

# Legislative Council.

Wednesday, 21st November, 1945.

	PAGE
Questions: Country water supplies, as to Great Southern scheme	2052
Lake Grace Hospital, as to shortage of staff	2052
Bills: Commonwealth Powers, report	2052
Increase of Rent (War Restrictions) Act Amendment, 2 <sup>a</sup> , Com.	2052
State Electricity Commission, 2 <sup>a</sup> , Com.	2057
South-West State Power Scheme, 2 <sup>a</sup> .	2062
Electricity, Com.	2066
Railways Classification Board Act Amendment, 2 <sup>a</sup> , Com., report	2070
Air Navigation Act Amendment, 2 <sup>a</sup> , Com., report	2072
Trotting Control, 2 <sup>a</sup> .	2073
Supreme Court Act Amendment (No. 2), Assembly's message	2095

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

## QUESTIONS.

### COUNTRY WATER SUPPLIES.

#### *As to Great Southern Scheme.*

Hon. A. L. LOTON asked the Chief Secretary:

1, As the State Government has not to date given any notification of its intention to introduce, during the present session of Parliament, any legislation to provide a water scheme for the Great Southern districts, is it right to assume that no such legislation will be introduced during this session?

2, Have plans for such a scheme been prepared?

3, If so, what is delaying the introduction of the necessary legislation?

4, Is it first necessary to present such plans to the Commonwealth Government with a view to obtaining financial assistance therefrom?

5, If so, what action has been taken?

The CHIEF SECRETARY replied:

1, Legislation may be introduced during the current session, but owing to the lateness of the session may have to be held over until next session which may possibly be held early in 1946.

2, Yes, substantially.

3, The necessity of obtaining a decision from the Commonwealth Government as to the measure of financial assistance it is willing to make available in connection with the scheme.

4, Yes.

5, A comprehensive "case" has been prepared for submission to the Commonwealth Government and will be submitted in the near future. Copies of the "case" will be made available to members of Parliament when the appropriate legislation is introduced.

### LAKE GRACE HOSPITAL.

#### *As to Shortage of Staff.*

Hon. A. THOMSON asked the Chief Secretary: Is the Minister aware that, owing to lack of staff, Lake Grace Hospital is in grave danger of being closed down. If so, will the Government give consideration to paying a very substantial bonus over and above the rates permitted to be paid to nurses and staff so as to encourage staff to go out into the country districts for at least a minimum of three months?

THE CHIEF SECRETARY replied: The Minister is aware that Lake Grace Hospital, in common with a number of others, is seriously embarrassed by lack of staff and he has been in constant touch with the Commonwealth authorities in order to obtain the release from the Services of nurses and others interested in the nursing profession. The Minister also points out that the course suggested by the hon. member would constitute a breach of the law.

### BILL—COMMONWEALTH POWERS.

Report of Committee adopted.

### BILL—INCREASE OF RENT (WAR RESTRICTIONS) ACT AMENDMENT.

#### *Second Reading.*

Debate resumed from the 15th November.

HON. C. F. BAXTER (East) [4.40]: The principal Act was brought into existence during the war period; and, naturally, now that the war is over, we shall find discrepancies in this legislation. With the Bill before us we can do nothing at present except pass it. I feel, however, that I ought to put a case before the Government, so that when the period of the re-enactment of this legislation expires, the Government will see fit to overhaul all, or at least portion, of it. The particular portion to which I shall refer affects only the States of South Australia and Western Australia; it has been excluded from the fair rents legislation in the other States.

We hear both in the city and in the country that licensees of hotels only give consideration to the part of the premises where drink is sold, as there they draw the most revenue from their business. They do not trouble to give proper service to the travelling public, either in the way of accommodation or the provision of meals.

By the regulations made under the Act the owner is unable to do anything about the matter. His position is almost impossible. It is most difficult from the standpoint of the owners, because there is no hope of their being able to resume possession of the premises, or even to oust the tenant and substitute another tenant in his place; that is, of course, unless a tenant is convicted under the licensing laws or the Licensing Court refuses a renewal of the license. It is, however, difficult—in fact, almost impossible—to secure evidence necessary for a conviction. The Licensing Court only reviews licenses annually. Great harm could be done before the owner could be placed in a position to evict a tenant who is not conducting his hotel in the best interests of the public generally. Moreover, even if a conviction is obtained the owner is still unable to obtain possession until an application is made and granted under the wartime legislation. For certain breaches of the licensing law a tenant forfeits the license and then an impossible position is created. Even if the Licensing Court merely refuses to grant a renewal of the license, the same difficulty arises.

It is necessary for the owner to take immediate steps to protect the license; but, as I have said, it is necessary under the wartime legislation for the owner to obtain the leave of the court to re-enter into possession; this results in delay, and a prolonged delay may endanger a license for all time. Licensed premises differ from ordinary premises inasmuch as special provision is made for licensed premises under the Licensing Act. That Act is designed to protect the interests of the public. That is the point I make. The restrictions in the legislation which we are now considering clog or reduce the effectiveness of the Licensing Act. This aspect and the difference between licensed premises and ordinary premises is recognised in the other States, as licensed premises are expressly excluded from the restrictive legislation in those States.

Western Australia and South Australia are the only States where it is desirable, in the interests of the better conduct of hotels, for legislation to be passed to bring those States into line with the other States, in order that there may be stricter supervision over our hotels and that lessees of licensed premises should not be permitted to continue to shelter under the restrictive legislation enacted in wartime. That is why I say it has become necessary from now on not to bring forward Bills such as the present one. I am not criticising the Government for doing so, but we should have a review of this legislation. It is advisable to review the effect of the National Security Regulations and our local regulations relating to landlord and tenant. The two main objects of the regulations and legislation are—

- (a) to secure stability of rental values; and
- (b) to ensure to tenants a measure of freedom from ejectment.

The first National Security Regulations dealing with the matter appeared on the 27th September, 1939, under the name of Fair Rents Regulations. They were superseded by the Landlord and Tenant Regulations. The regulations, so far as they apply to fixation of rent, were declared to apply to the States of New South Wales, Victoria, Queensland and Tasmania, but no declaration was made in relation to the scope of Western Australia or South Australia, as these States had already passed legislation dealing with the subject, i.e., the increase of Rent (War Restrictions) Act, 1939, of this State. When applying the rent provisions of the regulations to the States of New South Wales, Victoria, Queensland and Tasmania, premises licensed for the sale of spirituous or fermented liquors were expressly exempted. The provisions of the regulations relating to restrictions on ejectment were made to apply to each State, including the States of Western Australia and South Australia; and, so far as Western Australia was concerned, these provisions superseded the State legislation on the subject as contained in Section 12 of the Increase of Rent (War Restrictions) Act, 1939.

The provisions of the regulations in relation to restrictions on ejectment did not, however, apply to licensed premises in the States of New South Wales, Victoria, Queensland and Tasmania. That is the

bone of contention; they do not apply there, but do here, and I say that is not for the common good. The provisions, however, regarding restrictions on ejectionment did apply to licensed premises in the States of South Australia and Western Australia. This apparently was not intended, but arose from the particular wording of the regulations. The above indicated the position as it stood on the 2nd July, 1945, when the whole of the Landlord and Tenant Regulations were repealed, and new Landlord and Tenant Regulations (Statutory Rule 1945, No. 97) came into force. The present regulations are divided into four parts, namely, Part I., Preliminary; Part II., Fair Rents; Part III., Recovery of possession of prescribed premises, and Part IV., Miscellaneous. Regulation 7, Parts I., III. and IV. apply in each State and each territory of the Commonwealth, whilst Part II., dealing with fair rents, applies in each State other than the States of South Australia and Western Australia, and in each territory forming part of the Commonwealth. As a result the States of South Australia and Western Australia are still bound by local legislation in regard to fair rents. All the States, including South Australia and Western Australia, are, however, bound by Part III. relating to the recovery of possession of premises. The regulations only relate to prescribed premises which expression is defined by Regulation VIII. to mean—

Any premises other than—

(a) premises which are for the time being used or which are ordinarily used as a grazing area, farm, orchard, market garden, dairy farm, poultry farm, pig farm or bee farm, and

(b) any premises, or the premises included in any class of premises, declared by the Minister by order published in the Gazette to be excluded from the operation of these Regulations.

and includes any part of any premises and any land or appurtenances leased with the premises.

Pursuant to paragraph (b) the Minister has by order published in the Gazette of the 2nd July, 1945, declared—

(i) all premises licensed for the sale of spirituous or fermented liquors, and

(ii) all premises ordinarily leased for holiday purposes only

to be excluded from the operation of the Regulations.

The new regulations and the order of the 2nd July, 1945, have, therefore, in relation

to licensed premises, carried forward the position as it existed before the making of the new regulation, that is, firstly, in all the States and territories of the Commonwealth other than the States of South Australia and Western Australia, licensed premises are free from any restrictions both in relation to rents as well as recovery of possession, and, secondly, in Western Australia licensed premises are still bound by the provisions of the Increase of Rent (War Restrictions) Act, 1939, in relation to the fixation of rents. In addition, so far as Western Australia is concerned, licensed premises now become subject to Section 12 of the Increase of Rent (War Restrictions) Act, 1939, relating to the recovery of possession of premises. The operation of such section has been in abeyance during the continuance of the Landlord and Tenant Regulations, and still remains in abeyance in respect of licensed premises and holiday premises which are not now subject to the recovery of possession provisions of the Landlord and Tenant Regulations. While they are not subject to the regulations they come under the Act.

While the amendment of Section 15 continues the Act to the 31st December, 1946, if it is passed, then that date or whatever date on which the war is declared to be finished, will see the necessity for reviewing it again with the hope that it will cease to protect persons who may—and there are some—have a lease of hotel premises and refuse to be removed. There is at present no hope of removing them, and they are rendering poor service to the public and of course they are injuring the owner of the premises and damaging the reputation of the premises. There is no way of removing such persons unless they are convicted or their license is cancelled by the Licensing Court. It would be most extraordinary to get a conviction. It is impossible to get one because of bad service, and bad service is given in this State. I have had several experiences of it. There is no hope of control while there is in existence protection for these people making it impossible to shift them. I hope that, before the Bill comes up again for review, the Government will see fit to give consideration to this particular portion of it, in addition to others, and effect some amendment to relieve the position and protect the public from bad service. I support the second reading.

**HON. G. FRASER** (West) [4.55]: This is an Act which was introduced in connection with the war, and we have to realise that it has given vast protection to a large majority of the people. We must admit quite freely that many persons have played on this legislation, and they have been unworthy of the protection that it has given. We know also that many hardships are being caused because of this Act. But when one takes into consideration the amount of good that has accrued as a result of it one must realise that the good largely outweighs the bad that has resulted because many unworthy people have had its protection. Taking the long view of the greatest good for the greatest number I intend to support the second reading.

**HON. J. CORNELL** (South) [4.57]: Members who have spoken to this Bill have bemoaned the fact that it cannot be amended. It cannot be amended in its present form, but it could have been brought down in a different form. This Government like all governments, once it gets something of a temporary nature on the statute-book, invariably takes the line of least resistance. The line of least resistance in this case is to ask Parliament to continue the Act as it is. To my knowledge it bristles with abuses. Members will recollect that on the original debate on this Act the benefits that would be conferred because of greedy and rapacious landlords were dealt with, as Mr. Parker has pointed out. Well, the tables are turned and the Act now, in many ways, protects the unscrupulous people and the persons who do not care a hang for the property in which they are domiciled. I said, on the introduction of the measure, that the man who built houses had rights as well as the men to whom he let them. I know of houses today that have been let and, to look at them, one would think that a team of bullocks had run wild in them. The fences have been burnt for firewood, and no consideration has been given to the landlord's property.

Even at this stage I would say that the Bill, though it is to a certain extent mixed up with the National Security Regulations, could be withdrawn and an amending and continuing measure brought down that would give the noble order of the sack to tenants who have no regard for the property in which they are domiciled. On the

question raised by Mr. Baxter regarding licensed premises, members will recollect that I did not proceed three years ago with an amendment that was designed to get over that difficulty in our Act. I was advised that the National Security Regulations had come into force and would override anything we had in our Act. I understand from Mr. Baxter now that they do not apply and it is our Act which applies. The problem of three years of age remains. That is a point which should have been considered in an amending and consolidating measure. Even at this late hour there must be sufficient knowledge at the disposal of the Government to warrant it in giving some protection to those who have most at stake, the owner of the property, not the tenant. The Honorary Minister knows the treatment that has been meted out in many directions where decent premises have been seriously damaged by unscrupulous tenants. The owner of the property should be given more protection and should be able to get rid of an unscrupulous tenant.

**THE HONORARY MINISTER** (Hon. E. H. Gray—West, in reply) [5.3]: I think Mr. Fraser hit the nail on the head when he said that the good this legislation has done far outweighed the anomalies that exist.

Hon. J. Cornell: That is a queer process of reasoning.

The **HONORARY MINISTER**: I am pleased at the reception accorded to the Bill. It is recognised that anomalies exist and that some landlords have been unjustly done by. Mr. Baxter spoke about licensed premises. The Licensing Court is fully able to deal effectively with that problem.

Hon. J. Cornell: Is it?

The **HONORARY MINISTER**: It is its duty to see that the public is properly served. There are always some bad tenants and we always will have them. The only remedy is for the owner to take action and claim damages.

Hon. H. Seddon: What chance would the owner have of recovering anything?

Hon. J. Cornell: Some tenants cannot even pay for their groceries.

The **HONORARY MINISTER**: If a tenant does not pay the rent, he can be got out of the premises under the National

Security Regulations. If a man damages premises he is occupying, the landlord has his remedy. It is recognised that this Act is necessary, even if we admit all these things.

Hon. J. Cornell: The Irish method of dealing with landlords would not apply here.

The HONORARY MINISTER: Numbers of returned men have been unable to regain possession of their homes. Some people have abused the Act. A special officer of the Crown Law Department has been appointed to deal with all these matters. He gives advice free to persons who go to him. In the event of flagrant abuse by either the tenant or landlord, or both, that officer should be consulted. I think there is a way out.

Hon. J. Cornell: I know of a widow who owns two houses in the metropolitan area and cannot get into either.

The HONORARY MINISTER: I think there have been about 11,000 consultations with the officer I have referred to during the year, so that some people have claimed his protection. I have personally advised scores of people to go to him and learn the legal position from him.

