open air, and they do a fair amount of walking from the tote to the collecting window.

Hon. E. M. Davies: And to the bar.

The PRESIDENT: Order!

Hon. A. R. JONES: They are at least doing something and exercising themselves. So far as I am concerned, if they have the money they are entitled to go along and spend £2, £5, or even £500, at the racecourse.

Hon. E. M. Davies: That is a weak argument.

Hon. A. R. JONES: But nobody can tell me that it is a sport or a recreational facility to go down to the corner to the local betting shop, or to a legalised totalisator, or the s.p. joint which at present operates down the lane near the lavatory, and listen to the wireless which gives details of race meetings, place a few bets and have a few beers! If that is sport, I have something to learn.

Hon. E. M. Davies: Do not they do that at the racecourse?

Hon. A. R. JONES: Members on the Government side have claimed that a worker should not be denied his right to his sport. If he likes this sport, and racing is his sport, there is nothing to stop the average worker from going to the racecourse.

The Chief Secretary: Only the dough!

The Minister for the North-West: Only the fact that he lives in the bush.

Hon. A. R. JONES: If a man lives in the metropolitan area, it costs only 1s. to travel by bus to the nearest railway station, and the return fare from that station to the racecourse is only 3s. and the entrance fee into one section of the course is 4s. So any man or woman could go to the racecourse and back for under 10s. I venture to suggest that the average man who bets at a betting shop near a hotel spends 10s. or more on beer in an afternoon.

The Minister for the North-West: That is right. He spends it that way instead of on fares.

Hon. A. R. JONES: So the argument is cockeyed. If a man wants to bet, he can go to the racecourse, because transport to and from the course is not dear.

Hon. J. J. Garrigan: What about Broad Arrow?

Hon. C. W. D. Barker: What about the people in Kalgoorlie?

Hon. A. R. JONES: As yet I have not left the metropolitan area.

Hon. H. Hearn: Do not let them rush you.

Hon. A. R. JONES: In speaking of the morale of a community, I ask myself what we expect of our people. I believe we expect that they shall be conscientious in what they do; that they shall accept their responsibilities and that they shall feel their dependence upon one another. I lived on the Goldfields for a while; and my experience over the last 20 years leads me to the belief that our community is slipping badly. Today, people do not keep appointments. If I arrange to meet a person at 10 o'clock at a certain place, for that appointment to be kept on time is the exception rather than the rule. If one approaches a business house and asks for something to be done, such as the taking of measurements for a certain job, it is the exception rather than the rule to find that the individual concerned turns up on time—sometimes he is two or three days late.

The Minister for the North-West: Business is good.

Hon. A. R. JONES: Last month I had an experience of it. A man was to come to do a certain job one morning, but for some reason he did not turn up until two or three days later. So I believe that the morale of our people is slipping badly. My illustrations might sound trivial; but all these small things indicate that our morale is slipping, and slipping badly. We are going down; and if we drift any further and do not accept our responsibilities and realise that we are dependent upon each other, our State will not flourish; and, as a partner in the British Commonwealth, we will be worthless.

The Chief Secretary: If you defeat the betting Bill, our morale will be kept up! Is that so?

Hon. A. R. JONES: It will not be driven any further down if the Bill is defeated.

Hon. E. M. Heenan: We in this House are not always on time. Do you think our morale is slipping?

Hon. A. R. JONES: I do. If a person cannot keep an appointment, as seems to be the rule these days, it indicates that morale is slipping.

Hon. C. W. D. Barker: Your halo is slipping!

Hon. A. R. JONES: If I am fortunate enough to wear a halo, I hope my friend has one, too.

Hon. H. Hearn: He would look very well in one, too.

Hon. A. R. JONES: Promises are easily broken; and that thought takes my mind back to a chat I had with an old prospector at Kookynie. He told me, during one of my many visits to that centre in the early days, that on the Goldfields a man's word was his bond. I can still remember an old hotelkeeper who lived at Leonora—a man named Webb. I called on him to sell him a motorcar. I took out an agreement and asked him to sign it and pay me a cheque for one-third of the purchase money as a deposit. He said, "I am not interested in any agreement or deposit. I told you to get a motorcar for me, and when it arrives I will pay cash." He was one of the old school from the Goldfields. Those people gave their word and honoured their obligations. I had a lot of trouble in getting my manager to allow me to take the vehicle away without the one-third deposit and without having the agreement signed. Eventually I took the car up to Mr. Webb and he paid me a cheque for the full amount. I wonder if the same would happen these days.

