

news agencies; they are exempt, but if a newsagent is dealing in fancy goods, and it constitutes a part of his business, he also will have to close at six o'clock, the same as other shopkeepers. I do not know that I need say more in explanation of the measure. It is very short, only three or four clauses, and when we get into Committee we can discuss the matter perhaps a little more thoroughly. I have much pleasure in moving—

*That the Bill be now read a second time.*

On motion by Hon. J. D. Connolly, debate adjourned.

*House adjourned at 9.32 p.m.*

## Legislative Assembly,

*Tuesday, 12th December, 1911.*

	PAGE.
Questions omitted from Notice Paper ..	779
Questions: Railway construction, Wickopin-Merredin ..	779
Railway Department, Tickets for Long distance trains, Dining Cars, Great Southern, Kitson Lamps in use ..	779
Drainage Works, Coolup ..	780
Agricultural Department horses ..	780
Education Department, Medical Examination of School Children, Inspector General's absence ..	781
Bills: Hotham-Crossman Railway, 1R. ..	781
Yilliminning-Kondinin Railway, 1R. ..	781
Agricultural Bank Act Amendment, Report ..	781
Shearers' Accommodation, Report ..	781
Workers' Homes, Message, Com. ..	781
Transcontinental Railway, 2R., Com. ..	787
Totalisator Regulation, 2R., Com. ..	803
Parliamentary Allowances Act Amendment, 2R. ..	834

The SPEAKER took the Chair at 2.30 p.m., and read prayers.

### QUESTION—RAILWAY CONSTRUCTION, WICKEPIN-MERREDIN.

Mr. MONGER (without notice) asked the Minister for Works: Will the Minister place on the Table the report of the Advisory Board on the Wickepin-Merre-

din Railway, together with all correspondence referring to same and reports of interviews (if any) and replies given to the various deputations that have waited upon previous Ministers in connection with the said railway?

The MINISTER FOR WORKS replied: I have no objection to placing the papers on the Table.

### QUESTIONS OMITTED FROM NOTICE-PAPER.

Mr. SWAN: I desire to ask, Mr. Speaker, why a series of questions I gave notice of some days ago has been converted into a notice of motion.

Mr. SPEAKER: Because, in view of the questions asked, I deemed it advisable they should take the form of a motion for a return.

Mr. SWAN: Is it not usual to notify members asking questions in that way?

Mr. SPEAKER: No, it is not usual.

### QUESTIONS (3)—RAILWAY DEPARTMENT.

#### *Tickets for Long-distance Trains.*

Mr. BOLTON asked the Minister for Railways: 1, Is the Minister aware that instructions have been issued by the Railway Department which prevent the issue of tickets for country trains or the gold-fields express unless the passenger travels by the connecting train? 2, Does the Minister approve of the instruction that passengers desirous of leaving Fremantle for the country prior to the departure of the connecting train must purchase single tickets to Perth? 3, Will the Minister take steps to stop this unfair centralisation of railway revenue and inconvenience to the travelling public?

The MINISTER FOR RAILWAYS replied: 1, No such instructions have been issued, but country tickets issued at suburban stations are not available for break of journey within the suburban area, *vide* pages 16 and 17 of the Coaching Rates Book. This has been done to prevent fraud. 2 and 3, Answered by No. 1.

*Dining Cars, Great Southern.*

Mr. E. B. JOHNSTON asked the Minister for Railways: 1, Is it the intention of the Government to place dining cars on the Great Southern Railway? 2, If so, is the Minister aware that it would be a great advantage to the public to make the dining cars available as early as possible during this summer?

The MINISTER FOR RAILWAYS replied: 1, Yes, as soon as possible after the existing light rails are replaced by heavy ones right through to Albany. 2, Yes, but as explained in answer No. 1 it is not practicable at present, nor have we the cars available.

*Kitson Lamps in Use.*

Mr. GREEN asked the Minister for Railways: 1, What number of Kitson lamps have been purchased by the Railway Department? 2, Who was responsible for their purchase and when were they purchased? 3, What was the total price paid? 4, How many lamps have been put into use, and where are they in use? 5, Is the Minister aware that they are in use at the Kalgoorlie loco sheds, and that each lamp is so unsatisfactory, that it is liable to go out at any time, and that as a result workmen are in constant danger of falling into the engine-pits? 6, Will the Minister ask for a report on the working of the lamps at Kalgoorlie, and if the report is as suggested, will he authorise the installation of the electric light there to ensure the safety of the men and promote the efficiency of their work?

The MINISTER FOR RAILWAYS replied: 1, 49. 2, (a) They were purchased by the Department after due trial had been made; (b) between September, 1904, and February, 1907. 3, £587 18s. 4, Forty-six have been in use at various times; at present there are 29 in use, as follows: Clackline 2, Beverley 1, Brunswick 2, Geraldton 2, Merredin 1, Southern Cross 4, Narrogin 3, Wagin 2, Kalgoorlie 10, metropolitan regrading 2; total 29. 5 and 6, Arrangements have already been made to instal electric light in the locomotive yard at Kalgoorlie to replace the Kitson lamps.

## QUESTION — DRAINAGE WORKS, COOLUP.

Mr. O'LOGHLEN asked the Minister for Works: 1, Has a petition been received from the workers on the Coolup drainage works? 2, If so, what reply (if any) was sent? 3, Are the local contractors taking out the "dirt" as cheaply as the Government teams working on the drains? What is the cost per yard of "dirt" taken out by Government teams? 4, Will the Minister instruct the foreman of works to give preference to local residents? 5, Has the inquiry promised by the Minister been conducted? If so, what was the result? 6, Has work been refused to local contractors, who did all the deep drainage at a similar price given to others for shallow work? If so, why?

The MINISTER FOR WORKS replied: 1, Yes. 2, Reply was given to deputation which subsequently waited on Minister, who promised to make inquiries. 3, (a) No; (b) ditching machine having only recently started, reliable costs are not yet available, but there is evidence that work by the machine costs considerably less than that obtaining hitherto. Careful costs are being kept. 4, This is the practice. 5, The Minister proposes to make a personal inspection of work before coming to a definite decision. 6, In only one instance, because the contractor had not completed the work on which he was engaged.

## QUESTION — AGRICULTURAL DEPARTMENT HORSES.

Mr. LANDER asked the Minister for Lands: What methods are adopted for— 1, The purchase of horses by the Agricultural Department? 2, The purchase of fodder for feeding same?

The MINISTER FOR LANDS replied: 1, On receipt of an order from the Stores Department horses are purchased privately by the Chief Inspector of Stock himself, or by one of his officers. Suitable animals are selected from the various marts in the City, and occasionally in the country, when offering.

2, Fodder is purchased through the Government Stores Manager from the Government contractor for this line.

to have the first section ready by Christmas. 4, Yes. Each section will be laid on the Table of the House at the earliest opportunity after it has been received.

## QUESTIONS (2)—EDUCATION DEPARTMENT.

*Medical Examination of School Children.*

Mr. E. B. JOHNSTON asked the Minister for Education: 1, Is it the intention of the Government to increase the payment of 1s. per child per year paid to District Medical Officers for the examination of school children? 2, Is the Minister aware that to carry out the medical examination specified by the Education Department takes at least half an hour? 3, Does the Minister propose to see that the medical examination of all school children is carried out in a regular and complete manner in future?

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION replied: 1, The payments are fixed and made by the Department of Public Health. The question has been referred to the Colonial Secretary's Department. 2, No. The medical officers for schools reckon that from six to nine children can be examined in an hour. 3, Arrangements have been made for the examination of every child now attending school. Every child in future is to be examined twice during his or her school career. Children known to be defective, and children specially noted by the teacher, are to be examined at each visit.

### *Inspector General's Absence.*

Mr. HEITMANN asked the Minister for Education: 1, What was the object of the recent trip of the Inspector General of Schools to England and other parts of the world? 2, How long was that gentleman away from Western Australia? 3, Has the Minister yet received a report from the Inspector General? 4, Will the report be laid on the Table?

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION replied: 1, To attend the Imperial Education conference, and to inquire into educational matters in various countries. 2, Eight months. 3, Not yet. The Inspector General is preparing his report now, and will submit it in sections. He expects

## BILL—HOTHAM-CROSSMAN RAILWAY.

Introduced by the Minister for Works and read a first time.

## BILL—YILLIMINNING-KONDININ RAILWAY.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS (Hon. W. D. Johnson) moved—

*That the Bill be read a first time.*

Mr. MONGER (York): Would the Minister for Works present to the House the report of the Advisory Board on this railway so that members might have an opportunity of perusing it?

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: Full information would be submitted and ample time given in which to discuss it.

Question put and passed; Bill read a first time.

## BILL—AGRICULTURAL BANK ACT AMENDMENT.

Report of Committee adopted.

## BILL—SHEARERS' ACCOMMODATION.

Report of Committee adopted.

## BILL—WORKERS' HOMES.

*Message.*

Message received from the Governor recommending that an amendment be made in this Bill as appearing on the Notice Paper.

*In Committee.*

Resumed from the 7th December.

Mr. Holman in the Chair; the Premier in charge of the Bill.

Postponed Clause 6—Workers' homes fund:

The PREMIER moved—

*That Clause 6 be struck out and the following inserted in lieu:—*

*Funds.*

*See 1906, No. 15, s. 15, 16. Q., 1909, No. 10, s. 4, 5.*

6. (1.) *The funds necessary for the effectual execution of this Act shall be such moneys as may be raised by the issue of debentures as hereinafter provided, and such other moneys as may from time to time be appropriated by Parliament for the purpose.*

(2.) *The Governor may raise, by the issue of such debentures, any sum or sums which, together with any moneys appropriated by Parliament, shall not exceed in the whole the sum of two hundred and fifty thousand pounds.*

(3.) *All such moneys shall be placed to the credit of an account at the Treasury, to be called the Workers' Homes Fund, and applied to the purposes of this Act; and such account may be operated upon in the prescribed manner.*

(4.) *The provisions expressed in the schedule to this Act shall apply to all debentures issued under this Act.*

The main object was to provide that the Treasurer might use the Savings Bank funds by issuing debentures as mortgage bonds for the purpose of raising these moneys. It would be seen later on that it was proposed to provide a definite amount on the lines that already existed under the Agricultural Bank Act; the amount would be £250,000, and it would be necessary for Parliament from time to time, if required, to give further powers to the Treasurer to appropriate above that amount. The moneys refunded would be used for the purpose of redeeming the debentures. This was in conformity with the provisions which were operating under the Agricultural Bank Act, and the leader of the Opposition would know well what those provisions were.

Mr. FRANK WILSON: The Premier's desire to amend this clause could be appreciated; at the same time it had to be admitted that it was hardly possible for

members to peruse the two sheets of closely printed matter in order to get a full grasp of the intention of the clauses. The Premier ought to have postponed the consideration of these clauses until the following day. Of course if he adopted the principle which was in vogue in connection with the Agricultural Bank Act not much harm could be done, because the principle was a good one. The sum of £250,000 was going to be appropriated and that would be the capital to commence with for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of the measure. The Premier was to be commended for having done that, namely, fixed the capital, and the amount could be increased from time to time as the scheme advanced, and then he was going to use the repayments for the purpose of redeeming the debentures issued by the trustees or the board. Was the Premier going to confine himself to taking money from the Savings Bank funds, or was he going to take Loan funds, which might be voted on the Loan Estimates by Parliament?

The Premier: Take either.

Mr. FRANK WILSON: If the Premier was going to take Savings Bank funds he would be all right so long as he was confining himself to those funds, but if he was going to appropriate Loan funds, such funds carried a sinking fund. The position ought to be safeguarded so that when Loan Funds were utilised they ought not to carry the ordinary sinking fund payments, otherwise we would be in the position of paying twice over. Perhaps the Attorney General could assist the Premier by putting in a few words to safeguard the position, such as, "Provided always if Loan Funds are utilised there shall be no sinking fund," or, at any rate, the sinking fund ought to be paid from the repayments by the board. The Premier would require all the funds at his disposal to carry out the policy of his party, and therefore he did not want to be in the position of paying twice over for the redemption.

The PREMIER: There would be no danger from the position which the hon. member would lead the Committee to believe might exist. In the first place, the

sinking fund that had to be provided from Consolidated Revenue on our general loan was paid to trustees in London, and invested by those trustees, and the Treasurer could not at any time touch it. The moneys to be repaid under these provisions would be held by the Treasurer in trust, and, if necessary, the Treasurer could invest these trust funds in any desirable direction.

Mr. Frank Wilson: You said you would have to redeem the bonds.

The PREMIER: The moneys held in trust by the Treasurer would be called upon to redeem those bonds, or debentures as they were called. But where Loan funds were used it would not be necessary to draw upon the trust fund, because the redemption would then be covered by sinking fund. The same provision existed in the Agricultural Bank Act, and was not operating unfairly. It was not a new departure at all. We could only raise money by means of these debentures, and when we had exhausted the £250,000 we would require to come back to Parliament and ask for an increase of capital, just as in the case of the Agricultural Bank.

Mr. FRANK WILSON: The provision that, after payment of interest due on the debentures, and the expenses of administration, all moneys received by the board should be carried to redemption of debentures, was all right so long as they were special debentures. But if Parliament were to appropriate loan funds to the purposes of the measure then those moneys would carry a sinking fund, unless the Treasurer were to bring down a special loan authorisation. If that was the Treasurer's intention all opposition would cease.

The Premier: But we must pay the sinking fund.

Mr. FRANK WILSON: Not if special provision were made in the Bill. The Treasurer ought to define what he was going to do with the funds which would be paid to him. We should not be called upon to pay twice over.

The Premier: That would not be necessary.

Mr. FRANK WILSON: Under the Bill it was necessary to redeem the loan, while under the General Loan Act it was necessary to pay sinking fund.

The PREMIER: The repayments made would be paid into a trust fund to be operated on by the Treasurer, and provision was made that the Treasurer might use Savings Bank funds, loan funds, or revenue. The debentures would cover General Loan Fund, as well as bonds issued on the Savings Bank, and it was only in respect to the Savings Bank debentures that provision was made for an annual drawing to redeem those debentures. The balance would be redeemed under the provisions of the General Loan Act. Under special direction the Parliamentary Draftsman had framed the proposed new clause so as to give opportunity of disposing of the repayments in the manner desired by the leader of the Opposition, and at the same time to permit of the use of any funds Parliament might appropriate for the purposes of the measure. These funds would not be repaid a second time.

Mr. FRANK WILSON: It seemed the Treasurer was somewhat mixed over this matter. Any repayment made to the Treasurer had to be utilised for the redemption of bonds, and the Treasurer could not do as he liked with it.

The Premier: Another clause provides that he may.

Mr. FRANK WILSON: Provision was made for the annual drawings, indeed it was a specific instruction that the bonds should be redeemed. The other clauses were simply to allow the Treasurer to handle the money in the meantime. It was not that the country was going to be robbed of any money, it was simply overburdening the Consolidated Revenue Fund for the time being. The institution itself was finding the money to redeem the debentures by annual drawings, notwithstanding which the Consolidated Revenue Fund would be charged up with the sinking fund contribution provided under the General Loan Act.

The Premier: We would not issue special debentures except through the Savings Bank.

Mr. FRANK WILSON: Why not?

The Premier: Why should we, when we can get it from the General Loan Fund?

Mr. FRANK WILSON: What would be done about the repayments?

The Premier: Just the same as to-day.

Mr. FRANK WILSON: If £250,000 were included in the Loan Estimates to provide the capital, what would be done with the repayment of that sum? The repayments would have to go to redeem the bonds. The Treasurer would lend himself £250,000 out of General Loan Fund, and issue bonds to himself as Treasurer for the redemption; and as he received the repayments he would redeem those bonds. But in the meantime he would have paid from the Consolidated Revenue the sinking fund on the £250,000 raised. It was a wrong principle that we should be called upon to pay twice over.

The PREMIER: It was not desirable to continue to bandy arguments across the Chamber in connection with this matter. Apparently the leader of the Opposition was desirous of lending assistance, while he (the Premier) desired to have the measure perfected. Consequently he would have the matter looked into before the Bill passed another place and, if there was found to be anything in the point raised by the hon. member, steps would be taken to remedy the limitation.

New clause put and passed.

New clause—Holdings may be surrendered and workers' dwellings acquired:

The PREMIER moved—

*That the following be added to stand as Clause 44:—“(1) Any person being the holder of land for an estate in fee simple may, with the approval of the Minister, upon the recommendation of the Board, surrender such land to His Majesty at a price to be agreed upon between such person and the Board, and thereupon such land shall be dedicated in manner aforesaid to the purposes of this Act. (2) The Minister may, under and subject to Part III. of this Act, erect a dwelling-house on any such*

*land, and dispose of the same, as a worker's dwelling, to the person by whom the land was surrendered.*

This was in accordance with a promise given that opportunity should be furnished for an owner of land in fee simple to come under the operation of Clause 3 by handing over the land to the board at a price to be decided, and then making application for a worker's dwelling to be erected on what had been his fee simple land, for which he would afterwards pay 3 per cent. per annum. It would assist materially in providing them with funds for the payment of instalments off the cost of the building, or they could retain it for the purpose of making further improvements if they so desired.

Mr. GEORGE: In Part IV. the board might make advances to any worker for the purpose of erecting a dwelling-house on his holding. The new clause seemed to give a preference to those holders of the fee simple who came under Part III. A person might be very desirous of having a worker's home, and also of keeping his land, but under this clause it practically meant that a person surrendering his estate might have a better chance of getting his house than if he kept the land for himself.