Hon. G. W. Miles: This class of thing is responsible to a large extent for the present shortage of houses.

The HONORARY MINISTER: I do not think so. The Bill was brought down because it was deemed necessary to continue the Act.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

#### *In Committee.*

Hon. J. Cornell in the Chair; the Honorary Minister in charge of the Bill.

Clause 1—agreed to.

Clause 2—Amendment of Section 15:

Hon. H. S. W. Parker: I understand that Mr. Mather himself recommends a complete re-drafting of this legislation, not a continuance of the existing measure. The complete re-drafting is necessary because of the extraordinary anomalies and difficulties that have arisen.

The HONORARY MINISTER: I have heard nothing about that. If representations

along those lines had been made by Mr. Mather, I think I should have known something about them.

Hon. H. S. W. Parker: If such a recommendation has been made to the Government, will it seriously consider re-drafting the measure in time for the proposed early session next year?

The HONORARY MINISTER: I have worked in close contact with Mr. Mather because his work affects my department, but he has never mentioned the matter to me.

Hon. H. S. W. Parker: He has to me.

The HONORARY MINISTER: Any representations made by members of this House will always be considered by the Government. I will bring the point before the Minister concerned and it will be discussed.

Hon. C. F. BAXTER: It is necessary that the Act should be thoroughly overhauled. The time has come when the whole question should be investigated. All measures which have been brought down hurriedly because of war conditions should now be reconsidered. I know of many hardships that have occurred under this Act. I move an amendment—

That in lines 3 and 4 the words "thirty-first day of December" be struck out and the words "thirtieth day of September" inserted in lieu.

The HONORARY MINISTER: I oppose the amendment and ask the hon. member to withdraw it. I assure him that representations made by members in this Chamber will be considered by the Government.

Hon. C. F. BAXTER: I have no intention of withdrawing the amendment. It is my desire that investigations should be made. Promises do not carry me very far. Those people who are suffering today should be relieved and the whole position should be reviewed without delay. The matter is vital because it affects so many people.

The CHAIRMAN: I point out that the Act will continue in force, whatever date is put in, for six months after the declaration of peace.

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

Ayes .. .. .	15
Noes .. .. .	6
	—
Majority for .. ..	9
	—

## AYES.

Hon. C. F. Baxter	Hon. A. L. Lolon
Hon. L. B. Bolton	Hon. G. W. Miles
Hon. Sir Hal Colebatch	Hon. H. L. Roche
Hon. C. R. Cornish	Hon. H. Seddon
Hon. L. Craig	Hon. F. R. Welsh
Hon. J. A. Dymally	Hon. G. B. Wood
Hon. E. H. Hall	Hon. H. Tuckey
Hon. V. Hamersley	(Teller.)

## NOES.

Hon. J. M. Drew	Hon. W. H. Kitson
Hon. G. Fraser	Hon. T. Moore
Hon. E. H. Gray	Hon. W. R. Hall
	(Teller.)

## PAIR.

AYE.	No.
Hon. H. S. W. Parker	Hon. E. M. Heenan

Amendment thus passed; the clause, as amended, agreed to.

Clause 3, Title—agreed to.

Bill reported with an amendment.

### BILL—STATE ELECTRICITY COMMISSION.

#### Second Reading.

Debate resumed from the previous day.

**HON. H. SEDDON** (North-East) [5.17]:

This is the last of the three electricity Bills, and I think it may be described as the major one. As the marginal notes indicate, it is largely framed on the Victorian legislation and in fact the powers have obviously been taken from the Victorian Act. There is, however, a very serious difference between the conditions obtaining both behind the genesis of the Victorian scheme and the conditions under which it is operated, and the conditions and genesis of the South-West Power Scheme.

The Victorian scheme owed its beginning to the fact that the Yallourn brown coal deposit had been discovered, and was devised to make use of this newly-found source of wealth. It was a big job and it had to be tackled in a big way because, to get satisfactory economic figures, it was necessary to keep down expenses of operating to the lowest minimum figure and to do this involved an enormous capital expenditure. There was involved a considerable amount of scientific work. The authorities had to find first of all how economically to extract power from this very low-grade fuel, and they had to apply the scientific discovery made and applied in Germany for the manufacture of briquettes. So there were several obvious difficulties, but there were several possibilities associated with it.

On the other hand, a market was waiting there. Victoria had a population of nearly 2,000,000 people available, and the whole of

the manufacturing industries of that State which were not by any means small, were being carried on by the aid of imported fuel and there had been considerable interference with manufacturers on account of disturbances in the fuel industry. These manufacturing industries were all concentrated within a comparatively small area. The greater part of the population of that State is concentrated in Melbourne and its vicinity, and consequently the difficulties of transmission were not by any means large. Thus it will be seen that there were tremendous advantages to induce Victoria to undertake the scheme, large though it was and offering special circumstances as it did. I think we can agree that the success of the Victorian scheme was largely due to the magnificent management and ability of Sir John Monash, who was placed in charge of it.

Our scheme will operate over an area very much larger than even the State of Victoria. In the figures I gave yesterday, I showed that the scheme was intended to deal with a population not exceeding 100,000 as compared with 2,000,000 within range of the Victorian scheme. The market for power is large quantities, which would make power production economical and enable power production to be carried on at a low figure. These are factors that are practically non-existent here and will have to be developed. Meanwhile, as has been plainly indicated by the Minister in charge of the Bill, the State will have to bear the loss.

The Victorian scheme is founded on a basis where the labour factor is comparatively low and not very low. The whole scheme was planned from the beginning on a mechanised basis with the minimum of handling from the face to the fire box and to the retort for briquetting, and there were large bulk consumers waiting for the power. The Minister's figures for the Victorian scheme are very illuminating. Here is a scheme scientifically conceived, managed and developed, run as a commercial proposition and not, as so many have been in the past, with the idea of providing jobs. On the Minister's figures the Victorian scheme has a capital of £20,000,000 and has reserves amounting to another £10,000,000. In other words it has £30,000,000 of capital, and yet, as the Minister indicated, last year's operation showed a surplus of only £125,000.

The Chief Secretary: After providing for all contingencies, reserve funds and so on

Hon. H. SEDDON: After making all the recognised sound financial provisions associated with electrical enterprise.

The Chief Secretary: And others as well.

Hon. H. SEDDON: Not necessarily, because there is undoubtedly a higher scale of financial practice associated with large electrical enterprises than with other enterprises on the Australian continent. The point I wished to make was that the figure of £125,000, although it looks large, represents only .4 per cent. on the capitalisation involved, and this, as I have said, was obtained under a scheme devised on the soundest and best principles. The cost of fuel at Yallourn is low and the labour factor is low. The cost of fuel at Collie is high and the conditions are anything but stable. The labour factor at Collie is high and increasing. The figures I quoted last night showed the cost of fuel at East Perth as compared with the cost of current.

Nationalisation was introduced at Yallourn. It was dictated from the start. Only a Government could have found the necessary capital. Nationalisation at Collie is obviously an objective. At Collie, a power house is certainly in existence, and an extension of it could be provided with comparatively little engineering difficulty. Fuel is available and can be produced by more than one ownership, while other fuel sources are also available and are simply awaiting approval from the Commonwealth Government in order that development work may be started. Yet, with these important advantages over Yallourn, the proposal is that the commission shall have the right to take over and work coal mines of its own, which obviously will result in its obtaining the whole of its fuel from its own mines. Clause 7 of the Bill definitely lays that down. The definition of "undertaking" includes the following:—

"Undertaking" means (a) with respect to the commission an undertaking approved by the Governor for the erection, construction and provision of distribution works, electric works, generating stations, and includes all buildings, works, mines, open-cuts, quarries, etc.

The commission, under this measure, will be given powers of control far more extensive than the South-West power scheme itself justifies. The commission is to be given a very wide area over which to operate. As I pointed out on the

Electricity Bill, its powers will extend from Wyndham to Eucla and from the Indian Ocean to the border.

The cost of fuel is an important factor; in fact the cost of fuel represents one-ninth of the railway costs, and railway costs impose a most serious burden on the exporting industries of this State, a far higher burden than is imposed in overseas countries against the products of which our commodities have to compete. Thermally coal steam electric plants have a low efficiency as compared with gas or Diesel plants, and larger and larger units are constantly being employed in other countries utilising gas and crude oil engines. The ratios thermally even in Western Australia work out somewhat as follows:—For gas .6d. per unit, for Diesel engines .75d. per unit; even at the high cost of Diesel fuel, and the figure at the East Perth power house is .89d. per cent.

The commission has power compulsorily to acquire the plants of local authorities. This power, I consider, should be exercised discriminatingly. If plants are working efficiently, why should they be absorbed by the commission? Clause 27 (a) (i) provides power for the commission to explore for coal, etc. Clause 29 (2) (b) will empower the commission to supply, sell and dispose of electricity, coal and oil, and Clause 30 will enable the commission to purchase private undertakings, coal mines, etc. Government monopolies, like other monopolies, tend to become restrictive. Monopolies are notoriously restrictive, and Government ones are not the least restrictive.

I wish to refer to the provisions governing the financing of the scheme. On the estimates, the Government expects to lose £30,000 per annum over a period of about five years. That is an estimate, and it was based on the figures at the time of the report, and as costs are rising, that figure can no longer be of any use. The price of fuel is rising and consequently costs must rise, and the losses must increase. I have shown what a narrow margin of profit is obtained by the Victorian scheme, and I should like to be assured that even so small a margin will apply to our scheme. On the question of finance, I should like the Minister to look at Clause 43 (2) (ii), because it is rather perplexing to me. Clause 43 sets out that the funds necessary

for the effectual exercise by the commission of the powers conferred by the Act shall be such moneys as are from time to time appropriated by Parliament for that purpose; the income derived by the commission from the business carried on by it under the authority of the Act; and such moneys as the commission may borrow under and subject to the provisions of the Act. Then paragraph (ii) of Subclause (2) reads —

Moneys received by the commission either by appropriation by Parliament or by advances by the Treasurer when such moneys are drawn from the Consolidated Revenue Fund shall, for the purposes of this section be deemed in the hands of the commission to be revenue or profit or income moneys.

I do not know how one can regard money borrowed as income money and I do not know how one can regard such money as profit. It appears to me that that clause requires clarifying. Clause 49 appears to be a very important one, to which the House should pay particular attention. It provides that if a profit is obtained from the operations of the commission, that money shall go into the Consolidated Revenue Fund. Is it sound finance to treat such profits in that way? Here is an institution which would involve a very large capital expenditure. If there is to be any surplus, should not that surplus be used as an additional sinking fund to reduce the capitalisation of the scheme rather than be taken into Consolidated Revenue, with the temptation—a temptation which Governments in the past have succumbed to—of making it an indirect taxation machine?

We have the example of the Fremantle Harbour Trust to indicate the developments that might take place in that direction. As an example of what could be done by following the other method, I would refer to the record of the Glasgow trams. They were established by the Glasgow municipality and were so successful that not only were passengers given very cheap transport, but also the whole of the capitalisation was repaid, after operating expenses had been met, and the Glasgow trams stand on the books of the municipality at the figure of £1. In other words, there are no capital charges associated with that activity. In my opinion, that is a policy that might well be followed by the Government in the institutions under its control that are paying returns.

The Chief Secretary: What about those that are not paying returns?

Hon. H. SEDDON: In those cases the Government is in trouble.

The Chief Secretary: The taxpayer must meet those losses.

Hon. H. SEDDON: Perhaps the position would be watched more carefully if profits were not set against losses. I support the Bill, but I suggest that amendment should be made to it. I oppose the proposal to nationalise the coal industry, which appears to me to be one of the objectives of the Bill. I trust that the House will assist in taking out of the Bill any clauses that might be used towards the furtherance of that objective. We have not yet received a mandate for nationalisation in this State, and I do not think we should start with the nationalisation of the coal industry. I intend to oppose the State-wide scope of the commission. It is far too wide. If the commission is restricted in its activities to the South-West land division, it will have plenty to keep it occupied for a long time, and the rest of the State will be allowed to develop under the conditions applying there at present. I also oppose the idea that local authorities should be compelled to sell as appears to be provided in the measure.

HON. L. B. BOLTON (Metropolitan [5.35]: It is my intention to support the second reading. I do not pose as an expert on electricity, but I think the Government is to be commended in one way for the steps it has taken. I only hope the State will derive the benefit we anticipate it will from the various electricity measures before the House at present. I am a little concerned about two things. One is whether we are not placing ourselves in the hands of a little section of the community; and whether, if we are going to have continual stoppages in industry, as we have had in the past, we will derive the benefit we expect. If we read today's paper, we must come to the conclusion that the outlook is not very bright in that direction. If I could be sure that from an industrial point of view we were not going to be continually subjected to these unfortunate occurrences, I should be more happy in supporting the various measures. I agree with Mr. Seddon that the composition of the commission



worthy of a little consideration in Committee. I suggest that a commission of seven members would be rather unwieldy.

Hon. G. W. Miles: Hear, hear!

Hon. L. B. BOLTON: I do not know that I am altogether in favour of consumers' representatives. As a matter of fact, I feel that the three experts provided for in paragraph (d) of Subclause (3) of Clause 8 should be given complete control. A commission of seven members would provide an opportunity for the three experts to be out-voted or over-ruled, and that would be entirely wrong. I would prefer to see the three experts proposed and a representative of the State in the person of the Under-Treasurer, as suggested.

Hon. G. W. Miles: That is all you want.

Hon. L. B. BOLTON: Yes, I should say that is all that is required. I am perturbed that it is provided—as usual, unfortunately—that the Minister shall appoint the commissioners. Clause 8 provides that two persons nominated by the Minister as representatives of the consumers, one for the metropolitan area and one for the remaining part of the State, shall be appointed. I think we could very well do without those two persons; but if it is decided it is necessary for them to be appointed, why should the Minister or the Government appoint them?

The Chief Secretary: Why should the Government not appoint them?

Hon. L. B. BOLTON: Why should not the municipality or the people concerned appoint them? What is the use of having the whole of the commission appointed by the Government? There is one objection I have to the present Government: It does not matter what committee or commission is appointed, the Minister, or in other words, the Government—does the appointing. The other fellow never seems to have an opportunity to be represented. Here is a suggestion that there should be two representatives of the consumers. It is also proposed that there should be a representative of the workers and he also is to be nominated by the Minister.