Hon. L. A. Logan: With thousands of men, yes.

Hon. A. R. JONES: But I wonder if our principles are slipping. Could we depend upon a man to honour his obligations?

Hon. L. A. Logan: I think so.

Hon. A. R. JONES: We must all consider this Bill. I believe that it will affect the morale of our people because it will permit more betting shops to be established and will make it easier for people to bet, especially younger people. I was told that in South Australia, even though it was illegal for those under the age of 21 years to bet, there was a nice little business conducted by people who had just turned 21 years of age, and who used to take bets from youths congregating in the parks; lodge them with the bookmakers; and receive a certain percentage for their work. These youths were betting in amounts of 1s. or 1s. 6d. I did not see it, but I believe it happened, because the person who told me was not trying to make up a story. I do not say that sort of thing was rife, but apparently it existed. Only a few weeks ago I read that youths were betting in school.

Hon. L. A. Logan: In Western Australia.

Hon. A. R. JONES: Why make it any easier for these people to bet? Our morale has slipped far enough already. Do not allow it to go any further.

The Minister for the North-West: Will this make it any easier than it is now?

Hon. A. R. JONES: I believe our young people need all the guidance we can give them. At present, young people receive big wages, and there seem to be easy ways



for them to spend it; everything is done to encourage them to spend it. If we make it easier for them to bet, it will be a retrograde step. If parents are encouraged to bet, our younger folk will have before them the example of either the father or mother—quite often the mother—and will grow used to the idea of betting and will follow in their parents' footsteps. Because of the big money our young people are receiving, the easy life they lead, and the encouragement they receive from the Government not to save, I believe that in a few years' time we will have a race of people entirely dependent upon the State because they will never save anything; they will spend money they cannot afford.

The Minister for the North-West: Very successful men bet.

Hon. A. R. JONES: I do not deny that; but they did not bet before they became successful.

The Minister for the North-West: How do you know that?

Hon. A. R. JONES: Because gamblers do not become successful unless they carry on and follow the pursuits of gambling. Pat Healy is a successful man, but where has he got his success from?

The Minister for the North-West: Let us say successful businessmen bet.

Hon. A. R. JONES: Healy became successful at the expense of the small bettor. It is a well-known fact that any s.p. bookmaker is more interested in what is called the silver bettor—the man with two bob—than he is in the man with £20 or £30 in his possession, because he feels the latter may have some information and that he is liable to lose money to him. He would sooner have 200 two-bob bettors than 20 or 30 £10 bettors. Is it not a fact that bookmakers become wealthy at the expense of people who cannot afford to bet? Do not successful men bet? Of course they do! These businessmen go to the racecourse by way of sport and relaxation. When I go to a racecourse I go there primarily for relaxation, and I am quite prepared to lose £6 or so, which I usually do.

Hon. E. M. Heenan: Do you realise you are breaking the law?

Hon. R. F. Hutchison: That is not a good example.

Hon. A. R. JONES: I have broken the law, I suppose, almost every day of my life; and I suggest the hon. member who has spoken has done the same. I do not say I am a pattern to follow, but what I do suggest is that we have a responsibility and we should face up to it.

Hon. E. M. Heenan: Do you not think it would be better to correct it so that we would not break the law?

Hon. A. R. JONES: Does the hon. member think we could ever do that?

The PRESIDENT: Order! I would like the hon. member to address the Chair.

Hon. A. R. JONES: Each one of us breaks the law almost every day. We do not frame laws to have them broken; we frame them to protect the weak and those who are unable to protect themselves. We prosecute a person who breaks into a house and steals money. We prosecute people for getting drunk and driving a motor car while in that condition; we prosecute people for knocking somebody else down. We frame laws to protect the weak people. If we were to pass this Bill, and it became law, I do not think we would protect people who are weak; I think we would make it easier for them to become weaker, if that were possible. I do not reflect in any way on people who gamble, but I do suggest that there are plenty of them who cannot afford to do so.