The PREMIER: There was no preference to a person to become a Crown tenant. By surrendering his holding he contracted to continually pay to the Crown rental for the use of his ground. It was true he obtained payment for the value of the land, but after that he contracted to pay the rental for the use of the land in the same way as if he had never owned it. He was placed in the same position as an applicant under Part III would be. This provision was purely to meet the request of the committee that if a person desired to surrender his land and come under Part III. he should be able to do so.

Mr. GEORGE: The insertion of the clause would practically give people to understand that those who came under Part III. would have a better chance of getting their houses erected than if they

remained under Part IV. If the meaning of the Government was that there should be no preference—

The Premier: Absolutely none.

Mr. GEORGE: If that was so then the clause was all right. In speaking on the second reading he had stated that the Premier had said during the election campaign that he required 51 payments of £3 10s. each as repayment for every £100 that might be advanced. That assertion had been challenged by the Minister for Works, who had stated that the Premier had never made that remark and had never been so reported. Those remarks were made, however on 7th August, and reported in the *West Australian* on 8th August, and also in the *Vanguard*.

The PREMIER: The clause gave no preference except to the extent that if a holder of land in fee simple preferred to come under Part III. he might surrender his land to the board, obtain payment according to a figure to be decided upon, and then become a Crown tenant and pay 3 per cent. on the unimproved value of the land for all time for the use of it. In no part of the Act was there any distinction whatever. It provided for the erection of dwellings on Crown lands, for the advancing of money to lift mortgages, and for the advancement of money for the erection of buildings on land held in fee simple.

Mr. A. N. Piesse: For worker or non-worker?

The PREMIER: Only for workers. The hon. member could not come under the Act.

Mr. TAYLOR: If a person was the holder of land in fee simple, and the board decided to take over that land, that in itself suggested that the building would proceed without delay. For instance, the Government might have land of their own, and there might be numerous applications for workers homes, but he took it that if a man surrendered his land there would be no delay in putting up his buildings.

New clause put and passed.

New schedule:

The PREMIER moved that the following new schedule be inserted:—

#### THE SCHEDULE:

*Provisions applicable to Debentures issued under this Act.*

##### 1. Debentures—

(a) Shall be made out at the Treasury in such manner, form, and denominations as the Governor may direct; and

(b) Shall be signed by the Colonial Treasurer, and registered in the Treasury and by the Auditor General; and

(c) Shall be payable to the bearer or to the order of the person named in the debenture on presentation at or after the due date thereof (being a period not greater than twenty years from the date of the debenture); and

(d) Shall bear interest at a rate not exceeding four pounds per centum per annum, to be computed from the day on which the debenture shall be issued and bear date, and such interest shall be payable half-yearly on presentation of the debenture.

2. The principal sum and interest for which any debenture may be issued shall be a charge upon and be paid out of moneys arising from the operation of this Act, and so far as funds for the payment of any such principal sum and interest shall not be available under the operations of this Act, any such sum or interest shall be chargeable upon and paid out of the Consolidated Revenue Fund.

3. All the said debentures when due, and all interest thereon, shall be payable by the Colonial Treasurer at the place mentioned for such payment on the face of the debenture.

4. All interest, income, and repayments received by the Board under this Act, shall, subject as hereinafter provided, be held by the Colonial Treasurer in trust to repay the principal and interest moneys secured by such debentures.

5. (1) After providing for the payment of interest due on the debentures issued under the authority of this Act, and for the expenses of administration, all moneys received by the Board in

respect of leases, and in repayment of advances with interest, or otherwise under this Act, shall be carried to a Redemption Account, and the said funds shall be applied in the following manner to the redemption of the debentures issued under this Act:—

(a) The debentures shall be redeemed by annual drawings in every year after the expiration of six years from date of first issue thereof.

(b) A day shall be appointed by the Colonial Treasurer for the said drawing, of which not less than fourteen days' notice shall be given by advertisement in two daily papers published in the State, and the said notice shall specify the day on which, and the hour and place at which, the drawing will take place, and the nominal value of the debentures to be redeemed at that drawing.

(c) On the day and at the hour and place so specified, the Colonial Treasurer shall, in the presence of any debenture holders who may think fit to attend, draw by lot out of the whole number of debentures that have been in circulation six years, debentures of the nominal value specified in the said notice.

(d) The Colonial Treasurer shall thereupon declare the distinguishing numbers of the debentures drawn for redemption, and shall, as soon as possible, give notice thereof in two daily papers published in the State; and the principal moneys secured by the said debentures so distinguished, together with the interest due thereon, shall be payable on demand to the holders thereof, at the Treasury, on the day on which the then current half-year's interest is payable.

(2) The moneys standing to the credit of the Redemption Account shall be invested by the Colonial Treasurer in such securities as trust funds may be lawfully invested by trustees, and in the meantime shall bear interest at a rate to be fixed from time to time by the Governor.

6. From and after the day appointed for the repayment of any debentures, all interest on the principal moneys secured thereby shall cease and determine, whether payment of the principal has or has not been demanded.

7. Upon the repayment of the principal moneys secured by the debentures which have been withdrawn from circulation in the manner aforesaid, the said debentures shall be forthwith forwarded by the Colonial Treasurer to the Auditor General, who shall, in the presence of the Colonial Treasurer, cause the said debentures to be destroyed.

8. Any such debentures may be negotiated, sold, or disposed of by the Colonial Treasurer, who may fix the limit of price below which the said debentures shall not be negotiated, sold, or disposed of.

9. (1.) In case any debenture shall by any accident be defaced, the Colonial Treasurer may, on such debenture being delivered to him, cause a new debenture to be issued and delivered to the holder of such defaced debenture in lieu of the debenture so defaced, and the debenture so defaced shall be cancelled by the Colonial Treasurer in the presence of the Auditor General.

(2) The debenture so to be issued in lieu thereof shall have a like currency, and shall in all respects be subject to the same rules, regulations, and provisions as by this Act are declared of and concerning the debentures in substitution for which such new debenture shall be issued as aforesaid, and shall bear the same number, date, and amount, and bear the like interest, as the debenture so cancelled bore respectively.

10. In case proof shall be made to the satisfaction of the Colonial Treasurer, by statutory declaration or otherwise, that any debenture has by casualty or mischance been lost, or destroyed, the Colonial Treasurer may cause the principal and interest moneys due upon such debenture so lost or destroyed to be paid, as the same respectively be-

come due, to the person claiming to have been the last holder of the said debenture, in like manner as if the original debenture had been brought in and paid off:

*Provided that the person so receiving the principal money and interest in respect of such debenture alleged to have been lost or destroyed, shall give security to the satisfaction of the Colonial Treasurer against any lawful claim that may be made upon the Colonial Treasurer or the Government in respect of the debenture so alleged to have been lost or destroyed.*

The Schedule dealt wholly with the raising of funds and the disposal of them. The amendment had been put in the form of a Schedule in order not to cause too great an interference with the Bill as printed, but the provisions would have exactly the same force as a clause in the Bill would have.

Schedule put and passed.

Title—agreed to.

Bill reported with amendments.

## BILL—TRANSCONTINENTAL RAILWAY.

### *Second Reading.*

Debate resumed from 7th December.

Mr. FRANK WILSON (Sussex): I am glad indeed to see that we have now to pass a measure authorising the Commonwealth Government to construct this railway. Western Australia has been waiting for the past 11 years for proper communication with the Eastern States of the Commonwealth, and I say at once that all Federal Governments that have been in existence since the establishment of the Commonwealth have been remiss in respect of the construction of this great work. I recognise that there have been many difficulties from time to time in preventing one Government and another from carrying out, at any rate, the implied promise to Western Australia that this railway should be constructed as early as possible, and therefore I do not think it behoves us on this occasion

to indulge in recriminations. Rather would I take the opportunity of congratulating all and sundry who have been parties to the passing of the measure, which will ultimately result in binding Western Australia to the Eastern States by railway. I congratulate the Fisher Government certainly, because it has fallen to their lot to actually pass the Bill, and whilst we may say in passing that it was only their duty to do so, we are also perfectly justified in giving them our sincerest congratulations because they have at any rate passed the measure and will, I hope, initiate the construction of the work. All West Australian members of the Federal Parliament have, so far as I remember, consistently fought for the carrying out of this work, and I take some little exception to the Premier invidiously referring to some representatives and leaving others out.

Mr. Underwood: What about the invidious reports in the *West Australian* in past years.

Mr. FRANK WILSON: I do not know to what the hon. member refers. He bellows before he is hurt. Perhaps later on he will tell us what those reports are. I should like to congratulate not only the members referred to by the Premier, but also those Liberal representatives, Sir John Forrest, Mr. Hedges, and Mr. Fowler; and I may say all members, Labour and Liberal, who have represented Western Australia during the last 11 years, have fought consistently for the construction of this work.

The Premier: It is not comparable. The Labour members stumped the Eastern States for this Bill, whilst the others slept quiet.

Mr. FRANK WILSON: I do not think it can be said that Sir John Forrest slept quiet. He has always advocated this railway wherever he has been. At any rate, I want to return my thanks to all the members. I think our best thanks are due to them all. They have done the best they could in the circumstances, and I only regret the work was not commenced years ago.

Mr. Carpenter: If Sir John Forrest had raised his finger it would have been carried five years ago.

Mr. FRANK WILSON: I do not think Sir John Forrest has ever put his finger down, it has always been raised; therefore we should have had the railway before, according to that argument. But I think every member recognises that the opposition of the Eastern States has been pretty bitter, and that members representing several of the Eastern States and also the Eastern Press have always been against it, especially so in Victoria. I remember article after article in strong and pronounced language condemning the "desert railway," and the idea of coupling up Western Australia with the Eastern States of the Commonwealth was supposed to be that of a madman, indeed it was thought a crime for the Commonwealth to entertain such an idea.

The Premier: Some of the local members have been pretty strong in their language as to the Esperance railway.

Mr. FRANK WILSON: We shall have the opportunity of discussing the Esperance railway later, but there is no need to point out there is no analogy between the two works. South Australia was also half-hearted; indeed she seemed more anxious in the years gone by to get rid of the Northern Territory and some of her non-paying railways than to assist in building up the Commonwealth by bringing Western Australia into closer union with the Eastern States.

Mr. Underwood: The Northern Territory did not belong to South Australia.

Mr. FRANK WILSON: It did not belong to Western Australia.

Mr. Underwood: It belonged to Australia. South Australia was only looking after the Northern Territory for us.

Mr. FRANK WILSON: Then how is she getting so many millions in exchange for the Northern Territory? Members fail to realise that Western Australia is to participate in the cost of acquiring the Northern Territory and the railways handed over with it and half the cost of developing that territory. I think South Australia were very dog-in-the-manger in their policy which pre-

vented them from giving whole-hearted support to the efforts Western Australia, through her representatives, was making towards having this work carried out. However, I am happy to think we have some friends in the Eastern States, and that there are many good and true friends who believe with us that we are entitled to the railway being constructed, and believe with us that we will never have the Federal compact properly consummated, or that fellowship and close relationship which is essential towards building up a great nation, until we have railway communication. Commerce demands the construction of the line, and Federal union and safety demand it likewise. The reports of Lord Kitchener, to which the Premier referred, and of Admiral Henderson, have borne out this fact in unmistakable language. Their language is very pronounced—that for the defence of the Commonwealth the railway is a necessity. I think these reports, if perused by hon. members, will demonstrate to the fullest extent that what Western Australia has been asking for, and what she thought she was promised when we joined the Federal compact, is an absolute necessity in the interests of the Commonwealth as a whole. Sentiment I always maintain is a very great factor in the making of a nation, and it certainly appeals to me that the sentiment of brotherhood that ought to exist between two portions of the Commonwealth, no matter how far apart they may be, can only be cultivated by closer intercourse; and close intercourse between man and man and between peoples and peoples cannot be got unless proper means of communication are provided. So there we have at once a work which I think we can all rejoice is to be shortly initiated. Authority has been given for its construction, and we can whole-heartedly support any legislation necessary in this Chamber for the purpose of enabling the Commonwealth Government to carry it out. With regard to the route of the line, many people have ventured opinions as to where the railway should run, and, of late months, articles have been written

very prominently drawing attention to the suggestion that the line should go via Norseman, leaving Kalgoorlie away to the north and passing right across the continent to the border, thus coupling up with the line that will be constructed from Port Augusta via Tarcoola. As far as I am concerned—and I believe I am voicing the opinion of the great majority of members in this House—Kalgoorlie cannot be left out, cannot be missed. I do not care what Government are in power, we do not want to follow the example of the Russians when they constructed the trans-Siberian railway. I understand corruption was so rife that unless the local municipalities conferred large bonuses on the surveyors they were left out in the cold and the line went past them a considerable distance away. I understand they left centres of population out and ultimately had to couple them up with spur lines running back to these different towns.

Mr. Underwood: What harm would it do Kalgoorlie?

Mr. FRANK WILSON: It would do Kalgoorlie the greatest possible harm, and it would do the greatest possible harm to the State as a whole. Centres of population must always be served by our railway lines. It stands to reason we cannot possibly expect the same traffic if passengers wishing to travel from our goldfields to the Eastern States have to take the train back to Coolgardie and thence south to Norseman before they can couple up with the through mail train to the Eastern States. Again, the most of the goldfields traffic now carried on the narrow gauge will be taken on the broad gauge. Would anyone tell me that our own people are not to be considered? What about the people that travel to the goldfields centres, going backwards and forwards every week over the existing railway? Are they not to have the opportunity for travelling and the facilities provided by a broad-gauge railway? It stands to reason that we must cater, in fixing the route of this Transcontinental railway, for the requirements of our people travelling within our own borders, as well as for the re-

quirements of those who wish to make the through journey.

The Premier: Do you not see that we can junction only at Kalgoorlie?

Mr. FRANK WILSON: I understand that very well, but I was merely referring to the agitation for another route. I am supporting the Bill as it is printed; I am not supporting the Bill as some hon. members may wish to have it amended. The intercolonial mails must be picked up at all towns en route, otherwise mails would have to be made up in populous centres, Kalgoorlie, Kanowna, and Coolgardie, and even as far as Menzies, and transhipped to Norseman before they could be put on the railway either to go west to Perth or east to the other States. Again, we have had held out as a great possibility for many years past that passengers landing at Fremantle and purposing to go to the Eastern States will undoubtedly many of them break their journey. The glory of the Golden Mile has not yet departed, I am thankful to say, though it has diminished somewhat; and I am quite satisfied that many hundreds of passengers, travellers going through to the Eastern States, will get off, go overland and break their journey, not only at the capital city of Perth, but also at Kalgoorlie to see the renowned gold mines of Western Australia. And that is all trade for Western Australia; it is a good advertisement for us. Certainly it would be an absolute fault if any suggestion were made to alter the route from Kalgoorlie.

Mr. Turvey: That was settled long ago.

Mr. FRANK WILSON: We never know what is settled when an agitation is strong enough to make an alteration. I am commending the Bill inasmuch as it makes Kalgoorlie the junction between the Commonwealth railway and the State system. I have just glanced casually through the reports which have been made in connection with this scheme, and I think Western Australia is to be congratulated on the fact that, whilst there is a considerable amount of very second-rate and third-class land in South Australia to be passed through—in fact I

may call it sandy country, very poor country indeed—the reports show that, so far as Western Australia is concerned, the land between Kalgoorlie and the border, the land to be traversed by this railway, is fairly good almost right through, with the exception of about 40 miles. There is about 40 miles of poor sandy country, and all the rest is good pastoral country and timber country, and I think we in Western Australia ought to be congratulated upon this fact that there is a very great possibility of a big traffic ultimately resulting from the nature of the country the line passes through. We have about 460 miles to traverse to the border which is pretty well level all the way, as members know who have been out back from Kalgoorlie, and the formation is principally what is known as surface formation. The immense timber belts immediately adjacent to Kalgoorlie and the Golden Mile and running some distance to the east will be of great value inasmuch as they must bring traffic to the line. Generally speaking, we can congratulate ourselves that the reports show that the big limestone formation extending about 300 miles in Western Australia and over the border into South Australia is all good pastoral country provided we can find sufficient water. During my time as a member of the previous Administration, we spent something like £30,000 in finding artesian water for the purpose of inducing the Commonwealth to hasten the construction of this railway.

The Premier: You were going to build it.

Mr. FRANK WILSON: I would have built it. Even now I would attempt to build it.

The Premier: You cannot find anything on record as to that, excepting the Governor's Speech.

Mr. FRANK WILSON: I am glad to think fairly good water was discovered. It goes to show that where water has once been discovered, artesian water, in that huge limestone basin, there will be no difficulty in getting sufficient water, at any rate for railway purposes, throughout that 300 miles of our portion of the route. As for the State constructing the railway,

if I may be permitted to digress for a moment, I say at once that I would have much preferred to construct the railway ourselves right to the border. I do not believe in the dual system of railway ownership. I would far sooner see the State owning the whole of her railway system and not have a dual authority as we will have in these circumstances.

The Premier: There is no dual authority.

Mr. FRANK WILSON: We must have dual authority; at any rate there will be dual ownership; and there will be dual authority to this extent that we must run the same rolling stock that comes over the Commonwealth portion of the line.

The Premier: They do that in the other States now, and there is no dual authority.

Mr. FRANK WILSON: But it is always the cause of difficulties cropping up.

The Premier: No.

Mr. FRANK WILSON: If you are travelling from Adelaide to Melbourne you must get off the train to get a dinner at night because there is no dining car, and you get your dining car on for breakfast next morning because Victoria will not send it to South Australia.

The Premier: That is inter-State jealousy.

Mr. FRANK WILSON: There are exactly the same jealousies now. For that reason and because there will be a lot of difficulty in the running of the system which is partly owned by the States and partly by the Commonwealth, I would have preferred to see the State the sole owner of the whole of this railway system. I admit that the probabilities are that the Commonwealth Government will have to ask Western Australia to take over the running of the line for a year or two, and I can see suggestions being thrown out that the Commonwealth shall establish its own works and also that it shall have its own Railway Department to run its portion of the railway system.