Why should not the workers have the right to nominate their representative? Why should the Government do the nominating every time? Is it not only natural that the Government would appoint those who would necessarily carry out its policy? It would be

much better in every instance if the people concerned—in the case of the workers' representative, the union—appointed their own representatives. If the consumers are to be represented, then the local governing authorities of the metropolitan area could appoint one, and the local governing authorities outside the metropolitan area could appoint the other.

The Chief Secretary: Why the local authorities? There are plenty of other people besides them.

Hon. L. B. BOLTON: I am not tied to local authorities, so long as the Government does not want to do it. Why should the Government have all the representation on a body like this? The consumers are the ones most concerned; and surely if they are going to be represented they should have some say as to who shall represent them. The other feature of the Bill that does not appeal to me—and I can see the Chief Secretary smiling before I start, is that there is a provision for an extension of State trading. Clause 29 gives this body the right to sell, dispose of and trade in all classes and types of equipment, gear, fittings and machinery associated with the electrical or any other power industry.

The Chief Secretary: What is wrong with that?

Hon. L. B. BOLTON: A lot! We have a number of firms of standing which have built up, over a number of years, efficient organisations for the marketing of all classes of electrical equipment which have enabled them to maintain, even through the difficult war years, reasonable service both to traders and the consuming public. But the Government is going to enter into competition with those people, and that is entirely wrong.

The Chief Secretary: Don't you believe it!

Hon. L. B. BOLTON: I think it is entirely wrong. Whenever the Government gets an opportunity, it hops in and endeavours to extend State trading; and whenever I get an opportunity, I endeavour to stop it; and I am going to suggest that when we are in Committee we should eliminate paragraphs (c) and (d) and Subclause (2) of Clause 29. Otherwise I support the Bill and I hope that the out-

come of these measures will be of benefit to the State and that industry will not be worried by such stoppages as have occurred in the past and which appear to be likely to occur again.

**THE CHIEF SECRETARY** (Hon. W. H. Kitson—West—in reply) [5.43]: I do not propose to speak at any length in reply, because I realise members are agreed that it is desirable we have as early as possible a scheme on the lines proposed in these three electricity Bills. But I do wonder whether one or two members who say they are supporting the Bill and yet are going to emasculate it, mean what they say when they put forward the statement that they agree something of this sort is necessary. Mr. Seddon says, "I am going to support the Bill, but I am going to limit it to the South-West. I am not going to allow the commission, if I can help it, to operate in any other place." Yet he knows the whole scheme provides for a much larger coverage than the South-West, and that eventually other places shall be linked up with the scheme. We can argue that point in Committee. Though he says he is not going to agree to the nationalisation of coal-mines, and that this Bill provides for that, it does nothing of the kind, and I feel sure, seeing the smile on the hon. member's face, that he realises that it does not do so.

Hon. H. Seddon: Yes, it does.

**The CHIEF SECRETARY**: Mr. Bolton says we should not allow the commission to indulge in State trading, but does he object to the Perth Electricity and Gas Department doing the same thing? Objection was taken some years ago to the Victorian State Electricity Commission trading, and the Government of the day listened to the representations made and the commission was prevented from trading any further, but it was not long before the traders themselves were glad for that commission to resume its trading, and that would be the position here. We can deal with that in Committee also. I venture to assert that Mr. Bolton will probably agree to that clause of the Bill.

Hon. L. B. Bolton: I am not so sure that I will.

**The CHIEF SECRETARY**: I think Mr. Bolton will, being the businessman that he is, when he hears the arguments in favour

of it. Mr. Bolton does not agree that we should have seven commissioners. He thinks that number too unwieldy, and he does not see why the consumers should be represented.

Hon. G. W. Miles: Why is it necessary to have seven commissioners here, when there are only four in Victoria?

**The CHIEF SECRETARY**: Because the Government believes it is desirable that the consumers should be represented on the commission. That is part of the Government's policy, and there again it is no correct to say that the consumers would have majority representation on that commission.

Hon. L. B. Bolton: There are four lay men who could outvote the three experts and I do not think that is right.

**The CHIEF SECRETARY**: We will deal with that later. There are three professional men and the Under-Treasurer, four out of seven. I did not hear the hon. member say he would not agree to the workers being represented on this commission.

Hon. L. B. Bolton: I did not say that.

**The CHIEF SECRETARY**: We are providing for that also in this Bill, and so it goes on. We find members saying that some thing should be put into operation but not in the way submitted, and by the time they have finished making their suggestions, they have left nothing to be put into operation. At all events, I am again taking a risk with the Chamber, and I feel sure members will agree to the second reading. Though some members have indicated their intention to move amendments that would have the effect of restricting materially the operations of the commission, I hope this Chamber will not be persuaded by those members to be quite so drastic as they have outlined in their remarks.

I feel that this is the commencement of a new era for this State. We have the example of Victoria, which has been so fully quoted by Mr. Seddon. We have greater difficulties to overcome than had Victoria—as is recognised—but surely that is no reason why we should say we cannot do anything. I think it is an additional reason why we should be prepared, in legislation of this kind, to make sure that the commission is the best available, both from the technical and other points of view. If we do that, and are satisfied with the basis

of the scheme that is laid down—I think I made it clear in my remarks that all we can do at present is to lay down a basis on which the scheme is to be built, though that may have to be altered in years to come as developments occur—I do not think we can expect to do more at the present juncture. I believe that in taking this step the Government has done something that will prove, in the near future, to be of extreme value to the South-West portion of this State, and eventually, to the whole of this State.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

*In Committee.*

Hon. J. Cornell in the Chair; the Chief Secretary in charge of the Bill.

Clauses 1 and 2—agreed to.

Progress reported.

**BILL—SOUTH-WEST STATE POWER SCHEME.**

*Second Reading.*

Debate resumed from the previous day.

**HON. A. L. LOTON** (South-East) [5.57]: I am going to support the second reading of the South-West State Power Scheme Bill, because I can appreciate the benefits of electricity. I do not know why the Bill has been called the South-West State Power Scheme Bill, which seems to be a misnomer, in the opinion of people throughout the State, and people in the Great Southern areas in particular. They all say—as I think the Minister will agree—“Why the South-West?” I have recently had letters from the lower part of the Great Southern asking why Albany was not included in the power scheme, and when it was pointed out that Albany was embraced under the measure—

The Chief Secretary: Jealousy?

Hon. A. L. LOTON: Yes, it was. They did not want to be left out in the cold. I understand that power is to be generated at Collie, but the people of Albany did not understand that the scheme was to embrace the Great Southern area as well as the South-West.

Hon. G. W. Miles: The Minister who introduced the Bill in another place inti-

mated that the name was more or less a misnomer.

Hon. A. L. LOTON: That is so.

The Chief Secretary: What's in a name?

Hon. A. L. LOTON: When this scheme comes into even partial operation it will do much to open up and bring population to that part of the State. No other part of Australia has the same possibilities for development as has the South-Western portion of this State, including the Great Southern districts. When this scheme comes into operation it will be the third largest monument to progress in this State. I always consider the Kalgoorlie water scheme to be No. 1, the Southern Districts water scheme to be No. 2, and the electricity system, to be established throughout the southern portion of this State, to be No. 3. That is why I class this scheme as No. 3. The cost of installing the power in the more closely settled areas will be reasonably cheap, but in the more sparsely settled areas, where in some cases homes are three or four miles apart, the cost of installation will be heavy. The cost of erecting the transmission mains is in the vicinity of £200 per mile, and I am wondering how the individual is to finance the erection of the power line from the breaking down point to his property. Unfortunately, it will not be possible to tap the mains at any place. In some cases the main will run three or four miles past a property to a distributing centre, and a line will then have to be run back to that property, and the cost will constitute a tremendous burden.

The Chief Secretary: Have you any idea how that can be avoided?

Hon. A. L. LOTON: No, but I notice that in paragraph 39 of the Commissioner's report it says—

The committee feels that electricity must be supplied to the South-West at prices which will not place our dairy farmers, orchardists, agriculturists or industrialists at a disadvantage when compared with persons conducting the same pursuits in similar areas in the Eastern States.

I think the committee is wondering how that can be overcome. We all realise there are difficulties, and I think we are prepared to face them. If it is possible in any way—perhaps through seeking further advice—to do something towards lessening the cost or allowing the mains to be tapped at more fre-

quent intervals, that should be done. I think that is the only hope. If the power is supplied cheaply it will make a tremendous difference, eventually, to the whole of Western Australia. I am not worried about strikes at Collie, but I would like to see some alternative system of fueling for the generation of the power. It is all very well to talk about coal, but we have seen the trouble that has arisen in the past through lack of coal, and I would suggest that we try to introduce some alternative method of firing the boilers. I support the second reading.

**HON. H. TUCKEY** (South-West) [5.59]: I wish first to congratulate the Government on its decisions to provide the South-West with an efficient electricity supply. There has been considerable delay in this matter and no doubt that delay will mean a considerable increase in cost all round. It would not be reasonable to suggest that the electrification of the South-West is an easy matter. On the contrary, there are many difficulties in the way. It must be realised that an efficient electricity supply is absolutely essential for the economic progress and development of that part of the State. I feel sure that many people do not realise the full possibilities of that area. There can be no doubt about the results of the scheme if it is established on sound lines and is given a fair opportunity, free from strikes and other interference. The commission must be in a position to control, and every support possible should be extended to it in that respect. Perhaps the greatest problem we have to deal with is the question of fuel supplies.

In the past there has been considerable uncertainty with regard to coal supplies and there does not seem to be any prospect of an improvement in the immediate future. We have to ask ourselves whether people will be prepared to scrap their existing concerns if there is no certainty of their procuring continuous supplies of current. Many will be taken over by the electricity commission because if it is to reduce charges from time to time it will need to have every possible consumer in the scheme. The tentative prices to be charged are said to compare with those prevailing in the Eastern States, but that does not seem to me to be quite correct. It would not be expected that the scheme at the inception could compare with the position in the Eastern States. In

the country areas of Victoria the charges have been reduced in respect of 64 undertakings absorbed by the State Electricity Commission from an average of 8.02d. prior to acquisition to 1.86d., or less than 2d. per unit. That is a very great reduction and we are told that for the first 20 units the South-West power scheme will charge 5d., which is about 50 per cent. less than people are paying today, and if they can secure their current at that rate the people concerned will be very happy about it.

On the other hand it will take some time before our State scheme can compare, from the standpoint of rates charged, with the Victorian concern. Take the position at Werribee, which is 40 miles out of Melbourne. The Victorian Electricity Commission took the local scheme over and reduced the charges from 10.10d. per unit to slightly over 2d. per unit.

Hon. F. E. Gibson: That was for power.

Hon. H. TUCKEY: No, for lighting. In another instance the charges in a country town were reduced from 17d. to 5d. per unit. We cannot expect comparable prices in Western Australia because we can hardly contrast the South-West with many districts in Victoria. I was somewhat surprised to find that the suggestion is that many outlying districts will be connected up more or less at the one time. I thought that the scheme would supply Bunbury, Collie and other surrounding places more or less adjacent, and from time to time would be extended to other country centres rather than that it should be extended to Manjimup, Pemberton and similar places at the start. The scheme is to be launched with an anticipated loss of £30,000 a year to begin with. I approve of the scheme along those lines and I think considerable publicity should be launched in connection with the establishment of it. I suggest that there should be an "electricity on the farm" exhibition, which could be arranged in conjunction with the Royal Show. It could be conducted with the co-operation of the farm implement manufacturers and the machinery agents to demonstrate the practical and economic application of electricity to farm work. In Victoria men are employed to travel through the country districts to procure business. They provide expert advice and lend assistance to consumers and so procure a lot of business that otherwise would not be forthcoming.

In Melbourne a large show-room has been established where people can see for themselves what can be done with electricity. With the business methods adopted in that State, the scheme has gone ahead by leaps and bounds and has proved very successful indeed. Some comment has been indulged in regarding the proposal to establish a power station at South Fremantle. I do not desire to criticise the Government or its experts but it would be interesting to know why it was deemed necessary to establish a major power station within 12 miles of the East Perth plant. It has always occurred to me that the business way of extending electricity supplies in Western Australia would be to erect a power station in the South-West near the source of supply of fuel. With regard to the South Fremantle project we have been informed that it is cheaper to rail coal to the site than to erect a transmission line from the South-West to the metropolitan area. I do not suggest that that statement is incorrect, but I am just wondering why in Victoria the authorities constructed a high tension line from Yallourn to Melbourne at very great cost if it was really cheaper to rail the coal instead.

The Honorary Minister: There is the difference in the quality of the coal.

Hon. H. TUCKEY: That may be so, but the fact remains that the Victorian Commission transports current from Yallourn to Melbourne and breaks it down as required, and that system has proved a great success.

Hon. G. W. Miles: And here they will eventually do it from Collie.

Hon. F. E. Gibson: They are taking the current over into New South Wales from Yallourn.

Hon. H. TUCKEY: I know that. If we were advised regarding the reason for this suggestion there would be less criticism. No one desires to criticise the Government without warrant, but I think it would be an advantage if the people were satisfied on this point. The Yallourn-Melbourne high transmission line has been a huge success and has been instrumental in making the Victorian scheme what it is. In addition to that particular line the Victorian Commission has erected a rural line running through the same area. The main line is on the basis of 132,000 volts and there is the 22,000-volt

rural supply line covering practically the same route. I understand that that line is already overtaxed to such an extent that as soon as material is available its capacity will be increased to 66,000 volts. In the South-West we can look forward to great developments in the future and therefore we should take the long view and make provision so that there will be no need for expensive replacements. It is sound business to do a job thoroughly so that when development takes place, the provision will be there to meet requirements and there will be no need to pull down in order to re-erect at additional high cost.

With regard to the administrative side of the scheme it is far too early to think about laying down details, because the commission will be fully occupied for some time to come before the business side can be arranged. Another Bill is to be presented to the House for the purpose of empowering the commission compulsorily to take over local government and other undertakings. Some objection has been raised in that regard, but it will certainly be necessary for the commission to absorb such undertakings in order to make its business pay. If it is necessary to spend tens of thousands of pounds to generate merely a small quantity of current it will prove much dearer than if there were a large output. I assume that in dealing with the outlying centres of the South-West a similar policy will be adopted to that pursued in Victoria, where as soon as a guarantee was received that the consumers would take so many units per month the scheme was extended to meet their requirements and the local authority took no further responsibility. In Victoria the people gave no guarantee. When the commission decided to take over a concession or an undertaking it assumed all the responsibility and the local authority provided no guarantee whatever. When it came to dealing with a small centre, guarantees were required from the consumers that they would buy so many units per month and the commission then put in the necessary line to supply the current.