Hon. L. A. Logan: They do that today.

Hon. A. R. JONES: Exactly! But why make it easier for them to do so?

Hon. L. A. Logan: It will not make it easier.

Hon. A. R. JONES: There are dozens of people who would not at present go into these sordid places and bet; but they would certainly do so if it were within the law and was fashionable, and the place in which the betting was taking place were attractive. This Bill will not do anything to help the people who are weak; many of them gamble away money they cannot afford.

Let us consider the unions and the purpose for which they exist. I will stand corrected if I am wrong; but I believe a union is set up to secure what its members feel is the right reward of the people in the community for the work they do. Another aim of the union is to see that the man who is not as fortunate as his fellows is not left behind; that he is brought in as one of the community of workers, to receive the same wage under the same conditions. I suggest that the unions strive hard in an endeavour to see that the weak do not suffer in any way.

Yet we have members of unions and supporters of unionism who will uphold a Bill of this nature, which will in no way help the weak. Least of all will it help those who cannot afford to bet. I cannot reconcile the attitude adopted by members of the Labour Party with the principles that are upheld by the unions—particularly when they support a Bill of this nature; because these members to a degree support socialism and this measure will set up a capitalist class. This will make a number of men wealthy; and, of course, it will make it easier for the worker to bet—particularly the man who cannot afford to do so.

The Minister for the North-West: It will make it harder; it will control betting, which you are not prepared to do.

Hon. A. R. JONES: I would like to quote from a pamphlet I have received, giving the views expressed by legislators in South Australia. This is what Mr. Nieass had to say—

When betting shops were open I, as a union official, had more worries and troubles in trying to settle the domestic affairs of many of the workers as the result of the betting shops than I had in the whole of my experience previously . . . . Since betting shops ceased to operate I have not had one of these cases to deal with.

The Minister for the North-West: Why did they not close the shops at Port Pirie?

Hon. A. R. JONES: Another report comes from a union president who was a communist; and he said at the Royal Commission that he could not support a betting Bill because it would set up a monopoly, and that to support it would be against his principles because it would be establishing a capitalist system. Another opinion given in the pamphlet I have is that from the member for Midland in South Australia. It is as follows:—

I say straight out that I am opposed to betting shops whether in the city or country . . . . I know what happened particularly in country centres, when betting shops were legalised. On race days it was impossible to organise any class of sport—cricket, football or bowls—in any town in which there was a betting shop.

Hon. E. M. Heenan: You do not believe that!

Hon. A. R. JONES: I do. I know that in Peterborough and Georgetown there were four or five football teams which formed an association. Kapunda was another such centre. But even though they had good strong teams, this association disbanded at the time when betting was rife.

The Minister for the North-West: Where is the town in Western Australia today which has no betting shop?

Hon. A. R. JONES: Let us learn from the experience they have had in South Australia. Had I not read the reports and speeches made by members on this Bill when they referred to the set-up in South Australia and the experience they had there, I might have felt different; but now that we have the experience of South Australia before us, let us take advantage of it and profit by it. After all, we cannot say that all the South Australian members of Parliament are imbeciles.

Hon. E. M. Heenan: Can you tell us if there is any sport going on in Tasmania?

Hon. A. R. JONES: There must be.

The PRESIDENT: Order! I would ask the hon. member to address the Chair.

Hon. A. R. JONES: One other point I would like to make is this. If we are to legalise betting and accept it in our community as necessary, we will have our children growing up with the idea that it is the right thing to do. The inference I wish to draw is that in Victoria and New South Wales we have the Waterside Workers' Union suggesting that its men require at least £3 a week to spend on beer. Can anyone deny that? If this Bill is passed it will mean that betting will follow the same pattern, and the unions will probably consider that their men require a few pounds with which to bet.

The Minister for the North-West: Do you think it will affect the basic wage?