The Premier: We are pretty busy with our own works.

Mr. FRANK WILSON: I do not know that the hon. member has put any new works in hand.

The Premier: We did a little more than you.

Mr. FRANK WILSON: There is the football barracker again. I desire to conclude my remarks by making reference to the survey and to commend, and I think I am justified in doing so, our State surveyors, Mr. Muir, the superintendent of surveys, and more particularly Mr. Anketell, the surveyor in charge of this work. Hon. members may not know that these gentlemen carried out the survey covering a distance of 455 miles in three months. They did it at the rate of seven miles a day and it was a record in survey work. When we realise that the South Australian officers took over eight months to cover 608 miles, which, of course, was no mean work, and I do not want to make any invidious comparison, yet we must commend our surveyors and give them credit because they have not had sufficient recognition for what they have performed. In South Australia I believe there were more difficulties to overcome, there were stretches of sand plain which naturally took more time to cover in the selection of a proper route. The gauge of 4ft. 8½in. appeals to me strongly. I think we should have made a huge mistake if we had listened for one moment to the suggestion which emanated from South Australia that the line should be constructed on the narrow gauge.

Mr. O'Loughlen: It was 5ft. 3in.

Mr. FRANK WILSON: It was 3ft. 6in. in the first instance, and the suggestion of 5ft. 3in. came subsequently from Victoria. Again, I think we would have made a huge mistake if the Commonwealth Government had conceded the point with regard to the 5ft. 3in. gauge. I am satisfied that from the 4ft. 8½in. gauge, which is the standard of the old country and the United States of America and elsewhere, we shall get all the speed we require, and we can get the heavy rolling stock necessary to carry the traffic satisfactorily, and we shall also be in line with the principal countries of the civilised world. There are only two points in this small measure, which consists of only three clauses, to which reference might be made at this stage. With

regard to the land to be given I might say that I regret the Premier has not carried out his promise with regard to the paragraph which appeared in the *West Australian* wherein he was reported to have stated that Sir Newton Moore had promised to the Commonwealth Government 25 miles on each side of the railway line. Whilst we are prepared and whilst I endorse the remarks the Premier made in this connection that he will deal generously with the Commonwealth Government, I hope that in giving the Crown lands necessary for the construction and maintenance of the railway, the Government will not countenance anything in the way of the land-grab policy such as was mentioned by the then Minister for Home Affairs some eighteen months or two years ago. It stands to reason that we cannot have a State within a State; it would be disastrous to the prosperity of our State and it would be much more disastrous than any dual control.

Mr. O'Loughlen: The people would still own it.

Mr. FRANK WILSON: The Commonwealth would own it. Western Australia through its Parliament would have no say, and I maintain that so long as we have local Government we must control our own territory. I do not think from the Premier's remarks that he, at any rate, is imbued with any idea of going beyond what he has stated, and that is to give them all the land necessary but not one rood more. I hope that the depth which has been prescribed in the measure will be omitted. To specify that we shall give 200 feet in depth I think is too much. It is unnecessary, and it practically means that if we should discover minerals along any portion of the route of this line we will be barred from mining within 200 feet of the surface.

The Premier: Suppose they wanted to go more than 200 feet for water.

Mr. FRANK WILSON: I would give them permission to go as deep as they liked for water. The last bore we put down I think was 450 feet deep. Anyhow this will not interfere with the question of water and if they want to put down a number of bores I am quite sure the

Premier will only have to introduce to Parliament a small measure to give them the necessary power. I hope in Committee the Premier will agree to the usual limitation, which is prescribed in our mining leases—I think it is 40 feet. I believe that would be sufficient, and if not it could be increased. With these few exceptions the Bill meets with my cordial support, and again I say I am only too proud to think that at least we are to be brought directly into touch with the Eastern States, and in that way we shall be able much better than we can do at the present time, to take our part in the public affairs of the Commonwealth, and assist to make a big nation of Australia as a whole.

Mr. UNDERWOOD (Pilbara): I have just a few exceptions to take to the remarks of the leader of the Opposition. In speaking of those who helped to carry this Bill through the Federal Parliament the leader of the Opposition was very indignant because the names of certain liberal members had not been mentioned.

Mr. Frank Wilson: And a few labour members also.

Mr. UNDERWOOD: Quite so. I would like to call his attention to the fact that the leader of the Opposition in the Senate, Senator Millen, moved a resolution that this railway should stand over indefinitely, and he was supported practically by every liberal member of that House. I am sure that if this State had had to wait until the Liberals constructed the railway none of us in this Parliament would have been alive to see it carried through. The Right Hon. Sir John Forrest no doubt did much work through the columns of the *West Australian*, and I think, in fact I am sure, that is about where it ended as well as where it commenced. There is no doubt that hon. member has received any amount of praise from the press of this State, because the Premier of this State did not go out of his way to praise him. We have this fact that Sir John Forrest was a member of the Liberal Ministry for many years, and the farthest that Ministry got was to say that if the proposal did not appear in the Governor's Speech they

would be very disappointed. In regard to South Australia I wish to say one or two words in fairness to that State, in reply to the remarks of the leader of the Opposition. I contend that Australia should be grateful to South Australia for the work that State did in connection with the Northern Territory. As a matter of fact the Northern Territory never belonged to South Australia, it was really held by the Colonial Office in England, and South Australia took over the management of it, expended some millions of pounds there, and, further, kept it for a white Australia. If South Australia had not done that and if that portion of the continent had been allowed to remain under the control of the Colonial Office I have not the slightest shadow of doubt that there would be in the Northern Territory now an Asiatic province, and to attempt to sneer at South Australia I think certainly shows want of gratitude for the work that State did in connection with the Territory for the good of all Australia. Just one other point with regard to Kalgoorlie. It seems to be a pitiable thing that we cannot discuss a big proposition to bind a number of the States together and, as the leader of the Opposition said, to promote the brotherhood of Australia to defend this great continent, without coming down to little parochial matters, as to which town the railway is going to run to. As a matter of fact I trust the Government will go thoroughly into the question of the route of this line, and if it can be shown that the railway will be an advantage to Western Australia by leaving Kalgoorlie out altogether, then I think Kalgoorlie should be left out. I think this railway is being built for greater purposes than for the convenience of Kalgoorlie or any other town in this continent. As a matter of fact I fail to see what advantage Kalgoorlie is going to receive from this train running through that town. We will always have to run our trains to Kalgoorlie, and the interstate line will not be able to carry any of the Kalgoorlie traffic. It will be practically an interstate train and it will run straight through Kalgoorlie. If anyone desires to go up and see those

great mines at Kalgoorlie they can go there just as they go now; on the other hand it would take just as long to go to Kalgoorlie by the overland express, and wait in Kalgoorlie to return by the next one. Of course the leader of the Opposition has pointed out what a great advertisement it will be and that brings us back to the point that some people seem to imagine that running a State is synonymous with being an advertising agent. I am of opinion that some people, instead of being politicians, should have been advertising agents for a soap factory. However, I trust the Government will thoroughly consider this question, and that, if it can be shown that it will be of advantage to the State so to do, the line will be kept away from Kalgoorlie.

Mr. CARPENTER (Fremantle): It was with extreme pleasure I noticed that the Premier, on behalf of the Government and the State, had sent a message of congratulation to the Fisher Government, and to the members who represent Western Australia in the Federal Parliament when the Bill for the construction of the line was finally passed. It is characteristic of the elector, as I have observed him, that while he will enthuse a good deal for the purpose of obtaining certain legislation, as soon as the particular Bill becomes law, he seems to lose sight of the importance of the object for which he has been struggling. There is not, as a rule, much expression of gratitude on the part of any body of electors once they have obtained what for years they have been fighting for, and I have been somewhat surprised that, apart from the message of congratulation to which I have referred, there has not been something more in the way of congratulation on the part of the West Australian people that this measure, for which we have waited so long, and professed to be so anxious, has at last become law. I refer, of course, to the Bill for the construction of the line. The leader of the Opposition in the course of his remarks stated that in his opinion all the Federal Governments had been remiss in their attitude towards the construction of the trans-Australian railway. It is easy to form that opinion if we look at the matter purely from our own State point of

view; but, may I say as one who has had opportunities of ascertaining just what the difficulties were, and how great were the objections raised against this work, and how strong the influences brought to bear upon representatives of other States in order to prevent the carrying of the trans-Australian Railway Bill—having been in this position, permit me to state that so far from their having been remissness, it has been a surprise to me that, with all these influences against this great project, we have, at this comparatively early stage of our Federal experience, been able to secure the passing of the Bill for the construction of the line. Day after day while the measure was before the Federal Parliament a powerful journal like the *Age* denounced what it stigmatised as “the desert railway” in the strongest possible terms, referring to the representatives of Western Australia, who were doing their best to secure support for the Bill, as men who were selling their votes in a venal market; and those who know the *Age* know that the average so-called Liberal elector pays a good deal of attention to what that journal has to say. I repeat that it surprised me that some of the members of the Federal Parliament, particularly the Victorian members, were courageous enough to act in face of the opposition of that journal and vote for the construction of this railway. Then we had the dead weight of the opposition of those States which appeared to have no particular interest in the construction of the line. A majority of the Queensland members have been always antagonistic to its construction. This was not so much because they did not want to see it built; but their argument was “What interest have we in a work of that sort, and why should we be called upon to contribute towards the four million sterling which will be spent on its construction?” During the course of a visit to Queensland I found this feeling obtaining, not only among the Federal members and State members, but among the people of Queensland generally.

Mr. O’Loghlen: They were disappointed at not getting the kink in the Oodnadatta line.

Mr. CARPENTER : That was not then under discussion. I think it was merely that they did not recognise the Federal idea. It was simply the lack of Federal spirit. It is to me a matter for wonder that the legislators in our Federal Parliament have shown themselves to be sufficiently good Australians to put through this measure in the eleventh year of the existence of Federation. Something was said with reference to the parts the various parties had played in the carrying of the Bill for the construction of the line. I am free to confess that we owe its comparatively early construction very largely to what may be called the exigencies of party Government; that many members of the Federal Parliament voted for the Bill on the first occasion out of a sense of loyalty to their party, and, having done this once, when their Government were in office, they could not well go back on their first vote, and so they continued to support the measure on subsequent occasions. In the first few years of the Commonwealth, although it was stated that this railway had been promised to Western Australia conditionally on her entering the Federation, there was no written evidence of any responsible public man east of our borders having given any such promise; and when we referred to the fact that this had been held out as a bait, the question was always asked, "Who had authority to give such a promise"? We could point to no one except, perhaps, Sir Frederick Holder, the then Premier of South Australia, who, in conversation with someone from Western Australia, had, it seemed, made a statement to that effect. As a member of the first Federal Parliament I had the honour of introducing a deputation to the Prime Minister asking for a definite statement in regard to the construction of the line; and that deputation secured the first definite promise that a survey of the route would be made if the Government could carry the Bill. In my opinion the honour of having done the biggest share of the preliminary work should be given to the Watson Government. While it is true that the Deakin Government introduced the Survey Bill, it is also true that little or no effort was made to carry it through.

The Watson Government did more actual work for the pushing on of this railway in the three months during which they occupied the Ministerial benches than the other Government, their predecessors, had done in three years. Something was said by the leader of the Opposition in regard to the work Sir John Forrest has done. I am aware that to a great many people of the State Sir John Forrest is someone who ought never to be attacked by anyone at all. I have no desire to attack him, but I agree with the member for Pilbara that attempts have been, and still are being made, to give nearly all the credit for this work to one man, whereas that credit is not rightly his. I interjected when the hon. member was speaking that if Sir John Forrest had raised his finger the Bill for the construction of this line would have been carried five years earlier.

Mr. O'Loughlen: By the Reid Government.

Mr. CARPENTER: I have made that statement in public before and I now make it here. The circumstances were these: the Bill had gone through the House of Representatives, and we know that in the Senate also the members were prepared to pass it. It was simply a question of the Bill being sent on by the Reid Government in time to give the Senate a chance of considering it and passing it. Had that been done the Bill for the survey of the line would have been passed at that time. The Reid Government had come into office with a majority of one, Sir John Forrest being that one. In connection with another measure, a member of the House who had a particular interest in the Bill said to the Reid Government "unless you pass that Bill and send it on to the Senate I shall cross the floor of the House." No sooner was the threat made than the particular Bill went through and was sent to the Senate. Sir John Forrest had the power to do the same thing in respect to the Survey Bill, but on that occasion at least he put his party before the interests of his State. He held his peace, and, while we were there in a minority of one, begging the Prime Minister to send the Survey Bill on, he snapped his fingers at us, and Sir John Forrest, who had the

power to insist on the passing of the Bill, sat back and smiled, and nothing was done. I have said before, and I repeat, that Sir John Forrest was more ambitious to carry the Bill himself, than he was anxious to see it carried. It is only fair to the party to which I belong to say that I have never known anyone sacrifice the interests of his State to his party in the way Sir John Forrest did on that particular occasion. I may say that on the next occasion when the measure went through the House of Representatives and was sent on to the Senate for consideration we had lost Senator Matheson, who was then absent from duty, and that was the cause of years of delay in the carrying of that particular measure. But we are all glad that, no matter what may have or may not have happened, or what things have intervened, the Fisher Government had the courage previous to the last Federal election to announce themselves in favour of the construction of this railway. It is particularly gratifying to know that Mr. Fisher—he was not Prime Minister when he made the statement—as soon as ever there was a prospect of a Labour Government coming into power, in spite of the feelings of hostility all through Queensland towards this railway, had the courage to rise and say that he and his Government would make this one of the measures for the first session of the Parliament. It is, I say, to the credit of Mr. Fisher particularly, and to his colleagues, that we are in the happy position to-day of being able to congratulate ourselves upon seeing the final carrying of a Bill for the construction of this great work. I believe that Western Australia does not yet fully realise what it means to its people. It means the addition of practically another territory to Western Australia, a territory at present almost unknown and inaccessible, and the construction of this railway, I hope at the earliest possible date, will bring us into touch with a large area of land, much of which I am glad to believe from reports that have been presented will be of great value and may contain hidden wealth such as we have already unearthed on the Golden Mile. I hope that the Act, which this measure simply gives permission to carry

out, will be one which will prove of inestimable benefit to the people of Western Australia in particular, and of advantage to the people of Australia as a whole.

Mr. LEWIS (Canning): I desire to say a few words in connection with this very important national project, the linking of east and west together, and in doing so I desire to congratulate the Federal Labour party who have proved themselves to be the national party in Australian politics. They have always fought strenuously for the linking of east and west together, and whilst we have had other parties in power for a number of years, with ample opportunities to give effect to the wishes of the State, they have neglected those opportunities with the result that the Labour party, although in power for only a brief period, have been able to bring this proposal to a successful result. I desire to congratulate that party on the consummation of this great national project. References have been made to the necessity of reducing the grade somewhat, and I consider that is absolutely essential. In connection with a proposal such as this, we ought to do all we can to facilitate traffic and the conduct of the railway as economically as possible. On the existing line to the goldfields we have an exceedingly heavy grade through the Darling Ranges. For a distance of 35 miles there is on that line the heaviest grade that we have to contend with in this State. From Bellevue to Chidlow's Well the ruling grade is something like one in 40, and in addition, for about 17 miles the train has to climb a height of 923 feet. After leaving Chidlow's Well it drops 256 feet in eight miles to Wooroloo, and after that again ascends 235 feet, until it reaches Baker's Hill in grades of from one in 30 to one in 40. What the difficulties in haulage are on this part of the existing line will be understood from the fact that the schedule time for this distance is one hour and two minutes, whilst the 35 miles from Bellevue to Baker's Hill occupies two hours and one minute. If time is to be the essence of the contract, and that is essential from a defence point of view, we should have easy grades so that the

loads could be easily and expeditiously hauled. By adopting the southern route via Armadale, the line would pass through Wongong Brook, with a ruling grade of something like one in 80, and this would have to be encountered for a distance of only about one and three-quarter miles; after that the grade is estimated to be about one in 132, and then becomes considerably less as the line proceeds. This is a very important fact, and one that the Government should take into earnest consideration. Seeing that the Federal Government have decided on the route from Port Augusta to Kalgoorlie, I realise that it is too late in the day to have that portion of the route changed, but it is most important to this State that the climbing of the Darling Ranges should, if possible, be avoided. The adoption of this deviation would open up a large area of territory at the one expense, territory within the 13-inch rainfall, and thus we should be enabled to develop a very large area of fertile land. At the same time, the route would be shortened by about 40 miles, and the cost per mile would be considerably less. One of the main reasons for this transcontinental line is that it is essential for defence purposes; that being so, the shortest and easiest route must be a decided advantage, and the saving of time in the transport of troops and supplies must be a big consideration. Lasting advantages can be obtained by working the railway over easy grades and curves, where the haulage power can be used to the best advantage, and the maintenance of road and rolling stock reduced to a minimum. Those are important considerations. We have also to take this fact into consideration, that if the existing route is adhered to all the sleepers and bridge timber, as well as the rails, will have to be hauled over the Darling Ranges, and this in itself will considerably increase the cost of construction. At the same time, we have close to the proposed deviation abundant timber and easy grades. I feel sure that these points have only to be emphasised and to be taken into consideration by the Government, and they will see that it will be in the best interests of

the State to deviate the line so as to avoid the Darling Ranges. I desire to take this opportunity of again congratulating the Federal Government on having brought this particular project to a successful issue.