I look upon the scheme for the South-West as one possessing great possibilities. No country can prosper without the benefit of an effective supply of electricity. That and adequate water supplies are the

two major requirements for that part of the State. I know of one small town in the South-West that went ahead rapidly as soon as an electricity scheme was installed there. The same will apply on a bigger scale when the scheme is put in to deal with the South-West as a whole. At the same time I do not know why that scheme could not have extended a little further north than Waroona, so that Pinjarra and Mandurah would have been included. Those two centres will have to wait many years before the scheme is extended to meet requirements there. There is no hope of that extension for some years to come. At present current is sold at Safety Bay, which is more than half way to Mandurah, at a cost of 6d. per unit for lighting.

The Honorary Minister: That current is supplied from Fremantle.

Hon. H. TUCKEY: I do not see why the scheme could not have been extended to deal with those centres. I understand the Fremantle scheme supplies the Safety Bay area, but it would be of advantage if the people at Mandurah could get their electricity at a rate cheaper than 10d. per unit. They have to pay 8d. a unit for power, which is out of the question. It is impossible to saw wood and use power for other purposes at that price. Both Pinjarra and Mandurah are going ahead. There is an acute water supply problem at Pinjarrah, but a rather better supply is enjoyed at Mandurah. At the latter place the number of houses erected has increased in 10 years from 200 to 650, so that there is a fair demand for electricity there. Then again at Pinjarra we have a fairly large hospital and the Government has promised to erect a larger one in the course of a year or two. There again the district will be greatly disadvantaged because of the poor supply of electricity that is available.

*Sitting suspended from 6.15 to 7.30 p.m.*

Hon. H. TUCKEY: Before tea, I was pointing out that it would be necessary for the commission to take over certain local undertakings. I think we must agree that this is necessary in order to carry out the scheme. It has been proposed to pay certain profits into Consolidated Revenue. I agree with previous speakers that that does not seem to be quite the right thing

to do. This commission, which will be comprised of seven members, should be given the opportunity to manage the scheme on thoroughly sound business lines; and I think it should be entrusted with the profits of the scheme for use in order to carry on the activities of the commission. If the time arrives when there is a considerable profit—as I have no doubt it will arrive—then the consumers ought to be considered, instead of the profits being paid into Consolidated Revenue. There is no reason why some of the charges should not be reduced because, after all, I understand that is the objective of the whole proposal. We are quite prepared to pay 5d. per unit at the start; but when it is possible to reduce the charge to 2d. or less, the consumers should be entitled to the reduction.

I am afraid many people will have the idea that once this measure passes and the commission is appointed, they will be able to avail themselves of all kinds of electrical conveniences. I am of opinion, however, that it will be some time before many people will derive any real benefit from the scheme, because lines may be run from Collie to Bridgetown and other places, and there will be no means of tapping them. There must be separate distributing centres in various places, and that is quite a big job. Owing to the scattered nature of the population in my district, it will be difficult to bring about all these desirable things within a short space of time. I hope that very soon a start will be made with the scheme, but people must realise that it will take some time. It will also be costly to run lines through the South-West, and the commission will be called upon to meet many difficulties.

It was for that reason mainly that I was somewhat dubious about the South Fremantle power station proposal. It seemed to me that it would be a means of over-capitalising the whole electricity system of Western Australia. If a farmer required sufficient water to supply one horse, he would not erect two windmills where one would suffice; and it seemed to me that, with the small population and the small quantity of electricity that would be required for some time to come, the current could have been generated by building the second major power station in the South-West district instead of at South Fremantle. However, I do not want to labour that point; it is only my opinion

and I hope that I may be wrong. I feel sure that the Government and the commission will receive every possible assistance from the local governing authorities, who play a most important part in the development of the State. I also will be pleased to do what I can in that direction.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

## **BILL—ELECTRICITY.**

### *In Committee.*

Hon. V. Hamersley in the Chair; the Chief Secretary in charge of the Bill.

Clauses 1 and 2—agreed to.

Clause 3—Act repealed:

Hon. H. SEDDON: I move an amendment—

That in line 1 of Subclause (1) before the word "is" the words "in-so-far as it applies to the South-West Land Division of the State" be inserted.

The amendment is designed to restrict the Bill to the South-West land division. That division starts considerably north of Geraldton and runs eastward to the rabbit-proof fence and then passes down in a south-easterly direction through the Goldfields. The district includes certainly far more than it was intended should be under the control of the scheme.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: I hope the Committee will not agree to the amendment. It would be a retrograde step if we should limit the application of this measure to the South-West land division. There must be some reason behind the desire so to limit it which we have not yet heard. Is it the desire that the Goldfields shall be excluded from the scope of the Bill, or is there some other reason? This measure certainly should apply to the whole State.

Hon. H. SEDDON: We have on the Goldfields electricity plants that are working quite satisfactorily and are supplying current at a reasonable figure to the mines and to the municipalities. Some of the plants are working on oil and some on wood fuel. While the proposal contained in the measure may be satisfactory to the South-West division, in my opinion useless expenditure, in the way of alterations to existing Goldfields plants, would result. That is the main reason for my amendment. There has been interference on the Goldfields by preventing one station from obtaining additional plant. We on the Gold-

fields are quite prepared to run our own electrical affairs. We do not mind being advised; we have had that experience in the past. I do not think the mandatory powers which this Bill will confer should be allowed to operate on the Goldfields.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: In other words, Mr. Seddon is quite prepared to say that the Bill ought to apply to the South-West division, but that the Goldfields electric supply should be exempt. I am afraid I cannot subscribe to that argument. I can see some embarrassment to the commission if its operations are limited to the South-West land division. I suggest that the provisions of the Bill should be State-wide. I cannot see why there should be any exception.

Hon. L. Craig: This is cutting out the North and the North-West.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: That is so. I hope the Committee will not agree to the proposal.

Hon. J. CORNELL: I want to know what benefit will be conferred on the Goldfields by their inclusion in the scheme at the present juncture. As I know the North-East and the South Provinces, private enterprise holds no place in the generating of electricity. The local governing bodies do their own. Is it the intention of the commission to supply power to these local governments, and if so, when?

Hon. L. Craig: They do not come into it.

Hon. J. CORNELL: What are they going to do?

Hon. F. E. Gibson: It is for uniformity of equipment.

Hon. J. CORNELL: Kalgoorlie has an up-to-date plant and Boulder has a more recent one, and they are giving excellent service. I want to know what benefit can be achieved by stickney-beaking into live concerns.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: I do not know about the benefit, but I do not see why the Goldfields should be excluded from the provisions of this Bill, with which all other electricity concerns must comply. If the generating stations on the Goldfields are satisfactory they have nothing to fear. If the Bill does not apply to the whole State the electricity commission will find that its operations will be nullified to some extent.

Hon. H. Tuckey: Has the report been based on the whole State?

The CHIEF SECRETARY: No. It goes well up on the Goldfields line.

Hon. H. Seddon: How far on the Goldfields line?

The CHIEF SECRETARY: To east of Northam.

Hon. J. Cornell: That is over 300 miles from Kalgoorlie.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: It is quite immaterial. If we are going to lay down in an Act of Parliament the conditions to be complied with by power stations in this State they should apply to the whole State, and someone should have control.

Hon. J. Cornell: Is it going to apply to the Lake View and Star goldmine?

The CHIEF SECRETARY: It will only apply to this extent that if any scheme applied to a particular district it would have to be approved by the commission.

Hon. H. Seddon: And the local people would have no say in it.

Hon. L. Craig: The Lake View and Star is exempted because the Bill exempts people supplying power for themselves.

Hon. H. Seddon: But not local authorities.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: We must deal with districts.

Hon. H. Seddon: That is what I am advocating.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: I will not agree to limiting the area to which this shall apply.

Hon. H. SEDDON: The proposal is really laid down for the purpose of developing a unified scheme for the South-West portion of the State. The limits of the South-West Land Division comprise a larger area than the State of Victoria, yet this commission wants to have power to interfere with satisfactory local schemes operating outside that area, and that interference will involve the local schemes in a considerable amount of useless expenditure. I see no reason for these extended powers. We can give this scheme a try-out within the limits of the South-West Land Division, and it can be developed without extending its powers over the rest of the State which is governed by entirely different economic conditions.

Hon. L. CRAIG: Mr. Seddon has expressed fears in regard to one particular area, namely, the Goldfields. He should confine the area to within narrower limits.

The Bill specifically sets out that after the commencement of the Act no person shall construct or establish any generating station, etc. That is in order to achieve standardisation. Any new work shall be subject to the control of the commission in the same way as new houses are subject to the control of the Town Planning Commission. The Bill goes on to provide that nothing in the particular section shall be deemed to prevent any person from generating electricity solely for his own private use, not for sale, etc. It lays down that local authorities shall be allowed to continue in the past to generate and sell electricity.

Hon. H. Seddon: Subject to the commission.

Hon. L. CRAIG: Yes, in the same way as the Town Planning Commissioner operates. So far as I know he has not upset a local authority by the powers given him. Mr. Seddon has raised no real reasons why a line should be drawn in one particular place. If he could show any valid reason why there should be a line drawn through one particular place I would support him. So far he has not indicated any real reasons except the fear of what might happen in the future.

Hon. H. SEDDON: I have already pointed out that there has been interference. The Kalgoorlie municipal electricity plant is run on oil. It was about to reach the limit of its capacity and wanted additional units. Acting under the direction of the commission it has put in arc rectifiers in order to take current from the local power station. That objective could have been achieved by putting in an additional unit. We are suspicious as to the extent to which interference may occur. The whole of the State will bear the loss on this scheme and that is our contribution towards it. Even in addition we are to be subordinated to this scheme. Let the commission make success of it here and then come to us and be given powers over the rest of Western Australia.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: I am satisfied that this is purely a parochial reason. There is nothing in the Bill dealing with any scheme at all. This is to be an Act to provide certain conditions under which generating stations and distributing authorities shall operate. It lays down certain



conditions whereby the commission that is appointed under another Bill may, if necessary, co-ordinate the electricity supplies of a particular district. Then we have the South-West Power Scheme and the commission is given certain powers in connection with that scheme. There is nothing in this Bill, or any other, that would embrace the Goldfields in regard to a particular scheme that might be in the mind of the commission at the moment. It might be desirable 50 years hence. The 1937 Act, which this Bill seeks to consolidate, applies to the whole State. Why take the Goldfields out of it now simply because in another Bill we are providing for the establishment of a commission for a specific purpose?

Hon. H. SEDDON: This is much more than parochial. It will be seen that Clause 4 gives very wide powers. I am quite content for the commission to come to the Goldfields in 50 years time, but not now.

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

Ayes	.....	8
Noes	.....	12

Majority against	.....	4
------------------	-------	---

## AYES.

Hon. C. F. Baxter	Hon. G. W. Miles
Hon. L. B. Bolton	Hon. H. Seddon
Hon. Sir Hal Colebatch	Hon. F. R. Welsh
Hon. J. Cornell	Hon. E. H. Hall

(Teller.)

## NOES.

Hon. C. R. Cornish	Hon. W. H. Kitson
Hon. L. Craig	Hon. A. L. Loton
Hon. J. M. Drew	Hon. H. S. W. Parker
Hon. G. Fraser	Hon. H. L. Roche
Hon. F. E. Gibson	Hon. G. B. Wood
Hon. E. H. Gray	Hon. H. Tuckey

(Teller.)

## PAIR.

Aye.	No.
Hon. J. A. Dimmitt	Hon. W. R. Hall

Amendment thus negatived.

Clause put and passed.

Clause 4—This Act to be read in conjunction with and subject to State Electricity Commission Act, 1945:

Hon. H. SEDDON: This clause subordinates the Bill to the State Electricity Commission Bill and provides that where this measure is repugnant to the other, the commission measure shall prevail. Clause 7 provides that a local authority may maintain a generating station, but the commission Bill provides that the commission may acquire such stations. The commission Bill can over-ride the safeguards contained in

Clauses 7 and 9 of this Bill. Clause 9 would empower local authorities to establish and maintain generating stations and grant concessions for a similar purpose, but that clause may be over-ridden by the commission Bill. I move an amendment:—

That in line 4 after the word "Act" the words "excepting Sections 7 and 9" be inserted.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: We propose to give the commission very wide powers, one of which is to co-ordinate electricity services throughout the State where considered necessary. I cannot see why the commission should not have the same power outside the South-West land division.

Hon. H. Seddon: Power to over-ride the provisions of this measure?

The CHIEF SECRETARY: Certain things might happen outside that area that would interfere with the co-ordinating scheme of the commission. Therefore it is necessary that the commission should have this authority. Because we grant the authority, it does not follow that the commission would interfere with any particular scheme or district, but it should have this power in the interests of co-ordinating the electricity services of the State.

Hon. H. SEDDON: The Chief Secretary apparently has missed the point. Clause 4 proposes to give the commission power to over-ride any provision of this measure. The provisions to which I am referring contain the exceptions I have mentioned.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: We cannot have dual control, and uniform control can be obtained only by vesting power in one body, and the body decided upon is the commission. Under another measure, we propose to give the commission certain powers. This measure will be State-wide in its application and there is no reason why we should interfere with its provisions.

Hon. H. Seddon: My amendment would ensure that Clauses 7 and 9 of this Bill were not interfered with.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: The hon. member wishes to limit the activities of the commission so that it shall not interfere with any local authority.

Hon. H. Seddon: I want to prevent the commission from over-riding the provisions of this Bill.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: That point might well be discussed on the commission Bill, because these conditions must necessarily apply to the whole of the State.

Hon. J. CORNELL: Do not you think the commission Bill should be considered before this one?

The CHIEF SECRETARY: I do not think it matters.

Hon. J. CORNELL: Suppose the commission Bill is amended.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: This Bill is designed to co-ordinate an Act that has been in operation since 1937, and I cannot see why we should want to interfere with the commission Bill by amending this Bill. The commission Bill is the one upon which the hon. member should argue the point.

Hon. H. SEDDON: Clause 4 provides that where this measure is repugnant to the commission Bill, the commission Bill shall prevail. That would be all right provided there was no interference with the powers preserved in this Bill. The Act of 1937 provided for an advisory committee, but the commission to be appointed will be able to enforce its powers and I want to ensure that the safeguards included in this Bill are not interfered with by the commission.