Hon. A. R. JONES: That is the trend today. Anything accepted in the community today is, in a few years' time, considered a matter of right. The only right we have to bet is when we can afford to bet; and the only right we have to drink is when we can afford to drink. There is too much in the way of "We must have this much for drink, and we must have that much for gambling." I hope Mrs. Hutchison will give us the woman's point of view, and inform us how she would like her children and her children's children to be brought up. She has reared a family, and her views ought to be very helpful to us before we cast a vote on this measure. One of the members who spoke suggested that the totalisator would be better, but I do not agree with that either. It is just another system of legalised gambling, so I cannot see that it would do any good.

Hon. C. W. D. Barker: What would you do?

Hon. A. R. JONES: In the first place, I would not have this Bill placed on the statute book. I would go through the Police Act and decide what amendments were necessary to empower the police to do a decent job in cleaning up the present system. I do not say that in this way we could completely wipe out gambling, but it would have the effect of clearing the streets of the scenes that are witnessed today. Then the position would resolve into people betting by post or by telephone or giving up betting altogether.

I have lived in the country for 43 years, and the only time I was interested in racing was when I came to Perth once or twice a year and when the Melbourne Cup was being run, I found some way of having a bet. If I did not have the means to bet, it did not worry me one iota; and I think I can say that that applied to the whole of the community where I lived. But is betting something that is necessary in life? Must we have a bet? Supporters of the Bill say that it is necessary and that we must have it. I cannot believe that Mr. Davies would say it is necessary.

Hon. E. M. Davies: No, but I want a law that will be just to all people.

Hon. A. R. JONES: The law is the same as it applies to all.

Hon. E. M. Davies: Is it?

Hon. A. R. JONES: When the law is enforced, it applies to and affects all. I do not wish to occupy the time of the Chamber any further, but I hope that what I have said has proved to be a helpful contribution. I shall certainly oppose the second reading, and if the Bill is taken into Committee, I shall fight every clause of it tooth and nail.

**HON. L. CRAIG** (South-West) [5.2]: I am quite sure that any speeches made from now onward will not have any effect on members' attitudes to the second reading; but I think it necessary on a Bill of this sort, which has created a certain amount of public interest, that every member should express his views. All of the speeches have been of a very high order, though I must say that I do not consider the last speaker was up to his usual form. He usually makes a first-class speech.

The moral aspect of betting is an important one—the attitude of the community to betting and whether that attitude is a right one. One section of the churches opposes betting or gambling in any shape or form on moral grounds. Those people say that because, in their opinion, betting is an evil, they must have nothing to do with it. That, however, is not the unanimous opinion of the churches, because the Roman Catholic Church expresses no views on the subject, and is not opposed to betting. What it opposes is the abuse.

One has only to live in Ireland for a little while to find that every man, woman and child is interested in horse-racing. I recall having stayed at a hotel in Dublin—the best hotel, too—and the place was crammed with people. I inquired whether there was a big church conference on, as the place was full of clerics. My question was received with a laugh, and I was told, "No, there are certain races on today." The Roman Catholic Church does not regard horse-racing and betting as evil.

The Minister for the North-West: Only when carried to excess.

Hon. L. CRAIG: Yes, only when the people indulging cannot afford to do so. It is the abuse of betting that is objected to. Thus the church people are divided on the subject. I do not think that the church people in England are other than interested in racing because, ever since there has been horse-racing, the whole countryside has been interested in the turf and the breed of the horses. The cross-country races, which are all amateur

events, are a feature of the racing there, and people bet on them, though not in large amounts. So racing or betting is not an evil in itself.

The Minister for the North-West: One may bet on golf.

Hon. L. CRAIG: Yes, people bet on many things. In New South Wales, amongst the greatest betting events in summer-time are the yacht races. Big steamers go out packed with people, including bookmakers, and the people bet on the results. Dog racing and other forms of racing could be mentioned as providing opportunities for gambling. In Japan the form of gambling which is mostly indulged in, and which is becoming a menace, is the pin-ball game. Thousands of workers rush from their offices at closing time to play pin-ball. In England, the football pools are a form of gambling which is accepted by everybody. The most respectable people have their 1s. or 2s. every week on the football, and people in England even bet on Western Australian football.

Hon. C. W. D. Barker: Is that legal?