Mr. GEORGE (Murray-Wellington) : I am very glad indeed to have the opportunity of adding my few words of support to this Bill. We know perfectly well, those of us who have been in the State long enough, that this railway was one of the baits dangled before the people of Western Australia when the battle of Federation was fought some 12 or 13 years ago. I do not care whether the credit belongs to the Labour party or the Liberal party. It is sufficient for me as a Western Australian that what all Western Australians want, irrespective of party, is the Transcontinental railway, and if the Labour party can carry out this work, as I feel sure they can, then every one of us should give our meed of thanks and appreciation to them. Looking at the Bill itself, I see that it enables the Government to grant to the Commonwealth such waste lands of the Crown as are required for the construction and maintenance of the railway. I should like to see some provision made in the Bill by which the decision as to the quantity of land that is required should rest with this Government and the people of Western Australia rather than with the Commonwealth Government.

The Premier: It does.

Mr. GEORGE: Not according to this.

The Premier: It rests with both.

Mr. GEORGE: The clause says that the Governor may grant to the Commonwealth—

The Premier: You know what the Governor means, do you not?

Mr. GEORGE: I used to know, but under present day conditions I do not know. It says the Governor may grant to the Commonwealth such amount of land as in the opinion of the Minister of State for the Commonwealth may be necessary. Of course, the Governor-in-Council may refuse to grant as much land as is asked for, but it is hardly conceivable that he would refuse, or would have the

power to refuse, the same as he would if the Bill specified that the decision should rest with the State Government. I am not afraid that the Premier, or his Government, would grant to the Commonwealth an area of land that would enter into competition with the lands retained by the State, but we should strengthen the hands of the Government by fixing a limit to the area of land that should be granted. For instance, we might fix a limit of seven acres for stations, and where the line itself runs through, not more than one and a half chains. We have heard that most irresponsible and volatile gentleman, Mr. King O'Malley, required some enormous area of land for this railway.

Mr. Gill: He wanted room for his hat.

Mr. GEORGE: The room required for the hat of the hon. gentleman to whom I have referred would be only two feet wide, but the amount of ground required to bury him would be half the area of Western Australia. At any rate, passing him pleasantly on one side, I would like to see the clause so altered as to read that while sufficient land should be granted for the purposes of the railway, not more than sufficient should be granted.

Mr. O'Loghlen: Would it be a great calamity if they did take a little more?

Mr. GEORGE: I am sufficiently a Western Australian to desire not to give them more than is required. We have given the Commonwealth enough already; we have given them our persons, our property, and even our very souls; and all we have received from them has been a refrainment occasionally from their applying the toe-cap of their boot to us.

The Premier: Who are these people; where do they reside?

Mr. GEORGE: In that portion of the Commonwealth where the Federal Parliament is sitting. It is all very well for some hon. members to interject in this fashion because those who occupy the Commonwealth Government benches now confess the same faith and fly the same flag as themselves. I am not complaining of the flag. We all have our differences; hon. members are entitled to theirs the same as I am entitled to mine; but I may be pardoned if I think it is

possible for us to be Western Australians first and Commonwealth sympathisers afterwards. If it is argued that we, in doing that, cannot be good Australians, then I ask what sort of good Australians have we in the Commonwealth who have robbed us of the main portion of our revenue, and given us absolutely the chaff and dust that they could not use in the Commonwealth?

The Premier: What are they doing with it? All the other States are saying the same.

Mr. GEORGE: Then the Commonwealth Government cannot be very much respected.

The Premier: What are they doing with it?

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! I hope the hon. member will discuss the Bill.

Mr. GEORGE: I am endeavouring to do so, but when I am asked conundrums at the rate of two a minute how can I do it?

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member must speak to the Bill and not reply to them.

Mr. GEORGE: The Bill deals with the Transcontinental railway, and why I ask the Premier if he cannot see his way clear to fixing the width of the land and the quantity of the land to be granted to the Commonwealth Government, is that by having it in an Act of Parliament it will greatly strengthen his argument when the whole thing comes to be discussed. I think that for the purpose of the railway one and a half chains to two chains at the most will be amply sufficient for the main line, and, perhaps, 15 acres for station grounds. Of course there are other questions that will have to be discussed later on, such as the question of repairing shops and such like, but they are not likely to take any great quantity of land. But when we know that there are some of those in connection with the Commonwealth Government who desire a strip to be granted varying up to 25 miles on either side of the line. I think it would be asking for too much Western Australian territory, which we would have no right to give away. I am glad the Bill is

here before the House, and I shall be glad when the first rail is laid.

Mr. O'Loghlen: Would you not stretch the 15 acres to 20 acres for stations?

Mr. GEORGE: I think 15 acres is quite enough.

Mr. E. B. JOHNSTON (Williams-Narrogin): I have much pleasure in taking this opportunity of saying a few words in support of this enabling Bill in connection with the Transcontinental railway from Kalgoorlie to Port Augusta; and as one of the electors of this country, I hope that this is only the first Transcontinental railway that the Federal Government will build. I hope that before long we shall see them entering on other great national undertakings, such as the Transcontinental railway through the Northern Territory connecting Adelaide with Port Darwin.

Mr. Underwood: What about Port Hedland?

Mr. E. B. JOHNSTON: Yes; I should also be pleased to see something done for the North-West of this State later on. It must be gratifying to us all on this side of the House, and to the majority of Western Australians, to know that the Federal Labour Government have put this important railway in the very forefront of their public works policy. The people of this country know the years of waiting we always had for this railway when the Liberal party were in power in Federal politics. We know the members of the Deakin Government used to talk a lot about the Transcontinental railway at election time, but we never heard of it from them at any other time. I think the people of Western Australia are beginning to understand the real value of the Liberal birdlime spread so promiscuously around at any election whether State or Federal. They are beginning to assess it, as they did on the 3rd October last, at its real value.

The Premier: It has no commercial value.

Mr. E. B. JOHNSTON: Western Australians also know that it was a Labour Government that authorised the survey of this railway. It has been part of the policy of successive Labour Govern-

ments, and we are glad to know that the Fisher Government have at last authorised the actual construction of the work. The Labour policy, as I understand it, is to do justice to all parts of Australia, and to all sections of the community, so it is only natural that we should get from the Labour Government that recognition of the unwritten bond that previous Governments refused to grant. Mr. Fisher, in bringing forward this Bill, has shown that the Labour party are prepared to keep a bond once entered into whether it is *litera scripta* or not, and once more I congratulate his Government. This Bill is to provide for handing over the land necessary for the construction and maintenance of the Transcontinental railway, I hope the Premier will not regard his relations with the Federal Government, in the matter of handing over this land, in the mean and niggardly spirit suggested by the member for Murray-Wellington. In a few weeks, I understand, the Premier will be conferring with the Minister for Home Affairs in regard to the handing over of whatever land is necessary, and I think he can feel that it is the wish of the House, and also of the people of Western Australia, that he shall meet the Federal Government in a liberal and generous spirit in regard to giving them the land they require in connection with this railway. I think the Federal Government will require a good deal of land at Kalgoorlie. There is a great deal of land reserved at the west end of Kalgoorlie that would be very suitable for the large workshops and running sheds the Federal Government will have to erect somewhere in connection with this line, and I hope that in the town of Kalgoorlie the Government will make a generous offer to the Federal Government with a view to tempting them to put their large workshops at Kalgoorlie at the western end of their section of the railway. There is no reason why, if the State Government meet the Federal Government in this matter in a generous spirit, we should not have Federal railway workshops at Kalgoorlie equally as large as the State railway workshops we have to-

day at Midland Junction, and I hope the Premier will bear that point in mind and do his best to treat the Federal Government liberally in regard to the land they may require for such a purpose. I would like, incidentally, to refer to the route of the railway from Kalgoorlie to Perth and Fremantle which I understand the State Government have to build in connection with this railway. I understand it is proposed to continue the Transcontinental railway from Kalgoorlie to Perth on a 4ft. 8½in. gauge.

Mr. Price: Who said that?

Mr. E. B. JOHNSTON: It is generally understood that it is the case. I believe the Federal Bill is subject to that being done; and, therefore, as we have to do it, I hope the Government will not lay that 4ft. 8½in.-gauge railway alongside the existing Eastern Goldfields railway, but that they will build the line so that it will open up new territory in Western Australia from Kalgoorlie to the coast. As we have to pay the cost of the new line, the least we can do is to see that it does its part in opening up and developing our territory. I do not mind where it leaves the Kalgoorlie railway as long as it comes to Narrogin on its way between the goldfields and Fremantle, because Narrogin is the main centre of population of that part of the State, and I hope its claims will not be overlooked. I wish, in all seriousness, to point out that the Advisory Board have recommended the construction of a State railway from Narrogin to Armadale, which project is supported by hon. members on both sides of the House. I am pleased to state that at the time of the elections the leader of the Opposition said at Narrogin that it was the policy of his party to build that railway, and I congratulate him on the fact.

The Premier: Tell me where he did not promise one.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. E. B. JOHNSTON: At any rate we have the fact that a State railway from Narrogin to Armadale is necessary. It is necessary in the interests of the people of the State; it is necessary to

give the whole of the people in the southern districts direct access to the capital; and the Government have in this Transcontinental Railway proposal the opportunity of saving the expense of building it; because it will make it no longer to bring the railway from the goldfields to Narrogin and Armadale than by laying down a line alongside the existing Eastern Railway. The member for Canning has pointed out that a grade of one in 132 can be obtained between Narrogin and Armadale, and it is well known that the Wongong Brook gives the easiest access through the Darling Ranges; and if the Government accept the suggestion thrown out, this particular railway could go on that easy route through the Darling Ranges. The Advisory Board have recommended this line from Narrogin to Armadale, and as it has to be built in any case, I think it is clear that it will be an advantage to the people of the State to take the opportunity of building it in connection with the Transcontinental railway. That is the only point of detail I wish to mention. In conclusion I congratulate the people of Western Australia on the fact that we have in power in the Federal Parliament a party who are so fully alive to their interests in regard to this necessary, great, and important public work.

Mr. McDOWALL (Coolgardie): I think we can all congratulate the Federal Government on having brought to realisation our hopes in connection with this line. It has been suggested, or mentioned, that the line might not touch at Kalgoorlie. Hon. members on my left mention something about Coolgardie. I am not going to say anything about Coolgardie, but it would certainly be scandalous if there was any attempt to deviate the line from Kalgoorlie. Assuredly Kalgoorlie must supply a large portion of the traffic to be carried over this line. The neighbourhood of Kalgoorlie, the northern goldfields, such as Leonora and other places of the kind, will certainly contribute very largely indeed to the revenue which will be produced by this railway, and any deviation such as has been mentioned would, in my opinion, be utterly

absurd. We are told that the Premier in speaking on this question and in giving credit to various members of the Senate for pushing the railway, only mentioned Labour members and not Liberal members, and especially was he chided for having left Sir John Forrest out of the question. Now, the Premier has explained that the senators he specially mentioned were the ones who, during recess, attempted, by speeches in the various States, to educate the people up to the necessity for this line, and, therefore, his praise in that direction was well deserved. I have said before, and I shall say here once more, without any desire whatever to depreciate the excellent work done by Sir John Forrest, that in my opinion if he had not held back from Federation in the first instance the Transcontinental railway would have been a condition precedent to Federation. It will be remembered that before Federation was actually taken up in this State two referenda had taken place in the Eastern States. It was only in consequence of the force of public opinion on the Eastern Goldfields of Western Australia that Sir John Forrest eventually espoused the Federal cause. Had he espoused it earlier he could have made it a condition precedent the same as the sliding scale. I am only mentioning this to show that this gentleman has not done as much as he possibly could have done in connection with this line. Further, we have been shown by a previous speaker that when the Reid Government were in power he had only to raise his little finger in order to bring this matter about. In the circumstances, considering the Liberal Ministries were in power so long in the Federal Parliament, we can congratulate the Labour Ministry on pushing this matter forward so rapidly from a national spirit. The member for Canning has mentioned something about the deviation of the line. I realise that this is a question to be discussed when we come to consider the gauge, but I think we must all realise that, so far as crossing the Darling Ranges is concerned, some deviation may be necessary. I am speaking only on the spur of the moment. I say that in consequence of the 4ft. 8½in.

gauge requiring a greater curve than the 3ft. 6in. gauge, in consequence of various considerations of that kind, it might be found necessary to deviate to some other route. I am perfectly well aware that we would need to widen the tunnel for the 4ft. 8½in. gauge, but the most important thing of all is the undoubtedly heavy ranges, and it is just possible that for a short distance of the line through the well-watered areas of the State, it might be made productive of serving a certain amount of agricultural country as well as of serving the Transcontinental railway and the goldfields. So it might be advisable to consider that question, though this is not the time for it; but any extensive deviation of the national railway beyond the rainfall area and in unnecessary directions, would certainly be inadvisable. I am strongly in favour of pushing on this great work as rapidly as possible, and I sincerely trust there will be no battle of routes brought about in connection with it. We know the question of routes has kept railways back for years, and I sincerely trust we will sink everything in the desire for the national railway and for the linking up of the east with the west, which is essential in our own interests and in the interests of defence and communication from every point of view. The member for Murray-Wellington raises the question of this clause not being sufficiently definite in connection with the land asked for by the Commonwealth Government, but I think we gave sufficient safeguards in the clause to be perfectly sure that our Governor-in-Council—which, of course, means the Government—will not give away more land than is necessary. For my part, as an Australian I do not mind if they give them a few acres more than is considered necessary; because we must realise that the Commonwealth Government is not a foreign Government, that they are in effect ourselves, and that we would be perfectly safe in granting them a fair quantity of land.

Hon. W. C. Angwin (Honorary Minister): To sell to us again some time when it suits them.

Mr. McDOWALL: I am sorry to hear the Honorary Minister say that, because I think it will be found the Federal Government have on all occasions spoken with the voice of Australia. There may be a little difference of opinion between the Federal Government and ourselves on the Savings Bank question just now, but I am perfectly sure that will be rectified in due time. I only desire to emphasise the point that in dealing with the Commonwealth Government no spirit of meanness should be displayed. I trust there will be no mean spirit in connection with the land question. Certainly I do not think that we should throw our lands away and place ourselves in a position that might be difficult for us, but at the same time we should endeavour to do as much as we can to expedite the construction of this great railway.

The PREMIER (in reply): I only desire to make one or two statements by way of reply. Particularly do I want to make reference to the remark by the leader of the Opposition that there is a possibility, owing to the Commonwealth constructing this railway from Kalgoorlie to our border, of bringing about dual control in our railway system. I do not think we have anything to fear in that direction. I am of opinion that the Commonwealth Government will see the wisdom of allowing the control of the railway to be vested in those already controlling our State railway system. The question of ownership is, of course, a totally different matter, and they having found the capital for the purpose of constructing the railway it must be expected that the Commonwealth authorities will own it. I want to say we appreciate the action of the Commonwealth Government in coming to our assistance and constructing a work of such magnitude as the Transcontinental railway. I know they are not going to ask us, as the State obtaining the greatest benefit from the construction of the railway, to give a guarantee against any loss which might be incurred on its workings. It might be that the Commonwealth will ask us to take it over eventually, as it might be found that the work, owing to its immense capitalisa-

tion, will not be a payable proposition. But be that as it may, there is no possibility of bringing about a dual control which will have a harmful effect upon either the State or the Commonwealth, because the same conditions will exist under that dual control as exist to-day between other States of the Commonwealth. For instance, we have the railway from Adelaide to Melbourne, owned partly by Victoria and partly by South Australia, and there is no difficulty whatever in the working of that railway to the benefit of both States, notwithstanding that different sections of it belong to two different States. So from that standpoint there is not much to fear, even if the control remains with the Commonwealth. Moreover, it is to be remembered that this railway will not be competing with any other railway. The leader of the Opposition knows that we have had dual control of railways in this State for a number of years, and that it exists to-day, as, for instance, in respect to the line between Midland Junction and Geraldton. There are also several privately owned wood lines, principally on the Eastern Goldfields. While these railways are owned by foreign companies, with offices in London, and shareholders whose interests are not identical with those of our citizens, in respect to the Transcontinental railway the persons controlling it will be Australians, whose interests are identical with our own; and the profits will not be taken out of the Commonwealth and sent to some other part of the world, as happens in the case of the private railways in our State. We only provide in this measure that the Governor may grant any waste Crown lands sufficient for the purpose of constructing, working and maintaining this railway. That will include, as pointed out by the member for Williams-Narrogin, sufficient land at some point for the construction of workshops. The Government do not desire to approach the Commonwealth Government in niggardly fashion in this regard; we are prepared to give them all the land they require for the working of the railway. And I would like to point out as well, which has been missed by most members, that the Bill for the construction

of the railway passed by the Commonwealth Parliament only authorises the Minister to take land for the purpose of the railway and no other. There seems to be an opinion in the minds of some people, not only in this House, but by people outside, and by some newspapers as well, that the Federal Government by the terms of the Transcontinental Railway Bill are authorised to take land from the State for any purpose such as townsites and other purposes than the railway. But the Bill distinctly states that the Government can only acquire land from Western Australia and South Australia sufficient for the construction, the working and the maintenance of the railway, and for that purpose only. We are going to give them all the land they require from that standpoint. If it is found necessary to transfer to the Commonwealth some of the land away from the required route of the railway for the purpose of permitting them to provide water conservation for railway purposes, I do not think we should object to provide land for that purpose. We are going to give them all the facilities possible. At the same time we shall conserve the right as a Government responsible to Parliament and to the people of the State to see that the interests of the citizens of the State are conserved. Under these circumstances Parliament may rest assured that we shall approach the matter from the standpoint of giving land from these purposes only. I regret we have not provided in the Bill authority for the State Government to construct a 4ft. 8½in. railway from Fremantle to Kalgoorlie and have thus avoided another discussion in perhaps a future session, because practically the whole of the discussion this day has been on the question of the railway route from Kalgoorlie to Fremantle. We cannot decide in this House where the starting point of the Transcontinental Railway shall be, that is decided by the Federal Parliament without this State having any say in the matter at all. If we provided any place in this Bill it would not affect the question, we cannot decide the route of the railway, the Commonwealth Parliament decides that; we are not concerned

in it except in giving authority to the Commonwealth Parliament to construct the railway within our borders if we are satisfied that it is in the interests of the State, and we believe it is. As to extending the railway from Kalgoorlie to Fremantle, the present Government have not given any consideration to the question at all. True, representations have been made by different persons both through the columns of the Press and by letters addressed to the Government setting forth certain proposals, but we will have to be guided in this matter largely by the railway engineers. I want to inform members that we must consider this matter from the standpoint of bringing about a universal gauge throughout the Commonwealth. It is not a question of simply laying a 4ft. 8½in. railway alongside the 3ft. 6 inch railway, but it may be we shall have to take up the 3ft. 6 inch line and run a 4ft. 8½ inch line between Fremantle and Kalgoorlie. Just where the route will be, as far as over the ranges is concerned, will have to be decided principally by the engineers. Laymen—Ministers and members of Parliament—cannot be expected to decide a question of this kind, and we, as a Government have given no consideration to it.