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

Ayes	..	..	..	8
Noes	..	..	..	11

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

#### AYES.

Hon. C. F. Baxter	Hon. E. H. H. Hall
Hon. L. B. Bolton	Hon. G. W. Miles
Hon. Sir Hal Colebatch	Hon. F. R. Welsh
Hon. J. Cornell	Hon. H. Seddon

(Teller.)

#### NOES.

Hon. C. R. Cornish	Hon. A. L. Laton
Hon. L. Craig	Hon. H. L. Roche
Hon. J. M. Drew	Hon. H. Tuckey
Hon. G. Frazer	Hon. U. B. Wood
Hon. E. H. Gray	Hon. F. E. Gibson
Hon. W. H. Kitson	

(Teller.)

#### PAIRS.

AYES.	NOES.
Hon. J. A. Dimmitt	Hon. W. R. Hall
Hon. H. S. W. Parker	Hon. E. M. Heenan

Amendment thus negatived.

Hon. J. CORNELL: I want to direct the Chief Secretary's attention to the fact that he is asking the Committee to agree to a Bill which is subject to another Bill that is to be considered at a later stage.

Hon. Sir Hal Colebatch: To an Act that does not exist.

Hon. J. CORNELL: Yes. Clause 4 contains words to the effect that the measure shall be subject to the State Electricity Commission Act. So what is going to be the position if the Electricity Commission Bill is amended?

The CHIEF SECRETARY: I think the hon. member knows as well as I that it makes no difference at all. When the Committee deals with the commission Bill it will please itself whether it amends that Bill or not. If there is no commission Bill it is quite immaterial because it cannot apply. So it does not matter whether we deal with this Bill or with the commission Bill first. However, at the request of one or more members, I agreed to postpone consideration of the commission Bill until a later sitting. For that reason I propose to continue with this Bill, which is to cover the whole of the State.

Hon. J. CORNELL: I am not questioning the subject-matter of the Bill. I am asking what will happen if we materially amend the Bill to which this one is subject. The Chief Secretary says it will have no effect.

The Chief Secretary: We will see what the amendments are.

Hon. J. CORNELL: I do not think we are following the correct procedure; but if the Chief Secretary is satisfied, and the Committee seems to be. So I will let the matter go.

Clause put and passed.

Clause 9—Local authorities empowered to generate electricity:

Hon. H. SEDDON: This may serve to emphasise a point I raised when I said that this Bill was very much wider than the Electricity Act. That Act provides that local authority may establish and maintain generating stations in its district and may grant the sole concession to a concessionaire to do those things. But under this measure the local authority cannot do anything unless the commission consents. We have extended the operations of the measure to the whole State. So under this proposal a power station could not be established, say in Broome, unless the consent of the commission was first obtained, whereas under the Electricity Act of 1927 the local authority could establish and conduct such a station. I move an amendment—

That in line 3 of Subclause (1) after the word "may" the words "with the consent of the Commission" be struck out.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: There is no hardship in this provision. The electricity commission will be the highest technical authority in this State on electricity.

Hon. G. W. Miles: Portion of it.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: I said the commission will be the highest technical authority operating in this State. I stand by that.

Hon. G. W. Miles: Three of them.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: If the hon. member does not mind, we will speak of the commission. I think it can be taken for granted that any local authority desiring to establish a generating and distributing plant will be only too pleased to have the approval and consent of the commission. The commission is not likely to adopt an attitude detrimental to a local authority.

Hon. J. Cornell: You have enough commissioners—seven of them!

The CHIEF SECRETARY: I think it is quite a good commission. The commission will be there to assist local authorities; and if for any reason it considered there was no need for a local authority to establish a particular type of generating plant, it would give its reasons; and I would say that local authorities would be only too pleased to have the commission's advice and would be very satisfied with it.

Hon. H. SEDDON: The Bill goes a long way further than that. It provides that a local authority shall not establish a station at all without the consent of the commission. It is not a question of taking advice; that is what the 1937 Act provides. This Bill says "You will do what you are told."

Hon. L. CRAIG: It seems to me that even if these words are struck out that will not affect the position. Clause 7 says that no person—which would include a local authority—shall construct or establish a generating station without the consent in writing of the commission. So even if these words are struck out the commission will still have the power which Clause 9 provides.

Amendment put and negatived.

Clause put and passed.

Clauses 10 to 54, Title—agreed to.

Bill reported without amendment and the report adopted.

## **BILL—RAILWAYS CLASSIFICATION BOARD ACT AMENDMENT.**

*Second Reading.*

**THE HONORARY MINISTER** (Hon. E. H. Gray—West) [8.37] in moving the second reading said: This small Bill, which proposes to amend the Railways Classification Board Act of 1920-1935, has two objects; firstly, to delete from the Act all reference to the Railway and Tramway Officers' Industrial Union of Workers and to substitute the words "W.A. Railway Officers' Union"; and secondly, to include a provision which will enable the W.A. Railway Officers' Union to take legal action to recover arrears of subscriptions, levies and fines from its members.

The Act provides for the appointment and prescribes the duties and powers of a board for the classification of the salaried staff of the Government railways. The board's jurisdiction includes the classification of all salaried positions in the Government railways, with the exception of heads and sub-heads of branches; the creation of classes and the determining of the minimum and maximum salaries of all positions in any class; the prescribing of methods of promotion and the hearing and determining of appeals by officers in respect to classifications, reclassifications or salaries. The board has also the power to determine the maximum number of hours that may be worked daily or in any period or shift, the maximum number of shifts that may be worked weekly or in any period, the assessment of allowances, and to make awards in connection with these matters.

In addition the Act specifies that officers to whom it applies shall not come within the jurisdiction of the Industrial Arbitration Act. Section 4 of the Industrial Arbitration Act prevents the Railway Officers' Union from registration under that measure, the reason being that the union is suitably provided for under the Railway Classification Board Act. The first amendment is necessitated by the fact that there is no longer a Railway & Tramway Officers' Union. The tramway employees left this organisation some considerable time ago and formed a union of their own, which, unlike the Railway Officers' Union, is registered under the Industrial Arbitration Act. The proposal in the Bill will rectify this anomaly.

The second amendment is occasioned by the fact that the W.A. Railway Officers' Union cannot take legal action to recover amounts owing to it by its members.

Hon. J. Cornell: Why not?

The HONORARY MINISTER: Because it is registered under the old English Trades Unions Act, 1902, and not under the Industrial Arbitration Act. I think everybody will recognise that that is now out of date. Every other union registered in the Arbitration Court has the right to sue members who are indebted to it.

This amendment will therefore extend to the Railway Officers' Union a privilege that is enjoyed by other unions and will entitle the organisation to take action when necessary against any member, in a local court or in a court of summary jurisdiction. At the present time the union, although permitted by its rules to inflict fines, levies, etc., is prevented from recovering any amounts due by members, under Section 5 of the Trade Unions Act of 1902, which states that unions cannot enforce an agreement for the payment by members of penalties or subscriptions.

This provision was taken from the English Trades Union Act, 1871, and is now antiquated and not in harmony with modern methods and ideas. That is recognised to be out of date nowadays. All progressive employers acknowledge that unions have their proper place in industry. The aim of this amendment could have been achieved by amending the Industrial Arbitration Act, but the Government considered it would be preferable to amend the Railways Classification Board Act. I trust that members will approve of the Bill, which has no other object than to remove an anomalous position existing in connection with the Tramway Officers Union and to give the Railway Officers' Union a privilege which is possessed by other organisations registered under the Industrial Arbitration Act. I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

HON. J. CORNELL (South). [8.43]: There are two features in this Bill. One deals with a change of name, and the other with the right to sue members of the organisation for their dues. It amends the Trade Unions Act. The Minister has said that that is an obsolete Act, but there is a right way and a wrong way of doing

things. The Minister has indicated that this organisation cannot be registered and is therefore denied the right to sue its members for the recovery of dues. To overcome that difficulty clauses have been put in here to the effect that, notwithstanding in the Trade Unions Act, the organisation can do what it could if it were registered under the Industrial Arbitration Act. That is a dishonest way of going about things, and something that should not be encouraged. Why does the union want to remain under the Trade Unions Act?

The Honorary Minister: Because it cannot register under the State Arbitration Act.

Hon. J. CORNELL: It does not follow that it need register under the Trade Unions Act. It is not bound to do that, as the Minister should know, having been an industrial secretary. This is a hole and corner way of doing it, and is not honest.

The Honorary Minister: It achieves the same object.

Hon. J. CORNELL: Of course it does, and that object is to give the organisation a right that it is denied under the Industrial Arbitration Act. Is that the way to do it? Why not repeal the Trade Unions Act if it is of no use, or why not amend it so that organisations could sue for dues? That would be the proper way to do it rather than to include such a provision in the Bill. If the clause is allowed to remain, the Honorary Minister should move to amend the Title because the Bill really amends the Trade Unions Act. I protest against the adoption of such a method. I have certainly no objection to an organisation suing a member for dues that are 12 months in arrear, but I object to the method by which that is to be achieved. If it is necessary to amend the legislation for that purpose, the Government should amend the Trade Unions Act and not seek to do it in this way.

The Honorary Minister: This will save amending two Acts.

Hon. J. CORNELL: But it is a devious way. In this instance, the Labour Party is like the heathen Chinese in the adoption of a devious method.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

*In Committee.*

Bill passed through Committee without debate, reported without amendment and the report adopted.

# **BILL—AIR NAVIGATION ACT AMENDMENT.**

*Second Reading.*

**THE CHIEF SECRETARY** (Hon. W. H. Kitson—West) [8.50] in moving the second reading said: It is proposed by this Bill to amend the Air Navigation Act of 1937 by the insertion of a new section, the purpose of which is to define clearly the extent of the powers possessed by the Commonwealth in respect of civil aviation and to protect the rights of the State in that connection. Prior to the passing of the parent Act in 1937 the Commonwealth Government, through the Civil Aviation Department, had been exercising certain limited control over the operations of aircraft throughout Australia. These functions extended only to technical matters or safety measures, including the examination and testing of aircraft as regards their safety, the issue of certificates of airworthiness, the testing and licensing of pilots, the inspection, approval and registration of aerodromes, and air traffic rules.

In 1937, the High Court, in what became known as the Goya Henry case, ruled that the Commonwealth Government had no constitutional authority to assume these powers, which the court stated were the prerogative of the States. As a result, the Prime Minister convened a conference of State Premiers, at which it was agreed to introduce legislation in each State to provide statutory authority for the Commonwealth to continue its limited powers of control. The Air Navigation Act was therefore approved by the Western Australian Parliament in 1937. It provided that the regulations made under the Commonwealth Air Navigation Act, 1920-1936, should apply to air navigation within this State in a similar manner as if they were incorporated in the State Act, and that all powers and functions vested in Commonwealth authorities by those regulations should also be delegated to those authorities by the State Act.

Another provision in the Act was that any certificate, license or registration granted, recognised, cancelled or suspended under the

Commonwealth regulations or under the Act of another State should have the same effect as if the action had been taken under the State Act. No usurpation by the Commonwealth of State powers was effected by the legislation. In common with similar Acts passed in the other States it has ensured an efficient supervision by one authority of flying throughout Australia with a view to public safety. There are some doubts in the minds of those controlling civil aviation as to the limit of the Commonwealth's powers. This has recently resulted in some delay in the development of intrastate air transport in Western Australia, and this Bill is being introduced to clarify the position.

The Bill provides for the inclusion in the principal Act of a new section which states that the provisions of the Act shall in no way affect the operation of Sections 45, 46 and 47 of the State Transport Co-Ordination Act, 1933-1940, which sections deal with the licensing by the State of intrastate aircraft operating south of the 26th parallel of latitude. The amendment will clarify the position and leave no doubt as to the limit of the powers that are possessed by the Commonwealth Government in respect of civil aviation. There will actually be no alteration in the policy that has been in operation and has been giving satisfaction for a number of years. I therefore have no hesitation in commending the Bill to the House. I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

**HON. H. SEDDON** (North-East) [8.54]: I do not intend to oppose the Bill, but there is a point I would like to raise. At present, a certain amount of latitude is allowed with regard to the carrying on of air lines in Western Australia, which seems to be more or less circumscribed by the attitude adopted by the Transport Board. It occurs to me that possibly the board may be placed in a position where it could take action but would hesitate to do so in association with air lines or owners of aircraft who sought to undertake services in various parts of the State.

For example, a proposal has been made whereby the owner of an aircraft has asked permission to be allowed to conduct a regular service between two points in Western Australia. There may be railway communication between those two points but,

owing to existing conditions, the railways are not meeting the convenience of people who wish to travel in that part of the State and a quicker and more cheap service could be provided by air transport. I would like to know if the powers of the Transport Board could be extended, or allowed to operate, to meet that state of affairs. We know that the board is supposed to operate from the standpoint of efficiency and not necessarily to subordinate other transport services to the Railway Department. Unfortunately, in operation there has been a certain amount of recognition of the railway service somewhat to the detriment of others of the type to which I have referred. I regard the Bill as an opportunity to bring the matter under the notice of the Transport Board, through the Minister.

**THE CHIEF SECRETARY** (Hon. W. H. Kitson—West—in reply) [8.56]: I have a somewhat limited knowledge of the matter referred to by Mr. Seddon, but I do not think I shall be divulging any secret when I say that negotiations are in progress between the Transport Board and the railways and certain air lines with regard to satisfactory arrangements being made in connection with certain routes. Whether that referred to by Mr. Seddon is included in the routes of which I have knowledge I cannot say, but the Bill will certainly clarify the position, and will mean that the Transport Board will have the right to deal with the question of licensing aircraft for intrastate services.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

#### *In Committee.*

Bill passed through Committee without debate, reported without amendment and the report adopted.

### **BILL—TROTTING CONTROL.**

#### *Second Reading.*

Debate resumed from the previous day.

**HON. L. CRAIG** (South-West) [8.59]: Last week I spent an afternoon on the Trotting Control Bill and made copious notes. I made up my mind to vote against the measure. Since then the report of Mr. Dunphy has been submitted to the House by the Chief

Secretary and all my intentions have now been changed. Last night this House dealt with a Bill which would involve the Government in the expenditure of a sum up to £1,000,000 to supply electricity to the whole of the South-West Land Division. The House was half empty; and the people who had come to listen to the speeches were mainly shuffling through boredom.