Hon. L. CRAIG: I do not know; but a great amount of revenue is produced for the Government, because every bet has to be posted. The revenue runs into millions of pounds. Every country accepts gambling or betting. Is there anything morally wrong in backing one's fancy? One has only to live in the backblocks for a while to realise the great interest that is taken by the people, not only in betting on races, but also in the breeding of horses. On the stations there are men who are not interested in reading or music, and the whole recreational part of their lives is devoted to reading about horses. Some of them are able to tell the breeding of the best horses in Australia for the last 20 or 30 years. Their greatest and perhaps only pleasure is to have a bet on Saturdays, which they do by telephone.

Is there anything wrong or bad about that? I do not think there is. We all like to gamble. When there is a drought in the wheatbelt and I know that sheep may be bought cheaply, I buy as many as I can in the hope that when the rains come, the price will go up. It is really gambling on somebody else's misfortune, nothing more or less. The Stock Exchange is another form of gambling. Some shares and oil scrip in particular are not bought for the eventual income that might be derived from the production of gold or oil. They are bought in anticipation of a quick and large profit being made. So I consider there is no difference between betting on horse-racing and other forms of gambling. It is the abuse that causes all the trouble. If we can agree on that, I think we can get closer together in dealing with this problem.

If gambling on horse-races is being abused, are we content to allow the present set-up to continue? If it were good, we

would not change it; but there is not a member who has not complained about existing conditions. Mr. Jones devoted the whole of his speech to the deplorable conditions that exist today and the deterioration in the morality of the people. Should we allow that state of affairs to continue if that is how we feel? I am always in favour of doing something to change whatever is not good. If something is not working properly, we should not be content to do nothing. We should do something. We should make a change; because, as a rule, a change brings improvement.

We have the Commonwealth Government, through the radio, not only broadcasting race results, but also broadcasting illegal betting odds. Thus everyone seems to be contributing to betting. I personally see no wrong in betting itself, except the abuse of it. One speaker raised the question of drinking. Let us compare drinking and gambling. Which is the greater evil—if they are evils—drink or betting?

Hon. R. F. Hutchison: Drink.

Hon. L. CRAIG: I entirely agree with the hon. member. Drink is much the greater evil. It does more harm to the community and the home and causes more distress than anything else that can be mentioned. Yet drink in itself is a good thing. Christ himself turned water into wine. It is the excess or abuse which is the evil. What have we done regarding that? Because intoxicating liquor is used to excess by people who cannot afford it, and because it brings degradation to some people, we have clamped down heavily and taken strict control of the traffic. When drink is associated with gambling, it makes both of them very bad indeed.

Hon. C. H. Simpson: Does not the production of liquor give rise to industries?

Hon. L. CRAIG: So does the breeding of horses. Betting today is associated with hotels. One hardly ever sees a group of men betting except around a hotel; and the result is that, when the poor devils win a few shillings, they have some drinks and their judgment disappears. After that, they have no more chance of winning than of flying over the moon; and so these silly men have a bet or two, and go backwards and forwards to the pub until the week's wages have gone. When we impose control on betting we may have to experiment, because we will probably make some mistakes as South Australia did; but in that State it was not the legislation which was at fault, but the administration of the law.

Hon. N. E. Baxter: This system will fail.

Hon. L. CRAIG: Most of the speeches made in opposition to the Bill have been filled with predictions of what will happen. Those speakers may be right; but, if so, it will be the fault of those who administer the law and not of the law itself. If we appoint a proper board and give it

adequate powers, it will first of all be able to take betting away from the hotels, and see that the betting shops are not too lavish. Surely there is nothing wrong with making some effort to control betting and improve the present position, even though the system may not be perfect to begin with.

Much has been said to the effect that there is no public demand for the control of betting, and that no request has been made to Parliament for it. What request is ever made to Parliament for the scores of measures that we pass every year? That argument, therefore, does not carry much weight with me. I have no strong views on this question; but I am sure my wife would disagree with what I am saying, because she opposes betting on moral grounds, and will have nothing to do with it. If I tell her what I have said, I will probably get into a row tonight.

We must go further, and ask what is the sensible thing to do. Are we, as makers of the law, satisfied to continue to see it being flouted and that state of affairs being accepted? Mr. Jones complained of the lack of restraint and morality due to the flouting of the law; but this measure would remedy that condition. I believe a great many young people today—probably half of them—do not know that betting is illegal.