Mr. A. E. Piesse: Will the work be submitted to the Public Works Committee?

The PREMIER: The Public Works Committee will have to give consideration to this matter and I know of no work better than that of the route of this railway from Kalgoorlie to Fremantle on a 4ft. 8½in. gauge which should be submitted to a public works committee. There are so many fluctuating interests. There will be the desire, as the leader of the Opposition said, that the railway should touch every town in the State; that is a matter of impossibility.

Mr. George: An absurdity.

The PREMIER: We cannot do it. That is the desire always in the case of a proposed railway, but if we have a committee that can take evidence from all, inspect the routes and submit a public report based on the evidence, the people in

the State can then rest assured that Parliament will sanction the route in the best interests of the State and not only for to-day but for all time. We are not called on to decide the question of the railway between Kalgoorlie and Fremantle more than to say we are prepared as a Government to ask Parliament, as soon as we have an opportunity to go into the question to give authority to bring a 4ft. 8½in. gauge from Kalgoorlie to Fremantle in order to make the Transcontinental Railway complete. I have much pleasure in submitting this Bill.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

*In Committee.*

Mr. Holman in the Chair; the Premier in charge of the Bill.

Clauses 1, 2—agreed to.

Clause 3—Power to grant land:

Mr. MITCHELL: Would it be necessary to grant the land to the depth of 200ft. It might interfere with mining through the Kalgoorlie belt.

The Premier: There was no objection to making it 40 feet instead of 200 feet.

Mr. MITCHELL moved an amendment—

*That in line 3 the words "two hundred" be struck out and "forty" inserted in lieu.*

Amendment passed; the clause as amended agreed to.

Title—agreed to.

Bill reported with an amendment.

## BILL — TOTALISATOR REGULATION.

### *Second Reading.*

Debate resumed from the 7th December.

Mr. MITCHELL (Northam): The Premier in introducing the Bill made it transparently clear that it is the intention to control racing to some extent. The Bill looks simple enough on the face of it. It applies to sport and therefore we should consider this matter carefully before making the Bill law. Horse-racing is a popular sport amongst all British-

speaking people and by popular consent the control of the sport has been left to the racing bodies largely by the people most concerned. All over the world this sport is controlled by the people mostly concerned and here we have the Western Australian Turf Club whose duty it is to license racing clubs. It means more than the issuing of licenses for they have to inquire whether the license would be in the best interests of the district, whether the ground and appointments are in order and safe for racing and so on, and after having registered the course they restrict the racing to a considerable extent, if necessary.

Mr. Bolton: In the interests of the Western Australian Turf Club.

Mr. MITCHELL: We should not curtail the power exercised by that racing authority. I doubt if any Minister is capable of dealing with this sport in the way it is dealt with by the Western Australian Turf Club. At any rate the Act which controls this body gives them great powers, and we have affiliated with the Western Australian Turf Club the English Jockey Club and all the racing clubs throughout Australia. This is no small matter because racing clubs register all disqualifications. Transgressors against racing can only be punished by racing clubs. It would be utterly impossible to punish a transgressor in any court of law, I think it would be impossible to prove the case against a man when undoubtedly he is guilty. It is the practice of the English Jockey Club to warn people off; those who dishonour the sport must be made to suffer and if they can transfer themselves to other places and carry on their pernicious practices the punishment would not be much. At present if a man transgresses in Western Australia he is disqualified right throughout Australia.

Mr. Swan: This Bill will not interfere with that.

Mr. MITCHELL: This Bill is the first step towards taking the control of racing away from the local authority. It has to be remembered that under the Totalisator Act the clubs licensed by the Western

Australian Turf Club are empowered to use the totalisator.

The Premier: Why should they have a monopoly of the revenue arising from the machine?

Mr. MITCHELL: Because they alone can control racing successfully. It was not thought by those who introduced the Totalisator Act that the totalisator would be used on other courses than those controlled by the Turf Club.

Mr. Bolton: You know better than that.

Mr. MITCHELL: That was the law. At any rate, it was a very good law too. We cannot be too careful in the matter of encouraging the establishment of race clubs. If the Premier can set up a better authority than the Western Australian Turf Club, I shall support any measure which will have that object in view.

The Premier: I do not propose to do anything of the kind.

Mr. MITCHELL: The Premier has not shown that he is entitled to exercise, or that he is capable of exercising that power in the way that the Western Australian Turf Club exercises it. So far as giving the right to the W.A. Trotting Association to use the totalisator is concerned, I am with the Premier. I believe with the Premier that the trotting horse is useful, and I believe that the sport of trotting can be controlled by the Trotting Association. I do object to ordinary horse-racing being controlled by any other than the recognised authority, the Western Australian Turf Club. The Premier knows that the Football Association exercises similar control over that sport. I believe he knows more about that than I do. I believe also that the Cricket Association exercises control over the sport of cricket. Anyway, I believe that the control exercised by these bodies is in the interests of the respective sports. Would the Premier say that it would be possible to appoint a member of the Ministry to exercise that control as satisfactorily as it can be exercised by a body created by the people who were most concerned? The Western Australian Turf Club in this State have carried out their work very satisfactorily. There are many clubs registered by that body.

These clubs provide about 42 days' racing in the metropolis, and about 150 in the country, and it seems to me that we get quite enough racing for the good of the people. If the use of the totalisator is permitted by the Treasurer indiscriminately, not necessarily by the present Treasurer, very much harm might be done. Take the town I represent. There is a race club which is quite capable of supplying all the races required by the people. Bunbury also has a race club, and it is all that that town needs. Would it be right to transfer Bieton to Bunbury, or South Perth to Northam? I contend that this would not be wise. I believe the Bill has been introduced by the Premier with very little thought. It has been suggested that we should amend the Totalisator Act, but the Premier has decided without much thought to take almost unlimited powers. The Bill contains a provision that the granting of licenses shall be under the uncontrolled discretion of the Treasurer.

Mr. Bolton: The Turf Club have uncontrolled discretion now.

Mr. MITCHELL: It is a fact that in theory we set up a much higher moral standard with regard to sport than with regard to ordinary business transactions, and it is quite impossible to set up by Act of Parliament a code of laws that would have the effect of controlling racing satisfactorily. I have already stated that the English Jockey Club can warn a man off a racecourse. We know that the stewards watch the races, and if they are satisfied that a man is not behaving honestly, they can deal with him on the spot. If they had to go before a magistrate and prove their case, it would be a difficult or impossible matter, and probably few would undertake the task. No matter how imperfect hon. members may consider the control now exercised by the Western Australian Turf Club may be, it is at any rate the idea of British people and, so far as I am concerned, I believe the right one. I do not know how long the English Turf Club has existed, but I know it has existed for a great number of years, and in this State the Western Australian Turf Club has also existed for

many years, and we have got used to the idea of control by them. I have already said that I have no objection to the Premier granting the use of the totalisator to the Trotting Association, but I do hope he will agree to amend the Bill to curtail the power of granting the use of the totalisator to unregistered race clubs. I hope the Premier will not make this a party question, because all members should be allowed to exercise a free vote on it. I think it would be a good idea if the Government would always allow members to exercise a free voice on all matters affecting sport when before the House.

The Premier: You have my permission to treat it as a non-party matter.

Mr. MITCHELL: I am much obliged to the Premier. At any rate, I will not treat it from the point of view of the party to which he belongs. I believe not only unregistered race meetings should be denied the use of the totalisator, but the machine should not be allowed to be used in any club run for individual gain. The proprietary clubs should not receive the endorsement of this Parliament. I have no desire at all to let it be thought that I support private racing. I believe racing is a sport which should be controlled as the Western Australian Turf Club controls it, not for the benefit of individuals, but for the benefit of the sport. If we approached the Turf Club they would tell us that unless the existing proprietary clubs in Perth were licensed or registered by them, the racing people would not have enough work for their horses to do, and the horses would have to go out of training. I would rather see the horses go out of training than have too many race meetings.

Mr. Heitmann: Some of them should be in bakers' carts.

Mr. Underwood: And others in butchers' shops.

Mr. MITCHELL: It seems to me that the Premier by this Bill will be endorsing not only unregistered clubs, but also proprietary clubs. The Premier told us that they have machines on the Belmont course where the trotting races are run. I do not wish to argue against the totalisator;

I believe it is a much better form of betting than with the bookmaker.

Mr. Underwood: Where do you put your money?

Mr. MITCHELL: On the totalisator. I should like to see the bookmakers go, and I hope the Premier will take the question into consideration in recess with that object in view. The South Australian system, where the totalisator is used exclusively, has been very successful in connection with racing, and it will be found that South Australia is not over-raced. I believe we have about two race meetings a week in our metropolitan area. Can the people afford it? Is it wise to encourage it? I say it is absolutely unwise to encourage racing to the extent it is carried on now. The evil of gambling is admitted by everyone, and the opportunity to gamble is provided by the large number of meetings which are held. Is the Premier in favour of these unregistered clubs being granted the use of the totalisator?

Mr. Turvey: Extending the use of the totalisator will not necessarily increase the evil of gambling.

Mr. MITCHELL: I am asking the Premier to put down the bookmaker, and racing will then be controlled through the totalisator. Power is being given under this Bill to grant the use of the totalisator to any meeting in the State. Any public-house throughout the country will be able to get permission to run a race meeting. The Premier wants revenue, and he says he will get considerable revenue from this measure. I would remind the Premier that he will not always be Treasurer, and the use of the totalisator will not always be at his uncontrolled discretion. We are perfectly well aware that unregistered race meetings have been held in the Premier's own electorate, and he ought to understand just what an unlimited number of race meetings will mean. I would point out also that the Western Australian Turf Club is open to everyone, and I suppose that most hon. members know that a ledger stand is provided for the people of limited means at the small cost of 2s. for ordinary meetings, and 3s. at the Christmas meeting. If the people were not catered for one would understand the de-

sire of the Premier to encourage racing and provide for the unregistered clubs having the use of the totalisator.

Mr. O'Loughlen: It costs a man £1 to go to a race meeting with his wife.

Mr. MITCHELL: A man can go into the leger stand, which is a comfortable stand, for 2s.

Mr. Thomas: Quite good enough I suppose for a Labour member.

Mr. MITCHELL: The hon. member would look well in the Press box. He might well become the representative of a Bunbury newspaper. I think the Premier will agree with me that our legislation should be in the direction of curtailing the number of race meetings and also of curtailing betting.

The Premier: That has nothing to do with this.

Mr. MITCHELL: I am not questioning the Premier's knowledge of racing or of gambling, or his ability to control the use of the totalisator. I am perfectly willing to take his word for it that he only means the licenses to be granted to the trotting people.

Hon. W. C. Angwin (Honorary Minister): He did not say that.

Mr. MITCHELL: He said that he was only going to extend the licenses to the trotting people at present. I am prepared to give him that power and to trust to his discretion.

Mr. Underwood: What is your opinion of trotting?

Mr. MITCHELL: We have an example of what the Premier will do in connection with whippet racing. We saw a paragraph the other day stating that Cabinet had seriously considered this question of whippet racing.

Mr. SPEAKER: Whippet racing has nothing to do with the Bill. The Bill does not deal with whippet racing.

Mr. MITCHELL: I was only endeavouring to point out that the Premier believes in allowing whippet racing, and allowing bookmakers to practice in connection with that sport, and I say if he licenses bookmakers for whippet racing, why should he not license the totalisator in that direction? I object to gambling in any form, and I object to granting to

these people the right to bet, especially as the betting is largely by women and children.

The Minister for Mines: You do not know what you are talking about. You have never been there, you have never seen one, and you know nothing about it—like most questions you speak on.

Mr. MITCHELL: I have never attended a whippet meeting, but we had reports on the subject, and I think the hon. Minister should peruse the files. Betting, we know, does exist to a great extent even in Perth, and one has only to go into St. George's-terrace on a Monday morning after a race meeting to see the extent to which it is carried on. The late Government endeavoured to put down the gathering of people in the terrace, and with some result, but I notice that now they gather there in larger numbers than ever. I suppose there are more winners since the present Government assumed office.

The Premier: They are buying our inscribed stock now.

Mr. MITCHELL: If they are, they are buying it very unwillingly. I desire to protest against the indiscriminate use of the totalisator, and I object to the Premier having the right to grant the use of the totalisator to any race club, however small. There is no doubt that betting should be abolished. The Premier did not hesitate to say that people should not have their Sunday picture entertainments.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member must stick to the Bill.

Mr. MITCHELL: In dealing with the Totalisator Bill, which affects the morals of the people to some extent, I thought I might be allowed to refer to the picture entertainments, seeing that the Premier, since assuming office, has been so anxious to improve the conditions of the people. However, the Premier has not made this a party question, and I hope members will have the opportunity of voting on it according to their own discretion. Horse racing to the extent now carried on must be harmful, and gambling, if encouraged, must result in loss of individual credit, and must also result in damaging the State credit if it is given the protection of

the Government. It seems to me an extraordinary thing that in a session like this, which was to be very short, and in which as little as possible in the way of legislation was to have been introduced, the Premier has found time to bring forward a Bill of this description. It seems a pity to have brought down this Bill, which must have been only hastily considered. It will have a far-reaching effect if the Premier, or any succeeding Premier, issues licenses for the use of the totalisator indiscriminately. I, therefore, ask members to seriously consider before making this Bill law. There are few of us who desire to see unregistered racing encouraged.

Hon. W. C. Angwin (Honorary Minister): The detectives say that it is managed better than the other.

Mr. MITCHELL: I do not know anything about that, but I do know that public opinion is opposed to that of the detectives, and that public opinion is opposed to unlimited racing.

The Minister for Mines: Yet your Government made provision for unregistered race clubs to have betting on their courses.

Mr. MITCHELL: I do not know that the late Government did anything of the kind.

Hon. W. C. Angwin (Honorary Minister): Yes, they agreed to my request.

Mr. MITCHELL: I am surprised that the hon. member made such a request. The encouragement of unregistered racing will mean the breaking down of the Western Australian Turf Club, which is the authority established by the people concerned to control racing.

The Premier: How absurd. The only effect of the Bill is that it will cut into the bookmakers wherever it operates.

Mr. MITCHELL: I do not think it will have that effect at all. If the Premier brought down a Bill to prevent betting by bookmakers I would support it, and I think it would be well to introduce the South Australian system of having the totalisator entirely, as against the bookmaker. At any rate, I ask members to pause before they make this Bill law, and to think well before they give to any Treasurer the right to license clubs indis-

criminately. It should be the desire of the House to curtail the number of race meetings.

The Premier: The body to which you want to give entire control reserves for itself more racing days than any other controlling body in the Commonwealth.

Mr. MITCHELL: The Western Australian Turf Club have 18 days out of the 100 racing days in the metropolitan area, and that seems a small number compared with the number of days on which races are held. It must be remembered also that the Turf Club have a well appointed course upon which thousands of pounds have been spent, and it is an enjoyment for the people to go there. Every penny that is earned by the club is spent in adding to the comfort of the people and does not go to swell the banking fund of private individuals.

The Premier: The Turf Club have said that they do not object to the Bill so long as it does not apply to proprietary clubs, and yet they granted the totalisator to the proprietary clubs when they had control themselves.

Mr. MITCHELL: Well, I hope the Premier will give them a favourable reply. I regret that the measure has been brought down for consideration in this House during this brief session, and it will be a discredit to this Parliament if it becomes law. I believe that the present Treasurer will not issue licenses indiscriminately, but the time may come when some Treasurer will, and I do not think that we should give any Treasurer that unlimited power. I hope the Bill will not be passed.

Mr. LANDER (East Perth): I am very pleased to see that the Premier has the backbone to introduce a Bill of this kind. When we were on the hustings we promised that we would give the racing people equality, and now we will give the Trotting Association an opportunity to have a "cut in," the same as the Western Australian Turf Club have had for years. The member for Northam has been a splendid advocate this afternoon for the Turf Club, which is a most conservative club. Before I, or any workman, could take advantage of that club we would have to fork out 13 guineas, I am told. It is a

monstrous thing that any Government should give the Turf Club the full rights over the totalisator. The passing of this Bill, and allowing the Trotting Association to use the totalisator, will be the means of improving the stamp of horses, especially trotting horses, and the Western Australian Turf Club will have to take some action against the professional doper, "the king of dopers" he is known as. The member for Northam has been advocating the cause of the Western Australian Turf Club and the guns who operate there.

Mr. Mitchell: On a point of order; I am not advocating the cause of guns connected with the Western Australian Turf Club.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member for East Perth must withdraw that statement.