The **PRESIDENT**: Order! The hon. member must not reflect on the House.

Hon. L. CRAIG: I was going to connect my remarks, Sir. But when another Bill dealing with a sport or an industry was introduced the House filled and other things took place.

Hon. E. H. H. Hall: That is not correct. I walked out.

Hon. L. CRAIG: I meant people of importance.

Hon. J. Cornell: Another reflection!

The **PRESIDENT**: I must ask the hon. member to confine his attention to the Bill before the House.

Hon. L. CRAIG: I have no leanings towards the Trotting Association nor towards the Breeders, Owners and Trainers' Association. I have no special regard for trotting as a sport; but trotting has appealed to the people of this State and tremendous sums of money have become involved. When sport and money become associated, there is a tendency for the lure of money to undermine the cleanliness of sport.

Hon. A. L. Loton: That is the hon. member's opinion.

Hon. L. CRAIG: Yes. I am giving my own opinion. Consider the intense propaganda I received numerous letters and telegrams. Had the sport been cricket or some other sport in which finance or money did not enter, would there have been that propaganda? I have in mind that trotting is an industry; it is an industry which is doing much good. It is keeping many people in employment and providing a market for farmers' produce. It distributes money supplied by the wise or by the unwise, who let their hard-earned cash slip through reluctant fingers.

Hon. A. L. Loton: If you do not speculate you do not accumulate!

Hon. L. CRAIG: The point is that trotting has captured the imagination of large numbers of people, and therefore it

is the duty of the Government to ensure that the sport is continued not only as a sport but as a clean sport. For some time there has been friction between the Trotting Association and people engaged in racing but not within the association. I was indirectly connected with that friction through being a member of the council of the Royal Agricultural Society. I believe we were at one time criticised for allowing the Royal Show grounds to be used for trotting. The position was this: The Royal Agricultural Society owns a beautiful ground which is, and always has been, available for letting to anybody for any legitimate purpose. The Society was approached by certain people who were desirous of training or racing horses on the ground. Had the society refused permission, it would have been taking sides. It would have been drawn into the controversy. It had no reason to say that anybody should not use the ground, whether it were the Seventh Day Adventists, a children's party or trotters. We did not want to enter into any dispute at all and, had the ground been refused, we would have been taking sides. We had no feelings in the matter.

The PRESIDENT: Will the hon. member connect his remarks with the Bill before the House?

Hon. L. CRAIG: They are connected with the Bill.

The PRESIDENT: I am waiting for the hon. member to connect his remarks with the Bill.

Hon. L. CRAIG: I think they are very closely connected, but I defer to your decision, Sir. I hope I shall keep to the Bill in future. I wanted to clear the Agricultural Society from any suggestion of participation in this trotting dispute. A report has been submitted by Mr. Dunphy which I have in front of me. Mr. Dunphy has made charges against members of the Trotting Association, particularly the president. Those charges some will say are ill-based. I do not know. But the charges have been made publicly and cannot remain unchallenged. Mr. Dunphy says—

At pages 11 and 12 I made a tentative report on the positive statement made by Mr. Stratton that league control in South Australia and New Zealand had been a failure and that there was a strong move for reversion to principal club control. I there stated that I was making inquiries and would advise later as to the result thereof. . . .

I told Mr. Stratton I could hardly believe such a statement, as actually there was no substantial legislation existing in Western Australia governing the sport of trotting. In fact, I made it quite clear that I considered we were completely deficient of any effective legislative control in this State.

I now come to the charges which Mr. Dunphy makes—

In the circumstances, I consider that Mr. Stratton has deliberately misrepresented this portion of his case. He made an unequivocal statement that Lieutenant-Colonel Nicholl's inquiries in this State were being made with respect to the control of trotting by a principal club as opposed to control of trotting by a league. It is abundantly clear that such was never the case. Apparently, all that the New Zealand people were concerned about was the Australian system of race supervision by paid stipendiary stewards, as opposed to the New Zealand system of supervision by honorary officials.

That is the statement I am referring to. There are many others almost equally disturbing.

Hon. E. H. H. Hall interjected.

Hon. L. CRAIG: If the hon. member will allow me, I will read the report. Did the hon. member make statements when Mr. Parker was speaking?

Hon. E. H. H. Hall: No, I walked out. I will walk out again if you keep on.

The PRESIDENT: Order! The Hon. Mr. Craig.

Hon. L. CRAIG: Mr. Stratton holds a responsible position in this State. He is, I believe, the Treasurer of the Primary Producers' Association. He is a man of some importance and the least we can do, as well as the supporters on either side, those who want to see right done about trotting, those who want to clear the officials of the Trotting Association, those who want to clear the good name of Mr. Stratton, is to see that this Bill does not die. I heartily endorse and support the appointment of a Royal Commission. So grave are these charges that we must not let them stay where they are, otherwise a slur will remain on the names of people connected with trotting.

#### *Point of Order.*

Hon. E. H. H. Hall: Mr. President, I rise to a point of order. My point is that the hon. member will have an opportunity to state his views on the motion to be submitted tomorrow evening by Mr. Baxter for the appointment of a Royal Commission.

The President: Order! I think it is merely a passing reference to the possible appointment of a Royal Commission.

Hon. E. H. H. Hall: I hope so.

The President: The Hon. Mr. Craig!

*Debate resumed.*

Hon. L. CRAIG: Thank you, Sir. The hon. member apparently has some prejudice.

Hon. E. H. H. Hall: I want you to address yourself to the Bill.

Hon. L. CRAIG: I am addressing myself to the President. I hope the House will not rest satisfied and let this matter drop by defeating the Bill. I hope the House will support Mr. Baxter's motion for the appointment of a Royal Commission, where evidence may be taken on oath and full facts obtained. I hope this will eventually lead to the sport being conducted in a decent democratic way which will satisfy those controlling it, those who race the horses and those otherwise connected with the industry.

**HON. E. H. H. HALL** (Central) [9.12]: I will try to confine my few remarks within the space of a very few minutes, and not occupy as much time as was occupied by Mr. Craig. I am against the Bill. I am in favour of further action being taken as outlined by Mr. Baxter this afternoon. I shall content myself by stating my reasons on his motion.

**HON. G. B. WOOD** (East) [9.13]: What exercises my mind in approaching the consideration of this Bill is whether a change is necessary in the control of trotting in this State. It is not a question of Parliament settling a difference between one section of the sport and another section. Has the sport been conducted fairly and decently? By implication, Mr. Craig says it has not been conducted decently. He said that we should have an inquiry, so that the sport will be conducted decently in the future. I venture to say that it has been conducted decently over the past years. What I wish to prove to the House, if I can, is that not only has it been conducted decently, but that it has been conducted in a very businesslike way. It has been lifted up from the doldrums of some years ago to the wonderful financial position which it occupies today. There is no doubt in my mind that the Bill emanated from the Trades Hall.

The Chief Secretary: That is not true.

Hon. L. Craig: That is not true.

Hon. G. B. WOOD: It was conceived at the Trades Hall.

The Chief Secretary: No. That is far from true.

Hon. G. B. WOOD: Very well, I stand corrected. I understood that the people who sponsored the Bill and put it up to the Government were inspired by the support of Trades Hall people.

The Chief Secretary: That is not true.

Hon. G. B. WOOD: I withdraw that remark. It is what I honestly believed. If it is not true, I am quite prepared to withdraw it.

The Chief Secretary: That is the propaganda that is being put around.

Hon. G. B. WOOD: I have not listened to any propaganda. I have no axe to grind. I am not a racing man. Only on one occasion did I make use of my gold pass to attend the trots. I have never used it to attend a meeting of the W.A. Turf Club, for the reason that I have not got time. If I did have the time, I have not got the money to bet as I would like to.

The Chief Secretary: There is no need to bet; make a social engagement of it.

Hon. G. B. WOOD: I do not want anyone to think that I am kow-towing to the W.A.T.A. or any other organisation. I do not know any of the members except casually. There is no doubt that the people who put this up to the Government are those associated with a body known as the B.O. & T.A.

The Chief Secretary: That is not true. It was the Crown Solicitor.

Hon. L. Craig: If the hon. member reads the report he will find it all there.

Hon. G. B. WOOD: I think all this trouble was inspired by the B.O. & T.A. Whether that organisation has a just reason I do not know.

The Chief Secretary: Have you read the report?

Hon. G. B. WOOD: Yes. I intend to talk about it later. One of the proposals is to give the B.O. & T.A. representation on the league. My considered opinion is that it is a dangerous thing to give people who are living on the game—I have no objection to people living on the game if they can do so—the right to be on the board of control. Would Mr. Craig suggest that the jockeys and trainers should be on the committee of the W.A.T.C.



Hon. L. Craig: The owner-trainers can be on it.

Hon. H. L. Roche: Not professional trainers.

Hon. L. Craig: I did not mention that part of it.

Hon. G. B. WOOD: The hon. member talked about the Royal Agricultural Society and everything else but the Bill. All members will agree with me when I say that trotting today is a clean sport, or as clean as it can possibly be made. Why alter it? By interjection I asked the Chief Secretary, when he was speaking, why we should alter the present system. He said that I should know the reason because of what has happened in the past. Are we going to foster Government control every time there is a dispute somewhere? The Government has not attempted to take over the Collie mines because a few strikes have taken place there. This is definitely Government control of a sport.

Hon. G. Fraser: How is it?

Hon. G. B. WOOD: Some members speak against the Government control of industry; it is far worse when the Government steps in here.

Hon. G. Fraser: Where is the Government control of this sport?

Hon. G. B. WOOD: The hon. member has not read the Bill! I will deal with that later.

The PRESIDENT: Order! Mr. Fraser will have an opportunity to speak later.

Hon. G. B. WOOD: When I deal with the Bill I will try to demonstrate to this House where Government control of trotting comes in. I always think the public is a splendid judge of what is going on. The public does not have to go to the trots if it does not want to. But we know by the huge attendances there that the public does go to the trots, and it should be a very efficient umpire. If the public is satisfied to pay its admission charges and patronise it as it does—and I suppose there is no better patronised sport in Australia than the meetings of the W.A.T.A. at Gloucester Park—we would be well advised to leave the control where it is. On occasions we have large attendances at cricket matches, but for consistent attendances I venture to say that the trots hold their own with anything in the Commonwealth.

Let us look at the records of the stakes paid. The stakes are far higher than those provided by the W.A.T.C. They are higher than any stakes paid in South Australia or in any other part of the Commonwealth. The money that has been given away by this organisation is colossal.

In one part of Mr. Dunphy's report to which I shall refer later, he mentions what should be given to the country. I have a list of what has been given to agricultural shows and to country clubs. I shall not read the whole list, but mention some of the amounts. In 1945, in round figures £2,600 was given away. In 1942, £1,000 was given away and £1,190 in 1940. Away back in 1928, £779 was given away. In all a total of £12,154 has been donated. That is a lot of money. I also call to mind that in about 1926 the Trotting Association, in order to improve the sport in the country, donated the huge sum of £1,200 to improve the agricultural show ground at York. Unfortunately the galloping interests were too strong there and trotting did not catch on. I mention that just to show that this organisation is not selfish with its money, but is prepared to distribute it throughout the country. I can also call to mind that some years ago it was instrumental in spending something like £1,500 in importing stallions from America. It also gave £1,700 to Anzac House. I remember well the wonderful service that the association gave to the cricket association in Western Australia, and the pavilion it helped to build. I think the W.A.T.A. helped to keep cricket on the map during those years.

All these things must count with any fair-minded person. The facts I have put forward demonstrate the efficiency of the committee that has been running this association for so long. I understand that the Trotting Association has given something like £110,000 to wartime charitable institutions such as Service Homes, etc. Mr. Dunphy, in his report, takes exception to that and says that it should have spent the money on its grounds and provided further amenities. I think that is a terrible thing to say. Did not we all do what we possibly could to further the war effort, and let everything else go?

Hon. J. Cornell: He said some of it should have been spent on the grounds.

Hon. G. B. WOOD: Yes. I say that the Trotting Association did the right thing in giving every penny it could in that way, providing it could keep the sport going. The W.A.T.C., I understand, did the same thing. Many other associations did too. When we know these things I, for one, am not going to support this Bill. I could not, and I hope that other members will think likewise. I would like to make reference to the wonderful financial job that Mr. Stratton did when the Trotting Association was in a bad way. Members should compare the position it was about 15 years ago with what it is today. It was in debt then and it was at that time that these people should have come into the picture. We did not hear so much from them a few years ago when things were not so good. They want to come in now and get a cut out of the spoils.

I am going to make a comparison here. I have mentioned stakes. I am now going to deal with the nomination fees. In the W.A.T.C. the nomination fee for a £3,000 stake is £1, first payment £5, final acceptance £30, and losing rider £2, a total of £38. For the W.A.T.A. Cup of £3,250 the nomination fee for the qualifying races of £300 is £2 6s. acceptance, and the horses which qualify for the race enter without further fee. What a comparison that is! Yet we are asked by Mr. Dunphy to give the Minister power to make regulations similar to the W.A.T.C. Mr. Dunphy also talks about the admission fees. Well, the W.A.T.C. charges 14s. as against the Trotting Club's admission fee of 6s. 8d. A lesser amount is charged for ladies' tickets. I do not think that this committee is exploiting the position in having an open go. The committee controlling the sport should be the best judge of admission fees. Why should the Minister have power to say "Yes" or "No" with regard to admission fees? I say he should not, and I have my doubts as to whether he wants that right either.

The Chief Secretary: I have my doubts as to whether you have analysed the Bill.

Hon. G. B. WOOD: I will come to the Bill later. There are only two aspects of it that I want to deal with. If the B.O. & T.A. can get away with this, what about the boys at Belmont? They will want something, too; there is not the slightest doubt about that.

Hon. G. Fraser: It might not be a bad thing either.

Hon. G. B. WOOD: The hon. member thinks it would be a good thing. I definitely do not. Anyone making his living out of the sport and liable to engage in malpractices ought not to have a place on the controlling committee. It would be highly undesirable. We know the jockeys and trainers do things that they should not do.

Hon. G. Fraser: You let the owners in to the W.A.T.C.

Hon. G. B. WOOD: They are elected. To put these people in control would be very wrong, and this House should not agree to doing that. I want to know why the B.O. & T.A. knew all about this Bill and no-one else did.

Hon. G. Fraser: Who said it did?