Hon. N. E. Baxter: Do not tell us that!

Hon. L. CRAIG: The hon. member is entitled to his opinion as I am to mine; but if he asked 100 young men whether it was illegal to ring up a bookmaker and place a bet, half of them would say it was legal because it is accepted by everyone. The law says it is illegal, but this measure would make it legal under control and illegal outside the control. It would give us power to deal with the man who starts a betting shop illegally. But today we have not that power, and have to pick up a man in a lane and charge him with obstructing the traffic. When a country has to abuse its laws in that way, a change is overdue because such a position is bad.

It was said by Dr. Hislop that no Government would be willing to give up the revenue that would accrue from betting control; but I disagree, because if there was a strong enough public clamour, no Government would dare in face of that to continue living on the income from a vicious system.

I hope the Bill will pass the second reading. There are one or two amendments that might require to be made when the measure is in Committee. A suggestion that has been offered is that the betting shops should be closed after 1 p.m. The turf club has not taken that suggestion lightly. They told me that it would be a good thing to close betting shops in the metropolitan area, within a radius of 25

miles of a racecourse, at 1 p.m. This measure will give us a law to control the s.p. man who bets illegally—

Hon. A. F. Griffith: We have that law today.

Hon. L. CRAIG: There is no law under which we can arrest a man for betting.

Hon. A. F. Griffith: There is a law against common gaming houses.

Hon. L. CRAIG: I am speaking of the man who bets on the footpath. At all events this suggestion could be considered when the Bill is in Committee. Not one member who has spoken has said he is satisfied with the present position, or that he would like it to continue. All have said they would prefer some change; but no one has put up a constructive scheme for the reduction of betting. I support the second reading.

HON. R. F. HUTCHISON (Suburban) [5.25]: When the Bill was introduced, I did not intend to speak on it; but I now feel that we should all give our views, and I assure members that I will be sincere in what I say. I find myself in agreement with much of what Mr. Craig has just said. I am speaking as the keeper of my own conscience. I am not a bettor, and I have raised a family; and so far as I know, none of them bets much, if at all. I have seen the evil that at present exists through illegal betting, and believe that anything the Government has the courage to bring forward in an endeavour to alter the present situation must be a move for the common good.

I have received many letters, all from the religious section of the community—the Methodist and Presbyterian churches. I respect their views as sincere; but, as Mr. Craig said, the churches are not unanimous on this question, because some of them object only to the abuse of betting. I believe any sensible person objects to abuse in any field and it is from the lack of control over betting that the evil of the present system arises. This proposed law can be perfected only by a system of trial and error; but I am sure that when we have established control over betting, good will ultimately come from it. Once any festering sore or hidden abuse is brought into the open, means can be found of remedying it.

During the debate so far, I have heard no speaker who has not deplored the present system, and that is why I am supporting the Bill. I think the present situation is a good argument why women should be on juries, as I believe everyone expected me to disagree with the measure. I have asked all those who have discussed the question with me for some constructive suggestion on the measure; but nothing

of that sort has been forthcoming, because no one had constructive thoughts to offer. All they did was to try to say in advance what would happen if the Bill were passed. None of us can look into the future and foretell what will happen. We know that reform must be taken to the people; it never comes from them, and this Bill is an attempt to remedy a state of affairs that cannot be defended on any ground whatever.

Betting with bookmakers on a racecourse has no more legality than betting with bookmakers off the course. Very few people are aware of that; and, in fact, I did not know it myself. Off-course bookmakers bet in places where there is no traffic or no thoroughfare, and yet they are fined under the Traffic Act for obstructing the traffic. Could anything be more farcical than that? Fancy trying to stop persons from betting by charging them with an offence under another law! The State also issues betting tickets to bookmakers who bet illegally on the racecourse, and it derives revenue therefrom. Every time a betting ticket is issued, the State knows that that is an illegal act; but it still continues to obtain revenue as a result of its being committed. Any Government that did not make an effort to rectify that state of affairs would never have my support. Also, registered bookmakers who are licensed by racing clubs to bet on a racecourse have, for many years, taken substantial bets, off the course, on big Eastern States races and yet no action has been taken against them. That, too, is illegal. I have discussed the point with a bookmaker, and I know that is a fact.