Mr. LANDER: Well I withdraw the statement. We have heard so much about what the Turf Club have done, but we do not hear much about the abuses that have been going on. The Turf Club has had a monopoly long enough and I say that, by giving a club a license, we can exercise control over it and make our laws apply to it. It therefore gives me great pleasure to support this Bill.

Mr. O'LOGHLEN (Forrest): I cannot agree with the last speaker that this Bill is going to have the effect of clipping the wings of the Western Australian Turf Club, nor can I see that it is going to take away some of the monopoly enjoyed by that body. It is a very simple Bill and one which should receive the support of every member, inasmuch as the Premier has intimated that the chief object of the introduction of the Bill is to extend the facilities of the totalisator to trotting meetings. I believe every member in this Chamber would like to see trotting encouraged more than it has been in the past in Western Australia. I would be sorry to think that the Bill contemplated going further and allowing the Treasurer to grant the use of the totalisator to all unregistered meetings. The member for Northam stated that it would have the effect of encouraging the proprietary clubs. Well the greatest complaint of the proprietary clubs to-day, and also of most

of the men connected with racing, is that the Turf Club take too many of the very best racing days, and prevent the proprietary clubs, and the others interested in the sport, from having the opportunity that they should have. The hon. member also stated that he would like to see the bookmaker abolished. It might be a biased wish on the part of that hon. member and other members who have spoken, but I do not think this Parliament has power to abolish the bookmaker. We may put it in an Act that the bookmaker is not to practice on the registered courses, but such a law has not had the effect that was desired in South Australia. There the totalisator is legalised exclusively but bookmaking is in progress the same as it was before. If we do not allow bookmaking to be carried on in the open it will be carried on in the shops, in dark corners, and also in the streets. I do not think it is possible for Parliament to abolish the bookmaker. Besides we have the two systems running side by side in this State, and the very fact that to-day we see so many bookmakers flourishing is evidence that a good many people prefer the bookmaker to the totalisator, and while that feeling exists there is no evidence of any burning desire on the part of the public for the abolition of the bookmaker. The member for Northam has pointed out that the Bill might give power to a needy Treasurer to push business, that he would extend the totalisator to all picnic meetings and unregistered clubs as well, but we have to be guided by common sense in administering an Act of this kind. I am prepared to trust the Treasurer, no matter how needy he may be, to do the right thing and not encourage a class of sport that would have no other effect than an injurious one to the State. I take it the object in encouraging racing is not to consider the sporting public but to try to bring about a better breed of horses and encourage speed.

Hon. W. C. Angwin (Honorary Minister): Where do they do that?

Mr. O'LOGHLEN: That is the object of racing; and if we are to lower the standard in any way, I think we are go-

ing to do harm in this State to the breeding of horses and the encouragement of speed.

Mr. Taylor: That was the object in the earlier days.

Mr. O'LOGHLEN: It should be the object to-day. Unfortunately a great number of horses racing on metropolitan courses to-day should be in butchers' carts, and possibly a great many of their owners would be better off. I do not fear the Treasurer is likely to inflict any injury to genuine racing in this State owing to the fact that, should he be short of funds, he might extend the use of the machine. It is claimed that the object of Parliament should be to try to decrease gambling and to try to abolish it if possible. It is a laudable object, and all will agree it should be done as far as possible; but gambling has gone on from the very earliest time and will still go on. The farmer who sows a bushel expects to reap a bag. If we try to deal with gambling on the racecourse we might as well try to deal with it on the stock exchange and in every other walk of life. The element of gambling is there all the time. Out of every proposition we enter we hope to make something.

Mr. Mitchell: There is a reasonable chance in most cases.

Mr. O'LOGHLEN: I am prepared to agree with the hon. member, and I would not like to see a man have less chance than he has to-day; but I have not the slightest fear that the Treasurer will use the great power in this Bill to the detriment of sporting in Western Australia. I am quite confident to leave the matter in the hands of the Treasurer knowing he will do the right thing.

Mr. Mitchell: The present Treasurer will not always be the Treasurer.

Mr. O'LOGHLEN: The logical outcome of any change is that if the Treasurer now occupying the exalted position is deposed the next Treasurer must come from the Opposition. Before any change can come about, the Opposition must come over to the Government side in the ordinary course of events. Of course there may be a change of Treasurer, but, after all, when we talk of the Treasurer we

talk of the Government and the Ministry and the party supporting them; if there is any change to be brought about in the administration of this or any other measure, it must come only from the fact that the present Opposition will become the Government, and then the member for Northam will have sufficient followers to alter the Act and take away any of the undue power he feels there is in the Bill before us. I hope the measure will have a speedy passage. It will have the effect of extending the use of the totalisator to trotting meetings, which I believe we should encourage, particularly in a new country whose agricultural possibilities should be brought forward every week. I think the Bill will have the effect of encouraging trotting to a greater extent. We must always be guided by common sense in legislation of this kind. I contend if we go out in a drastic fashion to abolish bookmaking we are going to make ourselves ridiculous, and make the evil worse than it is to-day. Even in South Australia, where the "wowsers" are more prominent than in any other State of the Commonwealth, the bookmakers flourish; they have not succeeded there in bringing about the many reforms in connection with racing they hoped to, and I venture to say that we would fail in a similar attempt here. I cannot see any of the great dangers foreshadowed by the member for Northam, and I am prepared to support the Bill in the sure and certain hope that the Treasurer will, at all times, be guided by what is best for the community of Western Australia as a whole.

Mr. MONGER (York): I am certainly surprised that any Premier should bring in a measure such as the one we are now discussing. There is no doubt we have had a few surprises during the few weeks that the Premier has been at the head of the government of Western Australia.

The Premier: And there will be more yet.

Mr. MONGER: It is only a few weeks ago that we had the pleasure of reading an account of a very lengthy address delivered by the Premier in the church of one of our neighbouring towns, and no doubt the people of Western Australia

were expecting that one of the last measures that could emanate from him would be something in the shape of a gambling Bill, such as the one now under discussion. After hearing that address, the people were not at all surprised at the Premier's attitude towards Sunday pictures, but when they saw the announcement a little later that Cabinet had had a special meeting and had decided to give to bookmakers at whippet racing the same benefits as were allowed to bookmakers practising at horse races, considerable surprise was expressed.

The Premier: I hope I shall have an opportunity of replying to these accusations.

Mr. MONGER: In the minds of the greatest number of the people living in Kalgoorlie, where the home of whippet racing is—

Mr. Green: It is half way to Boulder, do not forget.

Mr. MONGER: There is no desire among the big majority of the people of Kalgoorlie—

The Premier: Speak for York, and you will have as much as you can do.

Mr. MONGER: I am speaking about whippet racing.

The Minister for Mines: What has it to do with the Bill?

Mr. MONGER: It has a great deal to do with the Bill. At all events, any Premier who could bring under the notice of Cabinet the desirability of granting full betting privileges to such a club does not command much respect from the sporting community of any country. As far as whippet racing is concerned, I believe the Premier has always taken a very active interest in it. I am told he was once president of the whippet racing club in Kalgoorlie; in fact some people go so far as to say he was a promoter of whippet racing. If that is so, I would not be at all surprised to hear that he was a participator in the profits.

The Premier: That is not correct, or I would put a collar on you.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. MONGER: At all events, the Premier deserves anything but thanks from the sporting community of Western

Australia for his attitude towards one of the lowest of sports any country has ever recognised.

The Minister for Mines: You do not know anything about it.

Mr. MONGER: It is not very long ago that a deputation from Kalgoorlie, headed by the gentleman now occupying the mayoral chair at Kalgoorlie, asked that whippet racing should be disallowed, and the Wilson Government did so, and one of the first things the Scaddan Government took on themselves to do was to withdraw the restrictions the Wilson Ministry placed on this objectionable sport.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! I do not think that this Bill deals with whippet racing, or that the hon. member should labour that point unnecessarily. I am quite prepared to allow the hon. member to make reference to any other subject provided in doing so he desires to compare the Premier's attitude in respect to this Bill.

Mr. MONGER: I was only leading up to the main point in the Bill that the Treasurer may, on payment of the prescribed fees, issue to clubs totalisator licenses under this measure. As far as I can judge, the only clubs in Western Australia that are not fully entitled to the use of the totalisator are the unregistered courses in the neighbourhood of Perth and Fremantle, and one unregistered club at Kalgoorlie; also the trotting club. All the other clubs run under the W.A. Turf Club rules, and consequently have the right to use the totalisator on their courses. The Premier said the main object of the Bill, and the only object that he and his Government had in view at the present moment, was to allow the use of the totalisator for the benefit of trotting racing. Well and good! But we know that only a short time back whippet racing was placed in the same category as horse racing, as far as the Premier was concerned; and we can only come to the conclusion that this Bill is introduced for the express purpose of giving to the unregistered courses the same benefits as are now given to the W.A. Turf Club and the clubs that race under the W.A. Turf

Club rules. The Premier said distinctly that neither he nor his Government would extend the privileges to unregistered racecourses; but, under the pretext or promise that he is only referring to trotting, he introduces in the Bill the power giving the Treasurer the right to issue licences to any club that he may think fit, while the only clubs that are not recognised and not allowed to run the totalisator are the three unregistered clubs to which I have referred. So I can only conclude that the desire and intention of the Bill is to legalise the totalisator on unregistered racecourses. If that be the desire of the Government, I have no intention of giving the Bill my support, and I feel certain there are many gentlemen on the Government side of the House who, notwithstanding the remarks that have fallen from the member for Forrest, will not be parties to giving to the unregistered courses the same benefits as are given to the bodies who send to those unregistered courses the men they will not allow on their own courses. I am sure that the member for Fremantle particularly would not be a party to that. The unregistered courses of Western Australia to-day consist of people who own horses, train horses, and ride horses, who are not recognised on any other courses in any other part of Australia. Were we to extend to these clubs the same privileges as are given to the W.A. Turf Club, it would be a standing disgrace to the members of this Parliament.

Mr. O'Loughlen: Who said we were going to do that?

Mr. MONGER: Am I not justified in inferring that the Bill must apply to unregistered courses because every other club in Western Australia runs under the W.A. Turf Club rules, and, if they so desire, have the full benefits of the totalisator?

Hon. W. C. Angwin (Honorary Minister): Does that guarantee clean racing?

Mr. MONGER: The Honorary Minister does not take a very lively interest in horse-racing, and I will tell him that if racing as carried out by the W.A.T.C. and the clubs conforming to their regulations is not clean then there is no clean racing

anywhere in Australia. The W.A.T.C., as the member for Northam has said, is recognised by all the racing clubs of the world.

Hon. W. C. Angwin (Honorary Minister): We have seen a few law cases against it.

Mr. MONGER: Yes, and invariably the club wins. There was one the other day, in which a jockey brought an action against the club for having, as he said, wrongfully wiped him out; the result was that the Supreme Court did not see fit to remove the disqualification. Let us look at the type of gentry that frequent the unregistered racecourses. It may be fresh even in the minds of non-racing members of both sides of the House that a few months ago an unfortunate jockey met his death through carrying a galvanic battery about with him during the time he was riding. The owner of the horse ridden by that jockey was disqualified for life by the W.A.T.C. The individual who in reality caused the death of that jockey is allowed the entree to the unregistered course notwithstanding his disqualification. That is the type of individual recognised and given the same privileges on these unregistered racecourses as would be given to any member of the House if he were to pay a visit to the W.A.T.C. course. Are we going to give those individuals the same benefits and advantages that we allow to the controlling body?

The Premier: The Wilson Government did.

Mr. MONGER: Nothing of the sort.

The Premier: Yes, they allowed them to bet on those courses.

Mr. MONGER: I intend to see as far as in my power lies that the Seaddan Government do not give to the clubs I have referred to the same privileges as are afforded the W.A.T.C. It must have been to a certain extent gratifying to the honourable gentlemen on the Government side of the House to be informed by the Premier that it was not his intention to make this a party question. I congratulate him, because I feel certain even if caucus had issued a mandate to the Premier a Bill of this kind would not

have been allowed to come into operation and take a place on our statutes. I ask honourable members sitting on the Government side of the House to give fair and reasonable consideration to this, and to tell the Premier that in regard to his attempts to introduce illegitimate legislation of this sort at all events some of his own side are not in accord with the views he and his Cabinet hold.

Mr. TURVEY (Swan): As a new member I am inclined to think that the only motive prompting those who have spoken this afternoon in connection with the Bill must be a tendency to pander to the "wowers" as they were termed by the member for Forrest. I am indeed surprised at the matter that has been introduced into the debate. The Bill is plainly set out as one to further regulate the totalisator. The member for Northam spent most of his time in advertising the W.A.T.C. The Bill provides little or no control as far as racing is concerned, but deals exclusively with the totalisator, and I am of opinion that the extension of the use of the totalisator will minimise the evil of gambling. Believing that, I have not the slightest hesitation in saying that I whole-heartedly support the Bill. I for one am ready at all times to give my earnest support to any measure that will tend to reduce the evil of gambling. Realising that the people will gamble, I say that it is the duty of the State to lessen that evil as far as possible, and I believe the extension of the use of the totalisator will have a tendency in this direction. Those who have had the opportunity of seeing the totalisator in operation know that those who use it must have ready cash. The greatest evil accruing from betting on the racecourse, in my opinion, is to be found in the practice of betting on credit. I am not inferring that all sections of the people do this, but it frequently happens that a man has not with him the money to do his gambling and, in consequence, he approaches a bookmaker who allows him to do it on credit. In dealing with the totalisator he must have the cash, and therefore the use of the totalisator will tend to lessen the evil of gambling. I

am surprised that the member for York should have referred to whippet racing as he did, as I can see no reference to it in the Bill. Surely, if the member for York had taken the trouble to read the Bill he would have seen that there is no intention of extending the use of the totalisator to whippet racing. As I have already said, it is to me apparent that those who oppose the Bill are doing so in a desire to pander to a section of the people, and with an idea of throwing dust and making people believe that the Labour Government are going to increase the possibility of gambling in Western Australia. I resent any statement of the sort as I am convinced the Bill will tend to decrease rather than increase the evil of gambling.

Mr. UNDERWOOD (Pilbara): I feel very much inclined to oppose the Bill as I believe it would be far better to deal with the whole question in a comprehensive measure. So far as the Premier went in introducing the Bill he showed us that the Bill is particularly designed to enable betting to be carried on at Brennan's trotting association.

The Premier: I said nothing of the sort.

Mr. Underwood: As a matter of fact the Premier said it was to allow the totalisator to be used by Brennan.

Mr. Allen: Who is Brennan?

Mr. UNDERWOOD: Brennan is a gentleman who proposes to establish in Western Australia a trotting association, and he desires the use of the totalisator. I am not satisfied with the existing conditions of racing generally. I am pretty well sure that they could be improved, and I would like this matter held over until a comprehensive measure can be brought down dealing with the whole question of the totalisator in connection with horse-racing. For the benefit of the Premier I would like to remark that when one does not know the bush it is advisable to keep on the main beaten track. It is very evident from the Premier's speech that he knows nothing about racing. No doubt this is considered a virtue by many people; but the fact remains that the Premier knows

very little indeed about hores-racing. For instance, he said that trotting horses were certainly superior to galloping horses, and that the breed of trotters was of far greater advantage to the country than the breed of gallopers. It only shows that the Premier has not gone into the question of horse-breeding. As a matter of fact, the blood horse can not only gallop but can trot also, and the blood horse is the best horse bred.

The Premier: Is not a trotter a blood horse?

Mr. UNDERWOOD: No. That is why I am saying the Premier does not understand the bush, and therefore should keep on the beaten road. It has been demonstrated over and over again that although you may have a horse that can trot, yet when it comes to a necessity for a horse that can stand a journey you want blood in him. If the Premier requires any further information on this question I would advise him to read the account of the early explorers who went from Adelaide to Palmerston. In that work it is pointed out that the ordinary bred trotters died weeks and weeks before the blood horses. If the Premier had been in possession of this information he would not have compared trotters with blood horses. Further, on this point I would like to say that a galloping horse can also trot, and there are many of our galloping horses at present in cabs, while I am of opinion that it would be better for some of our punters if other horses at present racing were in cabs also.