Hon. G. B. WOOD: I will tell the hon. member who said so. I have a letter from a man named George Cornell, of Kellerberrin. He wrote to me and he was evidently told by the delegation that went up there what was in the proposed Bill. He was evidently not told everything, but he apparently did know the constitution of the league. In his letter to me he states—

The meeting carried a resolution favouring the control of trotting by an independent board . . . to be presided by an independent chairman, nominated by the Government.

He was not told that the Minister had the right to reject any nominees, or to put them out of office if it pleased him to do so. The letter continues—

As the contents of the Bill are not known in their entirety—

Hon. J. Cornell: On a point of order, have I a right to ask that the letter being quoted by the hon. member be laid on the Table of the House?

The PRESIDENT: Yes, the hon. member may ask that that be done.

Hon. J. Cornell: Then I ask for it.

The PRESIDENT: The hon. member will later lay the letter on the Table of the House.

Hon. G. B. WOOD: Certainly! there is nothing to hide. The writer merely states the position as he sees it. He continued—it is difficult to give an opinion on it.

He does not express an opinion, which was very wise of him. He told me what had happened. He did not ask me to support or oppose the Bill. I had an invitation to at-

tend the meeting at Kellerberrin and I told him that I could not be present, and he was courteous enough to write me and inform me of what had happened. The letter continued—

However, in my opinion, it is essential that country clubs receive monetary grants, as without such financial assistance it is difficult to see how they could be self-supporting enough to be able to offer stakes sufficiently good to attract both good nominations and the public.

Any grants would need to be made available to the District Trotting Councils who would allocate it among the several clubs within each council area.

It is rumoured that the Bill is to be treated as a non-party measure and will be introduced first into the Legislative Council by the Chief Secretary.

So in answer to Mr. Fraser, I say that the B.O.T.A. did know the contents of the Bill.

Hon. G. B. Fraser: You knew them, too.

The PRESIDENT: Order! The hon. member will have an opportunity later.

Hon. G. B. WOOD: Before the Bill was framed, the W.A.T.A., in my opinion, should have been consulted and given an opportunity to express its views, especially after having done a good job over the years.

The Chief Secretary: The association was asked to confer with regard to recommendations for a Bill.

Hon. G. B. WOOD: That is all right.

The Chief Secretary: And the association refused.

Hon. G. B. WOOD: I was not aware of that.

Hon. G. Fraser: If the hon. member asks a few more questions, he might get some information.

Hon. G. B. WOOD: I was under the impression that the association had not been consulted, but I take the Chief Secretary's word that it was. I wish now briefly to examine Mr. Dunphy's report. I think Mr. Dunphy was sent out on a sort of fishing expedition to see what he could dig up against the W.A.T.A.

The Chief Secretary: On a point of order, the hon. member is accusing the Government of sending the Crown Solicitor out on a fishing expedition. I take exception to the remark. I think it is uncalled for.

The PRESIDENT: I am sure the hon. member will withdraw that remark.

Hon. G. B. WOOD: I unreservedly withdraw. I did not mean to imply anything

very harsh against the Chief Secretary. Apparently Mr. Dunphy took it upon himself.

The Chief Secretary: Certainly you have not read the papers.

Hon. G. B. WOOD: I read the whole of the report.

The Chief Secretary: Then you have forgotten what you read.

Hon. G. B. WOOD: There are no other statements attached to the report. I know that the Premier received some letters that are not with the report. I think Mr. Parker referred to this last evening. These were letters from the Fremantle Trotting Club and from the Golden Mile Trotting Club and, in my opinion, those letters should be on the file. The file is not complete.

The Chief Secretary: I do not like interrupting the hon. member, but may I draw his attention to the request of this House which was that Mr. Dunphy's report and relevant papers be laid on the Table of the House? The motion had nothing to do with correspondence sent to the Premier, to me, or to any one else. Further, the hon. member has no right to accuse the Crown Solicitor of not having placed on the Table the relevant papers.

Hon. G. B. WOOD: I think the letters should be on the file.

The Chief Secretary: There was no file.

Hon. G. B. WOOD: Mr. Dunphy made it his business to put on the file letters that suited him—letters from New Zealand and South Australia. Why did not he put the other letters on the file?

The Chief Secretary: He did not have them.

Hon. G. B. WOOD: I accept that explanation, but it is rather confusing to find some letters on the file and not others.

Hon. G. Fraser: It is not a file.

Hon. G. B. WOOD: I disagree with the Chief Secretary: They are relevant papers and should be on the file. I would have liked to see a list of the people from whom Mr. Dunphy took evidence. I would like to know who they were and what each one said. I quite expected that we would be supplied with such information. Mr. Dunphy did refer to professional men, trainers and so forth, but what is a professional man? Is it one who drives or rides a horse? Such a man could be described as a professional man.

Hon. V. Hamersley: Did he formulate the Bill off his own bat?

Hon. G. B. WOOD: I do not know.

Hon. J. Cornell: Why not accuse the Chief Secretary of writing it?

The Chief Secretary: I am getting used to accusations.

Hon. G. B. WOOD: I should like to know why the Chief Secretary did not quote from Mr. Dunphy's report when he was moving the second reading of the Bill.

Hon. G. Fraser: He wanted to keep personalities out.

The Honorary Minister: That shows how fair he was.

Hon. G. B. WOOD: Fair to whom? I feel inclined to compliment the Chief Secretary on having refrained from quoting the report. That indicates what I think of it. It seems to me that, as the Chief Secretary did not see fit to quote the report and use it, this House should not take any notice of it.

Hon. G. Fraser interjected.

The PRESIDENT: Order! The hon. member is not addressing the House. Mr. Wood has the floor.

Hon. G. B. WOOD: If the hon. member would make his interjections concise instead of trying to make a speech, I might be able to answer them.

The PRESIDENT: The hon. member must not provoke interjections.

Hon. G. B. WOOD: I propose to deal briefly with the report. The reason why I think we should not take any notice of the report is on account of certain remarks that Mr. Dunphy himself made about the evidence. He said—

Objections to Mr. Stratton were grouped as follows:—"To his absolute dictatorship and complete control of the association's affairs; to his direct personal monetary gain from his presidential position in manipulation of events, handicaps and officials in relation to trotting horses racing in his ownership or interests."

Later on he said that a lot of the findings in his report were based on hearsay and gossip. Are we to accept and take notice of a report which the man making it admits is based on hearsay and gossip? For my part I shall not take any notice of it. If the report had been based on evidence given before a Royal Commission—

Hon. G. Fraser: A Royal Commission was offered.

Hon. J. Cornell: The hon. member is about to commit suicide now.

Hon. G. B. WOOD: If the report were based on evidence given before a Royal Commission, we could take notice of it.

Hon. G. Fraser: A Royal Commission was offered.

Hon. G. B. WOOD: The Chief Secretary did not make any use at all of Mr. Dunphy's report.

The Chief Secretary: I wanted to keep personalities out of the debate, but have not been allowed to do so.

Hon. G. B. WOOD: I take my hat off to the Chief Secretary for having refrained from using the report.

The Chief Secretary: I will use it when I reply.

Hon. G. B. WOOD: But I will use it first of all. Mr. Dunphy admits that the report was based on gossip and hearsay.

Hon. J. Cornell: What did the auditor say about certain sums of money? Was that hearsay?

The PRESIDENT: Order!

Hon. G. B. WOOD: The hon. member will be able to speak later on. The auditor did make certain remarks about the salaries and expenses drawn by Mr. Stratton. In view of the wonderful job Mr. Stratton and his friends have done, and seeing that the sum total of the salary and expenses—his expenses must have been heavy—is only £1,500, I think the association got off very cheaply. So long as the members are satisfied, why should there be any complaint? I understand that Mr. Stratton goes East periodically and is under quite a lot of expense. He is in the East now. Mr. Dunphy, in his report, made mention of the Primary Producers' Trustee Company which handles the accountancy matters of the association. He said that Mr. Stratton obtained a lot of indirect profit, but he did not say how much. He did mention that Mr. Stratton had 2,205 shares in the company, but there are other shareholders with 4,000 shares. Another shareholder's name mentioned is one who I think has a character that is unassailable in this community.

Hon. H. L. Roche: Not in trotting.

Hon. G. B. WOOD: I do not wish to mention his name. Let me now refer to the Bill. There is provision in the Bill to give the Chief Secretary power to disallow regulations. The other organisations may nominate persons for appointment, but the Chief Secretary will have the final say. If the

Chief Secretary so desired, he need not appoint Mr. Stratton to the committee or to the league. Nor need he appoint Mr. Atkins or anyone else.

Hon. J. Cornell: Where does the Bill say that?

Hon. G. B. WOOD: I say that to give the Chief Secretary such power is dynamite. In fact, it is worse; it is atomic.

Hon. J. Cornell: That is not in the Bill.

Hon. G. B. WOOD: That does not apply to the W.A.T.C.

Hon. G. Fraser: In what clause is that stated?

Hon. G. B. WOOD: I am not allowed to mention clauses on the second reading, as the hon. member well knows. If the hon. member has read the Bill, he ought to know that that provision is in it.

Hon. G. Fraser: I cannot see it, and that is why I ask you to tell me.

Hon. G. B. WOOD: I would be called to order if I mentioned the clause, but I assure the hon. member that it is in the Bill.

The Chief Secretary: I think you are under a misapprehension.

The PRESIDENT: Order! I must ask the hon. member to ignore all interjections.

Hon. G. B. WOOD: I shall be only too glad to ignore interjections, but I do not wish to be discourteous.

The PRESIDENT: I especially ask the hon. member to ignore all interjections.

Hon. G. B. WOOD: I definitely shall do so. We have heard a little about the control of the W.A.T.C., and this is similar, I think. The Chief Secretary mentioned that. There is nothing in the W.A.T.C. Act of 1892 which gives the Minister such power. The Minister has power with regard to regulations, but nothing like this. By interjection, I asked the Minister whether in South Australia the Minister appointed the chairman and he replied, "I think so." The Chief Secretary guessed wrong; he just did not know.

The Chief Secretary: I am afraid you are all at sea with the facts.

Hon. G. B. WOOD: Under the constitution of the South Australian League, the chairman is appointed by the members. Each district council appoints a member of the league and the members appoint the chairman: but that is not so under this Bill. The Chief Secretary shakes his head, but I read

that in the constitution of the South Australian trotting organisation, and I can assure the House it is true. I read it only today in black and white. There, the Minister does not appoint the chairman—unless there has been an amendment in the last few months. Another part of the Bill I do not like refers to the power of the Minister to make by-laws. That may be the case in regard to the W.A.T.C., but it is most undesirable.

The Chief Secretary: He has the right to reject them.

Hon. G. B. WOOD: I stand corrected. I think that anything like that should come to this House. I intend to vote against the second reading. Today a question was asked in another place whether the Government would consider appointing a Royal Commission and the Premier replied that he would give it every consideration. I believe that is the proper way, in view of what has been said and what has been noised about in a whispering campaign.

Hon. J. Cornell: That is not the answer that the Premier gave. You are giving the wrong answer.

Hon. G. B. WOOD: The Premier gave the answer that the Government would consider the matter. I oppose the second reading.

HON. G. FRASER (West) [9.46]: I desire to offer a few remarks on this measure.

Hon. H. L. Roche interjected.

The PRESIDENT: Order! The hon. member must not interject.

Hon. G. FRASER: Before offering my few remarks, I had better make my position clear. There is a trotting owner or trainer with the same name and initials as mine with whom I have often been confused. As a matter of fact on one occasion, at the opening meeting at Fremantle, during the first race of the evening in which he had a horse running, I was pestered with inquiries as to whether it was a trier or not.

Hon. H. L. Roche: They are all triers.

Hon. G. FRASER: I became so tired of explaining that it was not my horse that I finally informed people that it would win. The story ended all right, because it did win. I have been a follower of racing and trotting all my life. I have followed trotting in the Perth area since the first meeting on the Belmont Park race course. I have followed it in the Fremantle area since the

days of the Tradesmen's Trot or, as it was known by many people, the Bieton Bush-rangers' Handicap. In the whole of that time I have not been connected with either the W.A. Trotting Association, the Breeders, Owners and Trainers' Association, or any other association officially connected with the sport. I have attended meetings in the guise of a member of the public, just as a modest punter; and, strange to say, I still have a few shillings left to gamble with.

It is said that the looker-on sees most of the game. I do not know whether that is so in racing and trotting, but I think I am competent to express a few opinions regarding trotting affairs in this State. No one could have had a longer association with the sport than I, because I have been attending meetings from the inception. I have no axe to grind either with regard to the Trotting Association or the B.O.T.A. I am not linked with either body in any shape or form. I am purely neutral and I consider I am competent to express opinions from a public point of view. I hardly think that as a result of my long association with the sport I am likely to do anything but support this measure. I listened attentively to Mr. Parker when he was submitting a case on behalf of the Trotting Association, and I was rather disappointed.

Hon. H. S. W. Parker: Mr. President, I ask for a withdrawal. I was speaking on behalf of the public and have nothing whatever to do with either party. I was not representing either the Trotting Association or the B.O.T.A. but was speaking on behalf of the public.

The PRESIDENT: I am sure Mr. Fraser will accept the hon. member's explanation.

Hon. G. FRASER: Shall I suggest that the hon. member was putting up a case against the Bill?

Hon. H. S. W. Parker: Most decidedly.

Hon. G. FRASER: Listening to that case, I was disappointed because it appeared to me that the tone of the debate suggested that it was a matter of Clark versus Stratton. I am not interested in either of those individuals, but I am interested in the sport. I hardly think that the hon. member at any stage touched on the Bill.

Hon. H. S. W. Parker: I touched on the principles.

Hon. G. FRASER: Or on the principles either. His speech was either about something that somebody broadcast or something

that somebody said. It is not my intention to deal with any broadcast or anything that is in the report of the former Crown Solicitor. I intend to deal with the position as I know it. Having been amongst the public, I am satisfied that the public want some alteration. This Bill appears to me to provide the necessary alteration.

Hon. H. L. Roche: Where does the public say that?

Hon. G. FRASER: I am saying it as a member of the public, and my association with the public leads me to believe that this is what the public wants. Mr. Wood put up a case just now, but admitted that he had never been to a trotting meeting. So he could not speak on behalf of the people attending trotting meetings. I have attended those meetings and I fraternise with others attending them, so that I have some idea of what they require. The trotting public of this State desires some alteration. I give due credit to the officials of the Trotting Association for the work they have done in connection with trotting in this State; but the great improvement that has taken place has not been due to one source alone but to three sources—the efforts of the Trotting Association, the efforts of the B.O.T.A. and the patronage of the public.