Another point is that the man proceeded against for starting-price bookmaking is only a dummy, and the actual bookmaker who derives his income from illegal betting remains untouched. That also is a fact; because I have been in business for many years, and I know several people who have permitted themselves to act as dummies for bookmakers. Further, the largest operators in the s.p. betting business are the ones who are able to carry on without any hindrance; and that does not appeal to me at all.

In my opinion, this Bill will bring order out of chaos, and will make those persons who are deriving large incomes from illegal s.p. betting on horse-racing contribute something towards the upkeep of racecourses and the sport in general. Not one member in this Chamber has objected to racing as such, and yet the very people who make large profits out of the business pay nothing towards the upkeep of the racecourses.

Royalty owns race-horses but we still look up to our young Queen. We do not say that horse-racing is not a good thing. Yet right down the ranks it is considered

that if a man has 2s. that he wants to invest in a bet, he is a fiend who should be controlled. I have known of hundreds of men who have invested a few shillings every week by betting on a horse. I have lived among them, and I know that to be a fact; and yet I cannot lay a finger on any person who has allowed his home to suffer as a result. We know that there are some people who will do so; but generally they also do other things to excess, because they do not possess the right characteristics.

In any case, the law can prevent a man from ruining his home by excessive betting. His wife can complain to the proper authority and he is brought to order. When I made inquiries about the Bill, I found that a man would not be permitted to pledge his credit in a licensed betting shop. That is one of the reasons why I am anxious to see the Bill pass, so that the present state of affairs may be rectified. I detest the existing set-up.

I lived in a two-storeyed house in the city for many years. It overlooked a lane in the centre of the city, and I used to lock the doors of the rooms upstairs to prevent my children seeing the things that used to go on in the lane whilst a bookmaker was operating there. These bookmakers know when the police are going to pay them a visit. They wait till the police are about to arrive and then cease their operations; and after the police have gone, they continue with their betting transactions. Such a state of affairs is very wrong.

I respect people who object to s.p. betting on moral grounds. I know that our society is made up of people of various ideas and temperaments and it takes people such as those to make a society. However, when we, as legislators, know that in our society the law is being abused—and this has been admitted—we should have the courage at least to support anyone who is making a definite stand in an endeavour to improve the position. I believe that that is what this Government is trying to do.

At this stage I would like to make the point that everyone knows that this is a non-party Bill. Thank God it is the first non-party measure that I have spoken to, knowing that I can vote and argue for or against it as I wish! As a citizen of good character, I hope that when I cast my vote on this Bill, the people will know that I am doing so of my own volition because I am of the opinion that something requires to be done to control s.p. betting today.

I have asked those women who have sent me letters whether they could put forward any constructive argument against the Bill, but I received none. My constructive suggestion is that the Bill should

be given a trial for three years and, at the end of that period, we can take action accordingly. If it does not achieve the results that I think it will, I will be in the vanguard to try to secure amendments to the legislation. I have seen the effect on young policemen who have had to charge people for obstructing the traffic when they were making s.p. betting transactions, because those officers knew what they would like to do. Mr. Simpson suggested a referendum, but I do not know whether a referendum on this question would be good or otherwise. I should like to see a referendum held on the restricted franchise of this Chamber.

The PRESIDENT: I would remind the hon. member that we are dealing with the Betting Control Bill.

Hon. R. F. HUTCHISON: The effect on the morale of our people would not be as great as the effect on their morale of knowing that when they place a bet on a horse they are breaking the law. One member made the point that the law must be the deciding factor in a democracy; and that if a democracy is to survive, the law must be paramount. I firmly believe that also. If we assert ourselves in this matter and get a strong board, we shall be honest with ourselves and say, "There is an evil abroad at the moment in starting-price betting as it exists, and we will do something about it." If I could make use of all the taxes received from betting, I would use them for improving educational facilities. Then we would see a better result than is now obtained. I support the second reading.

On motion by Hon. W. F. Willesee, debate adjourned.

#### **BILL—PHARMACY AND POISONS ACT AMENDMENT.**

Returned from the Assembly with an amendment.

*House adjourned at 5.43 p.m.*