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

Mr. UNDERWOOD: Before tea I was explaining the difference between a galloping horse and a trotting horse, and I made the statement that a galloping horse could trot, but a trotting horse could not gallop—an apparent contradiction. What I mean to say is this: an ordinary galloping horse can trot fast enough for utility purposes to go in a hansom cab, but a trotting horse cannot trot fast enough to win a race or head a cow. The breeders of

horses throughout Australia and in other parts of the world invariably get a blood horse when they want to get a hack or a useful horse. A blood horse may be infinitely superior to the trotting horse as produced by competing in trotting races. One other remark of the Treasurer, I would like to point out, is not correct in regard to trotting, and that is there is no professionalism in trotting races, and that a trotting horse can be employed in the ordinary avocations of a horse during the week and go to the course and win a trotting race on Saturday. This is altogether a mistake. As a matter of fact it takes as much time, patience and trouble to train a trotting horse to win races as to train a galloping horse to win races, and a man would lose his money if he worked a horse through a week and took him out on Saturday to run in a trotting race. My experience of trotting is that there is no chance of winning against a properly trained horse. Further than that, I want to say that there is as much professionalism in trotting as in galloping, and I further wish to say that from my experience a man would stand a long way better chance of losing his money by a trotting race than at a galloping race. Further than that, I want to say that, speaking from an experience of 25 or 30 years of going to races, I have seen trotting courses started again and again, and trotting meetings held, and they have invariably failed, while on the other hand there has been no diminution in regard to the courses where galloping horses are working. Having said that in regard to trotting horses, I wish to say a few words on the question of horse racing generally. Horse racing, according to some people, is sinful, and those who attend horse races are going to have a warm time by and by; and many of us feel prepared to take our chance about the by and by, but we would like some fair treatment in this world. We have to bear this in mind, that horse racing has for centuries retained its position as the most popular sport in the British Empire. We have had cricket, football, bicycle racing, foot

racing, rowing and innumerable other sports, they have all had their day and died out, and come again, but horse racing has gone on without, at any time, a decrease in its popularity. And I want to say this, as far as I am concerned that while it is properly conducted, and while the profits made on the courses are expended as they are by the Western Australian Turf Club, it is the one sport that I enjoy, and I am speaking and re-echoing the sentiments of tens of thousands of people in Western Australia. It is a most peculiar thing that in all other sports the Government have given concessions; they give them grounds, sometimes grants to improve their grounds, but more particularly they give them special trains, and a special train service to carry people to the various grounds to witness their sports. But if you come to the question of horse racing the Government charge about six times as much to go to a racecourse that they do to go to any other place. To go to a cricket match at Claremont the Government charge threepence return, and if a horse race is being held at Belmont the Government charge 3s. 6d. return. It seems to me rather unfair. Seeing that we are condemned to suffer all the heat that can be generated in the next world, it is undoubtedly unfair that we should be asked to pay all the taxes in this. It seems to me those who do not go to races, who do not smoke or drink, are on a really good wicket; they dodge the tax in this world and get a box seat in the next. I wish to say it is my opinion some reason should be used when dealing with horse racing, because, after all, it is an amusement and recreation in which tens of thousands, perhaps hundreds of thousands of citizens in Western Australia take part. In regard to the question of control, I may say—or to fall in with the Premier's idea—after this introductory, I now make a few remarks and come to the question of control. I have heard the suggestion that the Government should appoint a board to control racing, and judging by the questions asked by the member for Forrest, one would imagine that it is his intention that the Government should

practically be a court of appeal for the Western Australian Turf Club. I wish to say if it comes to a question of appointing a court to reconsider the decisions of the Western Australian Turf Club I am a candidate if the salary is good enough. I know as much about dead horses as anybody.

Mr. Taylor: Have you bought your experience?

Mr. UNDERWOOD: I have bought my experience. This is the position I want to point out. Every kind of sport is controlled by an association; if we have cricket, the cricketers come together, they have clubs, their clubs send delegates to an association and that association controls cricket. Football is the same; tennis, bowls, rowing, or anything else you like. You do not come to the Government to appoint a board, the people interested in the sport control it, and it should be retained in regard to racing. Let those who go to racing and enjoy horse racing control it. If they cannot control it then horse racing can go to the dogs or the whippets.

Mr. Bolton: If you do not injure anyone.

Mr. UNDERWOOD: Yes; if you do not injure anyone, I say so too. They are not likely to injure anybody besides themselves, therefore we come to this decision, that it is desirable to have horse racing controlled by some association or club, or something of that kind, and we have that here, we have the Western Australian Turf Club, and I for one am prepared to give my support to the Western Australian Turf Club, and allow them to control racing in Western Australia. It has been said that that club is conservative. There are many alterations that could be made for the improvement of racing; with these I possibly agree, at the same time we have to realise this, that almost anybody who has sufficient money to go to races can become a member of the Western Australian Turf Club, and can go there and voice his opinion as to what it ought to do. On the other hand if we are going to say we will pass a special Act of Parliament to allow a totalisator to be used on an unregistered

course, because that is what the Bill comes to, we say this: we are not going to support those who rebel against the authority of the properly recognised body to control horse racing. As the member for York has pointed out, it does not matter what crime, as far as horse racing is concerned, you commit on a registered course and become disqualified for it, you can still go to the unregistered course and follow your avocation, either as trainer, rider, or owner. The position is this, that there are certain nefarious practices in connection with racing, and the Western Australian Turf Club, the controlling body, endeavour to the best of their ability to put those things down. When a jockey, a trainer, or an owner has been convicted of what "Banjo" Paterson calls suspicious practices, he is disqualified from taking part in races for a few months, or a few years, or for life, and those who have been disqualified can go on to the unregistered clubs and still follow their nefarious practices. That does not seem to me to be the club this House should support; it does not seem right that we, as a Parliament, should pass a Bill enabling these clubs to continue to find employment for those people who have been disqualified by the controlling body for nefarious practices. The Honorary Minister interjected while the member for York was speaking, that racing was cleaner on the unregistered courses than on the registered, at least he said the detectives said so.

Hon. W. C. Angwin (Honorary Minister): I said it was as good.

Mr. UNDERWOOD: I have a great opinion of the acumen of most detectives, they can generally find a clue on the unregistered courses, they can get the clue as to which is dead, or as most are dead there, they can get a clue as to which is alive.

Hon. W. C. Angwin (Honorary Minister): Do you think they are worse than on the other courses?

Mr. UNDERWOOD: It would take even a Sherlock Holmes to pick a winner at Perth on some occasions. As to the question whether these races are cleaner than others, I wish to express the opinion

that the Western Australian Turf Club carry on their races better than any club in this State, and so far as the carrying on of the races is concerned I have very considerable confidence in the Western Australian Turf Club. As I said, I would have preferred to have seen this Bill held over until a comprehensive measure could have been brought forward, one dealing entirely with the question of the use of the totalisator on racecourses. There is one strong objection I have with regard to racing, and that is the proprietary club. I think it would be better for the sport and racing altogether—and I am speaking only from that point of view, I am leaving the morals of the people out of the question—if the Government put into force the laws which are in existence. The Western Australian Turf Club spend all their profits on improvements or put them into stakes, while at Belmont Park, Canning Park, and Helena Vale, the profits practically go into the pockets of the few men who own those racecourses. I think it would have been better for the Government to have held this measure over and brought in a Bill later on lines similar to the South Australian Act, which lays it down that the totalisator shall not be licensed except to clubs. That Act states that no license shall be granted to any racing club unless it possesses at least 100 members, that is when the club is situated within 10 miles of Adelaide, or 50 members if it is situated at a greater distance, and that also unless the subscriptions paid by members amount to £250 and £50 respectively. In my opinion, that is a sound proposition. We could permit the use of the totalisator then, and I think we would be correct in saying that we would permit its use in such a way as to prevent profits going to private individuals, and that all profits made should be devoted to the advancement of racing and the improvement of the racecourses and the increasing of the stakes. If the Government would introduce that kind of legislation I am convinced they would do a very considerable good to racing in Western Australia. There is another point in this Bill I

strongly protest against on principle, and that is the idea of handing over legislation passed by this Parliament to the administration of one man. I hold and have held, and my opinion has not changed since I crossed the floor of the House, that Parliament should keep control of the legislation which reflects the opinion of Parliament, and which should be administered according to the wishes of Parliament. Under this Bill the Treasurer will have power to grant a license to any racing club whatever without any appeal to the House, and without even the necessity of laying regulations on the Table of the House. I thoroughly and fully believe that the Treasurer at the present time, and while he holds office, has no intention of extending the privilege of the use of the totalisator to unregistered racecourses, but only intends it to apply to trotting races. But we have to recognise this: that we are not passing legislation to last while the present Treasurer is occupying office—there is no telling what time the present Treasurer may vacate his office, and then the legislation is simply what the Treasurer for the time being thinks it ought to be; in fact, we are making the Treasurer an autocrat.

Hon. W. C. Angwin (Honorary Minister): It is subject to Parliament.

Mr. UNDERWOOD: That is not in this Bill.

Hon. W. C. Angwin (Honorary Minister): Parliament can dismiss the Treasurer.

Mr. UNDERWOOD: That is just the point. Are we going to upset the whole Government of the State because the Treasurer has one little particular kink; he may be a good Treasurer otherwise. For instance, are we going to put the Government out on account of their picture regulations? Ninety per cent. of the members of this House are opposed to those regulations, yet we are not going to put the Government out; it is too small a matter. But when we pass legislation we should pass it so that it will have the effect of not being handed over to one individual who may have some particular kink one way or the other. We may have some man in the Treasury who will

be prepared to extend it to every club, flat, or backyard where they gallop horses, on the other hand, we may have a man who is opposed to racing and who is going to have the box seat in the next world, and who will not allow it anywhere. That is not what we want. This Parliament wants the totalisator extended and used. Let us put in our Bill what we do want, as has been done in South Australia, and then when we find it is advantageous to alter it let Parliament who made the law alter it. I intend to oppose the Bill.

Hon. H. B. LEFROY (Moore): I was pleased to hear the remarks of the member for Pilbara and although, like the Premier, I may not know much about racing, I look upon it as our great national sport and, moreover, the spirit of sport has, I think, to a very great degree, made the British race what it is. At the same time we want to keep it as clean as possible. The control of racing in Western Australia has been given over to the Western Australian Turf Club, and so that it should not be thought that I was voting on this occasion on party lines, I wish to say I am opposed to this Bill because I do not like the idea of taking the control away from the Western Australian Turf Club. I believe that body is doing its best to control racing in Western Australia in the best interests of racing and of sport, and I entirely agree with what has fallen from the member for Pilbara, and I congratulate that member upon the views he expressed here because, in my opinion, they are the views of a very large majority of the people in the State, no matter to what class or what line of politics they belong. I believe it is the general desire of the people of the State that the control of racing should be left in the hands of the Western Australian Turf Club and, as the hon. member has pointed out, this makes the Treasurer an autocrat with regard to granting licenses. He can grant a license to any club, and with all due respect to him, the Treasurer has stated, or I think it has been implied, that he does not know much about racing, as indeed I do not myself. At the same time, I go to

racers, and I do not believe that horse racing does any harm to the community. Moreover, we know that our great meeting at Christmas is looked forward to by everyone throughout the length and breadth of the country, and more especially the working man himself; the man who has to go out into the back blocks, and who perhaps has been 12 months at hard work. He has his fancy, and he watches his fancy all the year, and he comes down here at Christmas and planks his money on it.

The Premier: And he has to go back to work again.

Hon. H. B. LEFROY: I would rather see him do that than spend his money in the public house. I think myself that this privilege of granting licenses is better in the hands of the West Australian Turf Club, a body which is respected, I think, by the racing community of this country, and for that reason I intend to oppose the Bill.

Mr. FOLEY (Mount Leonora): I wish to state that I intend to support the Bill for the very reason that most of the speakers say they are going to oppose it. In the first instance, I take it that the Treasurer brought in this Bill to deal with racing as it obtains at the present time. I have had a little to do with racing, and I have yet to know that I have learned anything about racing other than what I knew before, but I have learned to-night what betting is. There has been a comparison drawn by the member for Pilbara between the galloping horse and a trotting horse, which my friend on the Opposition was pleased to eulogise. I would ask the member for Pilbara what is a galloping horse; is there anything in the stud book about a galloping horse? My experience of race horses goes back as far as that of the member for Pilbara, and I have yet to learn what a galloping horse is. There is another horse that can gallop, and that is recognised as the trotting horse. If the Bill that the Treasurer is bringing in is to do with betting as regards trotting horses, then the argument of the member for Pilbara that a galloping horse is also a trotting horse, shows that the

Treasurer knows a little more than the hon. member does, and that he is legislating for horses that can do either and not for a horse that can perform only one of these feats. Then there has been some mention made about the races which have been conducted under the auspices of the West Australian Turf Club. I have seen at country meetings dead ones and live ones, and I can assure hon. members that at various of these country meetings it is as hard to pick a live horse as it is at any unregistered meeting and, moreover, the sport is equally as dirty. If a man goes to an average country meeting he will find that the sport is as dirty under the auspices of the West Australian Turf Club as it is under any unregistered body, and I presume I am speaking with as wide an Australian knowledge as any hon. member. We find also that various of the registered clubs now are racing some horses which formerly raced under unregistered clubs, and yet the sport has not been materially altered. Now we find that racing has been spoken of as improving the breed of horses. I ask any reasonable minded man whether racing held by a turf club or a race fostered by that body can do anything towards the improvement of the breed of horses? Out of all the meetings held in this State how many are there which hold races up to a distance of two miles, and unless horses are bred to race up to two miles they will be of very little use for stock purposes in Australia. I believe in a good race meeting, and I also believe that trotting should be catered for. This club, which the various hon. members are pleased to speak so well of, has the power to give the right to use the totalisator. What the Treasurer wants is to possess that right which the Western Australian Turf Club holds at the present time. As far as unregistered racing is concerned I know very little about it on the coast, but if there were a club formed at the present time who would run all two-mile events they would need a better class of horses than run races under the Western Australian Turf Club now. If such a club were to come forward the Treasurer would have

the right to cater for them under this Bill and they would be doing something to improve the class of horses in Western Australia. I do think the Treasurer is acting well within the bounds of reason in taking to himself the right to grant licenses, of which the Turf Club have had the monopoly up to the present time.

Mr. DWYER (Perth): I do not wish to record a silent vote on this Bill, and I therefore desire to explain the light in which I regard it. It seems to me that there has been a great deal of wandering from the real issue. There is nothing in the Bill which would indicate to any hon. member that whippet races are intended to be included or come within its purview. The hon. member for York took up a good deal of the valuable time of the House in introducing all this extraneous matter, but whippet racing, its desirability or undesirability, has nothing to do with the measure now under the consideration of the House. It seems to me that this Bill undoubtedly gives the right to the Colonial Treasurer for the time being to permit any unregistered club to use the totalisator. By "unregistered club" I mean a club not authorised by the Western Australian Turf Club. Whether or not the Treasurer will exercise the discretion vested in him by the Bill and so permit an unregistered club to use the totalisator is another question. Personally, I think that if unregistered racing is bad at all it should not be allowed to exist. If it is of any use either in improving the breed of horses or in supplying a legitimate form of sport to the public, it should be allowed to conduct its business under the aegis of the law to the same extent as the Western Australian Turf Club is allowed to do, that is, not in accordance with the law but to a great extent in spite of and contrary to the law. As a rule unregistered bodies of any description are to be deprecated, and their establishment in our midst is not at all a desirable thing. In nearly every class of sport we have some governing body ruling by certain governing principles. In the present instance we have the Western Australian Turf Club, who govern and rule the sport of racing

in Western Australia. The Western Australian Turf Club seems to me to be an institution with dual functions, which are in a sense rather contradictory. In addition to governing the whole of the sport in the State, they are also the racing authority for a particular racecourse—the Perth racecourse. It seems to me that if racing is to be governed at all, it should be governed by some association connected certainly with the registered racing clubs, but an institution or corporation apart from the clubs which form its constituent parts. The proper government of racing seems to me to be a body selected, authorised, established and founded by each and every one of the racing clubs which are at present registered or are allowed to exist. In that way we would have a body which would not only control racing throughout the State but also on the Perth racecourse itself. It seems a contradiction that the Western Australian Turf Club, while being the supreme authority in racing in this State, are also the owners in their corporate capacity of the Perth racecourse. I am at one with the member for Pilbara when he says that it is regrettable that we cannot have a comprehensive enactment which will deal generally with the whole of racing in this State. Then we could bring into existence some such body as I have suggested, formed of delegates or appointed members from each of the constituent clubs with power to register and control the whole of racing in the State, including trotting, and power to register the totalisator, and at the same time pay a decent, fair, and reasonable tax to the State out of the profits that accrue from the totalisator. In the meantime, however, I intend to support this Bill in the hope that it will be amended in Committee. It seems to me that if we substitute the Colonial Treasurer for the Turf Club we may make an improvement, but it will be merely substituting one form of authority for another which may be less satisfactory, because the granting of licenses will be at the will of the Treasurer for the time being, and we do not know who may occupy that position in future. He may

be one who will allow any club whatever which comes within the definition of the Bill to use the totalisator, and I say that once the Colonial Treasurer under this Bill allows the use of the totalisator on any racecourse, by that very act he will give that racecourse a legal status; so that, assuming for the purpose of argument we have a Colonial Treasurer who would take a light view of racing and authorise the use of the totalisator on any of the unregistered establishments, that very act would give them a legal status and raise them to the level of a body authorised by the Turf Club or any other authoritative body.

Mr. Price: Is there any reason why they should not be allowed to use the totalisator?

Mr. DWYER: The only reason I can see is that if they are proper racing establishments then the stigma of the term "unregistered" should be taken away, and they should have just as much right and privilege as any other club; but if, on the other hand, they are irregular places where sport is degraded and where there are low-down practices, then they have no right to exist at all, and our legislation, instead of leaving the door open whereby they may be legalised and registered in a sense, ought to suppress them in all cases in which the sport is conducted on irregular and immoral lines, as some members have suggested. I do not pretend to have an intimate knowledge of racing, but I do want to point out the glaring inconsistency that exists. Under the present laws relating to racing we have a supreme governing body who also are the proprietors of a racecourse. We have bodies termed unregistered clubs which, if worthless and immoral, ought not to be allowed to continue, and we have also clubs registered and unregistered allowed to carry on betting and other practices in contravention of the law itself. While human nature is constituted as it is at present, and while we in Australia are a sport-loving public, I for one, speaking not only for myself but I believe on behalf of most of the people of the State, would regret to see any form of legitimate sport deleted from our

midst. I hope on the contrary, not only to see the sport continue, but to see it continued and conducted on a higher plane, where the reproaches now being cast upon it can no longer be levelled, and where the stigma of "the quick and the dead" which we have heard to-night in connection with both registered and unregistered race meetings, can no longer rest on the fair record of our racing. I intend to support the second reading, but hope that certain anomalies will be remedied in Committee.