Hon. H. L. Roche: The public is not mentioned in the Bill.

Hon. G. FRASER: Whether the public is mentioned in the Bill or not, it is deserving of consideration. The members of the public are the people who keep the sport going. As three sections have been responsible for building up trotting to its present standard, is it not only right and fair and proper that those three sections should have a say in the control of the sport? That is what this Bill sets out to prove. It has been said that the breeders, owners and trainers will be given control of the sport. Another member said that the Government will control it. But let us analyse the constitution of the proposed league. Neither of those bodies will have control of trotting. The control will be vested in the trotting clubs of this State in conjunction with the Trotting Association—

Hon. G. B. Wood: Subject to the Minister.

Hon. G. FRASER: —because of the fact that on the league will be two members of the Trotting Association, one member each from the district councils of trotting in the

State—which will make five—and one from the Fremantle Trotting Club—which will make six members as against whom there will be two members from the B.O.T.A. and one nominee of the Government. Therefore—how ridiculous it is for any member to say that if the Bill is carried either the B.O.T.A. or the Government will control trotting! If there were a combination between the representatives of those two bodies—the Government and the B.O.T.A.—they would still have only three votes out of nine; yet members tell us that those three will be so powerful as to over-ride the other six members representing the trotting clubs.

Hon. G. B. Wood: Who said that?

Hon. G. FRASER: That has been suggested here by different members who have said that the B.O.T.A. is endeavouring to get control of trotting. But an analysis of the position shows that the control will be in the hands of the Trotting Association and the trotting clubs. The composition of the league indicates that the three sections I have mentioned will have some representation. There will be two representatives from the B.O.T.A., six from the trotting clubs and one from the Government, and the last-mentioned will, I assume, represent the point of view of the public. I would like any member who follows me on this matter to show me where the control of trotting has been taken away from the trotting clubs.

Hon. G. B. Wood: I am not allowed to.

Hon. G. FRASER: I defy anyone to do it, because trotting will be controlled by the clubs. There will be six representatives from the clubs and the Trotting Association out of nine members on the league. If that is not fair representation for the controllers of the sport, I do not know what would be. I do not know what more they could want. The question has been asked: Why the alteration? An alteration is necessary because after many years' trotting in this State the principals in the concern disagreed, with the result that the sport was denied to the public. Seeing that the principals in the sport disagree, it is necessary to do something in order that this sport may be carried on. This Bill is an honest attempt in that direction. At no time do I intend to depart from the contents of the Bill and deal in personalities such as have been indulged in so far, but I would issue a warning to

some members who may be inclined to do so that if they wish to serve their cause they had better leave out personalities.

Hon. G. B. Wood: Mr. Dunphy started it.

Hon. G. FRASER: If that practice is persisted in, someone will be seriously hurt.

Hon. G. B. Wood: The Chief Secretary said that he ignored the report on account of personalities.

Hon. G. FRASER: I would warn the hon. member that if the Chief Secretary is goaded into the same manner of reply that has been used by some members, those persons who introduced the question will be seriously hurt.

Hon. H. L. Roche: How do you know?

Hon. G. FRASER: I have been a follower of the game for a long time, and I know a little bit about what has happened. However, to get back to the Bill. Not many members have touched on it.

The PRESIDENT: Order! The hon. member should not say that. References made by hon. members all had direct or indirect bearing on the Bill. The hon. member may proceed.

Hon. G. FRASER: The Bill sets up a league, and six of the nine members will be direct representatives of the Trotting Association and the trotting clubs, which gives them absolute control of the sport. Yet it has been suggested that other bodies will obtain that control! However, I think I have dealt sufficiently with that point. I have examined the Bill and I would like to ask any member to show me where it proposes to take away from the association or the clubs, powers that they hold today—except in regard to the presentation of programmes for the required authority and matters of that description. The association will carry on exactly the same in the future as in the past in regard to racing.

Hon. H. S. W. Parker: I think you are right there.

Hon. H. L. Roche: Subject to the Minister.

Hon. G. FRASER: They still have power to appoint handicappers and stewards and have full control of meetings.

Hon. H. L. Roche: Subject to the Minister.

Hon. G. FRASER: I will admit it—subject to the Minister. The Minister is represented by a chairman who is responsible

as a liaison officer between the Government and those controlling trotting.

Hon. G. B. Wood: Read Clause 33.

Hon. G. FRASER: There are certain regulations that will have to be referred to the Minister. I was saying that the Trotting Association will still retain control, but was that the attitude of that association to the Fremantle Trotting Club? I interjected when Mr. Parker was speaking last night, when he quoted from a letter under the heading of the Fremantle Trotting Club, and I asked was the letter from the committee or the club? He admitted it was from the committee. Does he know what is the constitution of the Fremantle Trotting Club, or the treatment that it has received from the Trotting Association since it was established? Before trotting was first started in Fremantle, a promise was made by the then president of the Trotting Association that the Fremantle course would be given to the Fremantle Trotting Club. As the years have gone by, that has been denied. It is remarkable that every member for the Fremantle district will, without exception, endorse what I am about to say, that ever since the formation of the Fremantle Trotting Club, Fremantle members have received nothing but complaints from the committee and members of that club regarding the treatment meted out to them by the parent body. Down through the years they have been compelled to pay a rental—

Hon. G. B. Wood: On a point of order. I take strong exception to the last remark made by Mr. Fraser. I have a letter here written to the Premier, from the Fremantle Trotting Club.

The PRESIDENT: What is the remark to which the hon. member takes exception?

Hon. G. B. Wood: That every member of the Fremantle Club wanted some change of control. This letter shows that they do not want change of control.

The PRESIDENT: That is not a point of order. It is a personal explanation, and I am sure Mr. Fraser will accept it.

Hon. G. FRASER: The hon. member did not hear what I said. I said that every member for the Fremantle district has received nothing but complaints from members of the committee and members of the Fremantle Trotting Club.

Hon. G. B. Wood: Do you mean members of Parliament?

Hon. G. FRASER: Yes.

Hon. G. B. Wood: I thought you meant members of the Fremantle Trotting Club.

Hon. G. FRASER: I say that members for the district have received nothing but complaints from the members and committee of the Fremantle Trotting Club, ever since that club was established. It is rather Gilbertian to see a letter from the Fremantle Trotting Club asking that the present control be left as it is. The Fremantle Club committee was originally composed of seven members elected by members of the Fremantle Trotting Club. They were promised certain things which have not materialised, and they have paid a rental for that course and have paid interest on the improvements made to the course, a fairly large sum. About six or seven years ago the Trotting Association, probably because of the Trotting Club getting into financial difficulties, coerced the Fremantle Trotting Club into giving the association three direct representatives on the Fremantle Trotting Club committee, so that today that committee is composed of four members elected by the members of the Fremantle Trotting Club and three members put there by the Trotting Association. The hon. member might now understand why a letter would come from the Fremantle Club on the lines that he has mentioned.

Hon. G. B. Wood: It is signed by the president.

Hon. G. FRASER: Of course it is. There are four Fremantle Trotting Club members out of a committee of seven, and three members belonging to the Trotting Association. The prospect of the introduction of this legislation has been known for some time, but the Fremantle Trotting Club met in September last and this measure was never considered by that club. Although they had their meeting in September, their four members, together with the three belonging to the parent body, forwarded what was supposed to represent the attitude of the club. They do not know what is the attitude of the club, and I defy contradiction of that statement. I think the Fremantle Trotting Club has about 70 members, but four of those members, on the committee, in conjunction with three from the parent body, have sent



what they say represents the desire of the club. They do not know what that desire is.

I do not know whether the same position obtains regarding the Goldfields Trotting Club, but we had a letter from them and there again it was only from the committee of the club. I do not know how that committee is constituted but even if the members are all elected by the members of the Goldfields Trotting Club, there are still only about seven of them, and I do not think they are in a position to say what the whole of the membership of the club desires. They are there to control the sport and the meetings that are held and it is only fair, when anything endangers the sport, that a general meeting should be called and an expression of opinion obtained from it. The general meeting of members of the Fremantle Trotting Club was in September. It is now November, but this matter was never mentioned at the Fremantle Trotting Club meeting, though a few weeks later there was a letter saying that the club favoured the present control. I challenge the Trotting Association to call a meeting of the Fremantle club and get the opinion of its members. They might find a different story.

Hon. H. S. W. Parker: Are you a member of the trotting club?

Hon. G. FRASER: No, and I owe no allegiance to it.

Hon. H. S. W. Parker: I was wondering how you knew all this.

The PRESIDENT: Order!

Hon. G. FRASER: Because we have brought deputations to the Trotting Association, interceding on behalf of the Fremantle Trotting Club. That is how I know, and from the complaints made, not only to me but to every member for the Fremantle district, regarding the treatment stated to have been received from the parent body. I know it from my long association with trotting, as a follower, and I am in a position to know what the trotting public wants. It has been suggested during the debate that a Royal Commission should be held. I am not dealing with the notice of motion given tonight, but with something mentioned here last night about a Royal Commission. To hold a Royal Commission now will hold up any alteration in

trotting for another 12 months, and I am not prepared to do that. I want action now. The matter has been brought before Parliament and it is our duty to leave aside personalities and to judge this Bill on its merits. If that is done, I ask any member who will still vote against it to give the reason why the W.A.T.A. should be the only racing or trotting body in Australia not under legislative control.

Hon. G. B. Wood: Because it is making such a good job of it.

Hon. G. FRASER: If any member votes against this Bill it is up to him to put a case why that body should be the star body in Australia.

Hon. J. Cornell: The opponents of the Bill want a Royal Commission. Why?

Hon. G. FRASER: To stave off the evil day for 12 months. The Trotting Association has nothing to fear under this measure. If it imagines it is going to lose control and that people who have no right will have some say regarding its assets and so on, that is not the case. The tone of the debate would lead members to believe that some such thing would occur, but I defy any member to show how, if this Bill goes through, the Trotting Association will lose £1.

Hon. H. L. Roche: Who is worrying about that?

Hon. G. FRASER: I think many members are worrying about it. The principle I am dealing with is that all trotting and racing bodies throughout the Commonwealth are under legislative control, with this one exception.

The Chief Secretary: Throughout the Empire.

Hon. G. B. Wood: Not under measures such as this.

Hon. G. FRASER: Admittedly, this Bill is different from the controlling legislation of the W.A.T.C., but I consider it is an improvement on that legislation and would be prepared to vote for a similar measure to cover the W.A.T.C.

Hon. J. Cornell: Even the egg-producers are subject to control.

Hon. G. FRASER: Even the paperboys on the streets are subject to control. Here is a body owning thousands of pounds worth of property, and, apart from being under the Associations Incorporation Act, there is no legislation covering it.

Hon. G. B. Wood: Try to control football, and see how you get on!

Hon. G. FRASER: That has been mentioned in the debate. Has the hon. member examined the constitution of the W.A. Football League?

The PRESIDENT: Order! The hon. member should ignore interjections and get on with his speech.

Hon. G. FRASER: The football league is governed on almost the same lines as are set out in this Bill, with the exception that there is no chairman nominated by the Government. The league is governed by delegates appointed by each club, which this Bill sets out to do for the sport of trotting. Let members contradict that if they can! Every other sport is governed in much the same way. Representatives of the various clubs are elected to control the sport. That is practically what the Bill seeks to accomplish with regard to trotting. It is fair and reasonable. I support the second reading of the Bill.

On motion by Hon. J. Cornell, debate adjourned.

## BILL—SUPREME COURT ACT AMENDMENT (No. 2).

### *Assembly's Message.*

Message from the Assembly received and read notifying that it insisted on its amendment No. 2.

*House adjourned at 10.17 p.m.*

## Legislative Assembly.

*Wednesday, 21st November, 1945.*

	PAGE
Questions : Native Service personnel, as to removal of disabilities	2085
Fishing Industry, as to aliens and boats	2085
Country water supplies, as to Mt. Barker scheme	2086
Tram derailment, as to action to ensure public safety	2086
Trotting control, as to inquiry by Royal Commission	2086
Bills : Loan, £956,000, 1r.	2086
Financial Emergency Act Amendment, 1r.	2086
Industries Assistance Act Continuance, 1r.	2086
Mortgages' Rights Restriction Act Continuance, 1r.	2086
Criminal Code Amendment, 2r., Com.	2112
Supreme Court Act Amendment (No. 2), Council's Message	2113
Municipal Corporations Act Amendment, 2r., Com.	2117
Motions : Tourist traffic, as to encouraging urban beautification, passed	2086
Wool handling delays, Select Committee appointed	2098
Superannuation and Family Benefits Act, as to increasing payments to beneficiaries, defeated	2104

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

## QUESTIONS.

### NATIVE SERVICE PERSONNEL.

#### *As to Removal of Disabilities.*

Mr. McDONALD asked the Minister for the North-West:

1, Is it intended that natives who have served in the Australian Defence Forces in the recent war and who would normally be subject to the restrictions imposed by the Native Affairs Act shall continue to be subject to such restrictions?

2, In view of the considerable number of natives who have rendered good service in the Australian Defence Forces, is the Government prepared to provide for the removal or modification of such disabilities in the case of native service personnel?

The MINISTER FOR LANDS (for the Minister for the North-West) replied:

(1) and (2) The Government is sympathetic to the cases of well deserved natives, and if they have served honorably, and provided they do not live as natives or associate generally with them, they may apply for certificates of exemption or certificates of citizenship, and if their applications are successful they would not be subjected to the provisions of the Native Administration Act.

### FISHING INDUSTRY.

#### *As to Aliens and Boats.*

Mr. NORTH asked the Minister for Industrial Development:

1, Is the fish supply for the metropolis dependent upon the industry of former enemy aliens?

2, Are there Federal and State plans as yet to include Australians in the industry?

3, Has the department on hand any vessels at Willmott's yards (Rocky Bay) suitable for fishing?

4, Has anything eventuated regarding the efforts of Mr. F. E. Williams of Cottesloe to start a fishing venture in Shark Bay?

5, If not, will he consider fitting out a suitable vessel for use in Shark Bay on a year's trial manned by an Australian crew to be worked on some share basis?

The MINISTER replied:

1, Yes, to a large extent.

2, Yes.

3, Four vessels at these yards are now being altered to the order of the State Government to render them suitable for fishing.