Mr. ALLEN (West Perth): I rise to oppose this measure, and I desire very briefly to give my reasons. The Bill is described as being for the purpose of "further regulating the use of the totalisator," and I think the title should state also "for further facilitating the means of betting." We have heard a great deal in the course of the debate regarding whip-pet racing and other foreign matter, but I intend to confine myself to the Bill itself, and I have looked carefully for the reason why this Bill has been introduced. The only reason I can find is that it is brought forward to provide certain facilities for the trotting association. It was stated by the Premier in the course of an interjection that the Bill would not facilitate or encourage betting, while the member for Forrest stated that without the totalisator the trotting association would not succeed. If that is so, that is to my mind a very good reason why we should not pass this measure. We do not want to give any increased facilities for betting, and I believe that the people of the State as a whole are satisfied that we have at the present time enough facilities in that direction. Certainly if we place the totalisator on a trotting ground we are going to make betting easier. Some people say that betting with the totalisator is less harmful than betting with the bookmaker. I am not going to discuss that question, but it does seem to me that it is quite as big a temptation for a man to embezzle his employer's money to bet on the totalisator as it is to bet with a bookmaker; in fact, the temptation of the totalisator might be slightly greater, because for the totalisator the bettor must have ready

money, whereas with the bookmaker he may bet on credit and the bet is only a debt of honour. I see only one reason for bringing forward this measure and that is to facilitate betting at trotting matches. Do the people go to these matches to see racing or for the express purpose of using the totalisator? We have often heard that there is safety in numbers. With the Turf Club there are numbers who consider the pros and cons in granting these licenses, but if the granting of licenses is to be left in the hands of the Colonial Treasurer, whilst it may be all right in the control of the present holder of that position, the day may come when a Colonial Treasurer holding different views will grant these licenses for reasons not altogether desirable, and largely with a view of bringing in more revenue to the State. I am not going to say whether I am opposed to racing or not. I am not much of a frequenter of racecourses; I go to the Cup occasionally. I think that we want rather to detract from, or deter facilities for betting, than to increase them. For these reasons I shall oppose the Bill.

Mr. THOMAS (Bunbury): If the Bill or the discussion has served no other good purpose it has shown us that there are members in the Chamber who have a perfect knowledge of racing and things connected with the sport. I dare say a fair knowledge of sport or racing shows a well-balanced mind, but I think the knowledge indicated by the members for Pilbara and York rather shows an ill-spent youth. These hon. members have gone into such details in connection with the matter, and reiterated many points so keenly, that one must come to the conclusion they have spent a lot of time in the study of the pastime. I am not particularly interested in the Bill. I do not think it will be of very much consequence if the Bill is passed or not, but I am very much surprised that so much of the time of the House has been taken up at this stage of the session in discussing it. But what I am interested in is the Premier's moral welfare. I noticed the other day with considerable surprise, as the member for York has said, that the Premier had been preaching at one of the churches; and

later on I read in one of the papers, with still greater surprise, that the Sunday picture shows were to be stopped, and I began to fear that our good Premier had been inoculated with the virus of "wowsers-itis"; but to-day I find he is so inconsistent as to bring in a Bill which, so far as I can judge, is to provide facilities for unregistered racing, to provide a new source of gambling; so I come to the conclusion that, after all, he is not so affected by the virus that I have referred to, and I rejoice, because it would be one of the greatest calamities that could ever overcome a Premier. I do not think this measure is likely to affect the W.A. Turf Club in the slightest degree, I do not think there is any need for the defence put up by the members for York and Northam on behalf of the W.A. Turf Club, but I object to any recognition of these unregistered race meetings under any consideration. I understand the Bill gives the power to grant to unregistered racecourses the concession of using the totalisator. If there is no intention of doing so why then not insert a clause clearly defining their position in the matter? We are discussing a matter of granting the use of the totalisator to individuals interested in trotting courses. If the Premier had mentioned this, possibly so much time would not have been taken up over the measure. I know that the most pernicious and objectionable kind of betting that can take place on any course in Australia is that which takes place at unregistered race meetings. It is not so much the man losing his money, but it is the boys and women, some of them, putting their shillings on. All sorts of facilities are provided for them for the most degraded kind of speculation; and if I had the power to do it I would wipe out these unregistered meetings altogether.

The Premier: Hear, hear!

Mr. THOMAS: It has been proved, and we know it exists, that men who cannot get a footing on existing racecourses, where they are governed in clean and honest conditions—

Mr. Turvey: Where is that?

Mr. THOMAS: Shakespeare says that to be honest is to be one in ten thousand.

I do not suppose you will get one race-course in ten thousand where there will be absolute honesty, but the W.A. Turf Club, and many others of the same class of race clubs, make the greatest possible efforts to have clean racing. I do not think that can be said of the unregistered courses. If they are aiming at clean sport, why do they take up some of the riff raff, the worst that can be found on any racecourse in Australia: If these people offend against the rules of the registered clubs and the unregistered clubs are allowed freedom in this way, what control is there over these people? We are depriving the genuine turf clubs of their power when we allow the other illicit clubs to provide means of livelihood for those people who are turned out from the registered clubs. I see this Bill gives the Minister power to grant the concession of the totalisator to these unregistered clubs.

Mr. O'Loughlen: The Minister has given us his assurance on that point that he will not.

Mr. THOMAS: Then if the Minister will include a clause to provide that he shall not have the power to grant the concession to unregistered clubs I am satisfied; but anything we do that lends assistance to unregistered race clubs is an unmitigated evil to the country, and I have no hesitation in saying it. I hope the Premier will give us that definite assurance that the Bill is not to be used for that purpose. If he will tell us it is only to license this trotting club, which I have no doubt is a very harmless institution, any opposition I have to the Bill will be removed.

Mr. Dwyer: That only binds himself and not his successors.

Mr. THOMAS: I quite agree with the hon. member. I see no reason why it should be put in such an ambiguous way. It should be clearly and definitely stated. If they must have betting on race-courses I think it better to place the money on the totalisator than with some of the bookmakers. I have long since given up betting on sport. Most people will say there is not much in sport if betting is not allowed. I contend that if there must be betting, and if we must have unregistered

courses, it would be better to bet on the totalisator than with some of these doubtful bookmakers. If there is one thing that gets on my nerves it is the undesirable section of the community that gets a livelihood on these race-courses. It is a class of the community the country can do without. I have no sympathy for this class of people. I trust, if we are to have a Totalisator Bill, it will produce a condition of things in which the thieving bookmaker will cease to trouble and the weary punter will be at rest.

Mr. TAYLOR (Mount Margaret): I have listened with considerable interest to the debate on this Bill. It is a small measure, but the debate has ranged far beyond it and has dealt with every phase of racing, bookmaking, gambling, and the breeding of horses of all types and classes, and has been extended by some members to the whippets and even the Church. I listened to the speech of the Premier in introducing the measure; and, subject to his correction, I think he indicated that the Bill was practically, and almost purely, to allow the W.A. Trotting Association to run a totalisator. At the time someone interjected "What about Bieton," and the Premier said, "I have had no application from Bieton, and therefore I have not given it any consideration." Had the Bill specifically laid down and covered what the Premier indicated in his second-reading speech, I feel confident the House would have passed it with little or no comment or discussion; but the Bill gives to any association or company formed for the purpose of horse-racing the right to make application for a license for a totalisator. That being so, any section of the community in any part of the State could form itself into an association with the object of promoting horse-racing, and, relying on the Bill being on all fours with other measures on the statute-book, believe they could get a license to use the totalisator. The language of the clause is absolutely clear on the point, that any association or corporation for the purpose of promoting horse-racing can always be granted a license to have the totalisator. The Bill deals with no phase of racing; it is only to give power to use

the totalisator; it does not regulate racing in any particular: it does not deal in any way with racing further than defining what a racecourse is, or what a club is. A club is formed for promoting racing, and the grounds where the racing is operating constitute a racecourse, and the Treasurer for the time being has power to grant, or refuse, a license. We have an idea that the Treasurer has no intention of granting a license for a totalisator on unregistered racecourses as we know them at present in Western Australia. In his second-reading speech the Premier said that he had had no application from these unregistered courses but that when they came along they would get fair consideration and be dealt with on their merits. If that be so there must be some underlying current that applications are going to be made, and the Treasurer for the time being will decide as to the respectability of this club or that club, as to whether it should be granted a license for a totalisator. If the sole desire of the Premier is to give the W.A. Trotting Association a license to run a totalisator—because I believe where they hold their trots now there is already a totalisator in existence, but they have no power to operate it—if the Premier is desirous in this measure—and I am guided by his second-reading speech—to give that association power to have a totalisator, why did he not put it that way in the Bill, and nothing else, and there would have been little or no argument? I believe all members are anxious to give the W.A. Trotting Association the same freedom regarding totalisators as the W.A. Turf Club have.

The Premier: Is not that a matter for discussion in Committee?

Mr. TAYLOR: But it is usual on the second reading of the Bill for members to indicate their attitude on a measure; and if the Bill has not satisfied a sufficient number of members on the second reading, they will reject the second reading without wasting any further time. I hope the Premier will agree to alter the definition of club, and only give power in this Bill to the W.A. Trotting Association, he is so anxious to assist, to have a license to run a totalisator. It is wholly at the dis-

cretion of the Premier—as it happens the Premier is Treasurer—as to whether he shall grant, or not grant, a license.

Mr. George: He has uncontrolled discretion.

The Premier: That is necessary, or there would be litigation as to whether my action was wise or not.

Mr. TAYLOR: Why pass legislation when there is no desire to use the power given in the measure? The Premier has indicated that the Bill is to be confined to the W.A. Trotting Association. Why not confine it to that association?

Mr. George: It shows the weakness of the case.

Mr. TAYLOR: It shows the Bill has deserved the discussion, though, perhaps, it has gone further than the Bill itself. I hope the Premier will allow alterations in Committee in connection with the definition of what a club or association is. People will form themselves into an association for promoting horse-racing, in keeping with this measure, and when they apply they will be refused, and be put to unnecessary expense in unnecessary preparation to make application for a license to run a totalisator. I hope the Premier will allow an amendment in Committee, and, that being so, I am content to support the measure; because I believe in totalisators. I supported the Totalisator Bill brought down by Mr. Rason in 1905 on the ground that it was absolutely the very best form for a person to put a few shillings on a race without going to a bookmaker. I believe it is the cleanest way of making a wager, and it is the best way in which betting can be done on a racecourse. Mr. Rason brought down his Bill for revenue purposes. The present Premier has not claimed this Bill to be revenue producing, but that it is brought down to rectify something in connection with an association carrying on trotting. So far as I can learn, trotting is a clean and legitimate sport, and a sport which will tend to increase a type of horse that Western Australia is now badly in need of. We should give the trotting association every facility for breeding that type of horse. That is all I desire to say. I hope the measure will pass the second

reading on the understanding that the Premier will alter the definition so that the Bill will only do what it is intended to do, namely, to legalise the totalisator at the West Australian Trotting Association meetings.

Mr. B. J. STUBBS (Subiaco): We have heard long dissertations with regard to the control of racing, with regard to unregistered racing, and with regard to the difference between trotting and galloping horses, but we have had very little discussion indeed as to the importance of the Bill. No arguments have been advanced as to the advisability of further extending the use of the totalisator. I have not heard one member discuss that phase of the question pure and simple. The arguments have veered round to the problems I have enumerated, and have not by any means been confined to the subject matter of the Bill. Personally, I think it is advisable to extend the use of the totalisator; that is, if certain clubs at present in existence are to be allowed to remain. If we are going to have unregistered racing in our midst—and we have had no pronouncement from the Premier that these unregistered clubs are to be abolished, and therefore we must take it they are still to be allowed to carry on—if we are going to allow these unregistered racing clubs to continue we should undoubtedly extend the use of the totalisator to them as well as to all clubs carried on under the patronage of the West Australian Turf Club. It is all very well for members to get up and say that certain persons are allowed to race and carry on their occupations at unregistered courses, persons who have been disqualified for various practices on registered courses. Those people are carrying on there now, and there is no pronouncement that they are to be stopped. If they are to be allowed to go on to the course, why cannot we extend the use of the totalisator to them? Those who have been disqualified on other courses are carrying on bookmaking on the unregistered courses, and I say that anything we can do to rid racing of the bookmaking fraternity will not only be

in the interest of the sport, but of the people at large. The same argument applies to the trotting association. The question is as to whether the trotting association is to be allowed to exist. If the Government are not going to put a stop to trotting meetings, and I am not arguing that they should be stopped, then undoubtedly the use of the totalisator should be extended to those meetings. The totalisator is a machine and cannot speak, while the bookmaker can speak, and it is well known that many of the scandals of the turf are engineered by the bookmakers. The use of the totalisator should be extended to any class of racing which is to be permitted. I intend to support the second reading of the Bill, although, when in Committee, I propose to move an amendment providing that all the profits derived from any club by the use of the totalisator shall be expended in the direction of increasing stakes, and in carrying out improvements to the course. Such an amendment will prevent those profits going into the hands of the shareholders of proprietary clubs. This is something we should aim at, while, if there is anything in the contention that horse racing tends to improve the breed of horses, clearly it is only by increasing stakes, and encouraging the best horses, that that result can be obtained.

The PREMIER (in reply): When I introduced this measure I thought I was introducing one which would be readily received by members on both sides of the House. In order to clear up a few points introduced by hon. members who, apparently, have not read the Bill, I may explain that it is not to control whippet racing, or the liquor traffic, or picture shows, or wowsers, or anything of the sort. Moreover, I want to say I introduced the Bill without any pressure from any quarter whatever. May I also explain that I am not particularly interested in horse-racing, either as it is controlled by the West Australian Turf Club or as it is controlled by the trotting association; in fact, while not a wowsler, I do not frequently visit racecourses of any description, although I do at times

attend a race meeting. And may I be candid enough to admit that when I do so it is not for the purpose of seeing the races, but rather that I might there meet people I would not otherwise be likely to meet. That is to say, it usually happens when I am in Kalgoorlie or Boulder. I have been in Perth for eight years, during which time I have visited only one Perth Cup meeting. On the other hand, in order to show that I am not inconsistent in these matters, I still hold the same view as I have held ever since I have been in politics, namely, that it is not right to judge actions purely from my own standpoint, because they may suit my own particular interest; but that they should be judged from the standpoint of other people, whose interests they are more likely to suit. While I may indulge in a little sport on Saturday afternoon by seeing a football or a cricket match, I have no objection to another man attending a race meeting if he prefers it, nor do I think I have any right to compel him to refrain from attending that race meeting merely because I prefer a football match. If we are going to have race meetings, I want to give them facilities for betting by the least objectionable methods, and, in this respect I have no hesitation in saying that the totalisator is preferable to the bookmaker. I have been considerably interested in the remarks of the member for Northam, who, in his usual virtuous manner, rose and asked why did not the Government abolish the bookmaker? Let me say that the hon. member was in the last Cabinet for years, and I can find nothing on record, nor do I remember any public utterance of his in which he gave expression to a desire to exterminate the bookmaker; in fact, he and his Cabinet did an illegal action by instructing the police to permit bookmaking on unregistered courses.

Mr. Mitchell: No; we treated them all alike.

The PREMIER: Nothing of the kind. In the first instance they issued instructions to the police that no betting was to be permitted on unregistered racecourses or whippet grounds. That instruction

went out to the police, and eventually the members of the unregistered clubs began to put the lever under registered racing clubs by asserting that unless permitted to bet on their own racecourses they would compel the police, under the Act, to lay information against betting on registered race-courses. And the Cabinet, including Mr. Mitchell, were so strong in opposition to the bookmaker, and to the unregistered courses, that they issued a further instruction, to the effect that the original instruction was only meant to apply to whippet races. They did not say so much in those words, but they said any course used for the purpose of conducting horse-racing, where there was the ordinary provision of grandstands. And "grandstands" was interpreted by the Cabinet as "a structure erected for the purpose of allowing the judges to see the finish of the event." It is well we should know these matters. These are the gentlemen who, to-night, rise in their places and with righteous indignation talk about the duty of the Government to put down bookmaking. We are doing it in the best manner possible. We want to encourage the use of the totalisator where racing is held and permitted under the existing law, and when that is done we shall then be able to abolish the bookmaker without interfering with the sport of the great mass of the community. That is the correct attitude to adopt and not commence it the wrong way about by putting down the bookmaker first. We have heard a great many of the members in the House to-night talking of the wowsers in the Cabinet, but we do not hear one word in regard to betting which they say existed on the goldfields. I want to know is there any more betting on the goldfields and is it any worse than betting in Perth, or any other part of the State. Why did the late Government make such a dead-set against racing on the goldfields?

Mr. Frank Wilson: It was the goldfields people who approached the Cabinet.

The PREMIER: It does not matter who approached the Cabinet, if betting is wrong on the goldfields it is wrong in Perth also.

Mr. Frank Wilson: Are you going to stop it then?

The PREMIER: I am speaking of the remarks of the member for Northam, who was a member of the Cabinet that introduced this system. There is a report from the police themselves that the people who witness this whippet racing numbered 320, and these whippet races were held only once a month. The Government of the day when whippet racing began on the goldfields, gave a special piece of ground to the whippet club on which to hold their race meetings, and that piece of ground was situated between Boulder and Kalgoorlie.

Mr. Mitchell: Which Government, the DalGLISH Government?

The PREMIER: No; the Government of which the hon. member was a member did it. The last Government allowed this club to spend money in making their grounds and putting it in order, then after it was in order they wished to put down this evil, and would not permit the bookmaker to apply his calling where 320 people assembled once a month.

Mr. Monger: Mostly children.

The PREMIER: What nonsense. Let me tell the member for York, and he knows it full well, that the betting by the women in particular on the course of the Western Australian Turf Club is the greatest evil in the land to-day. I may tell him that there are scandalous scenes at times on these courses, the women rushing and pushing the men away in order to get a ticket early. I know this of my own knowledge; there are more women to-day going in and out of what is known as the bird-cage to get inside information than there are men. They rush for the bird-cage and then for the totalisator or the bookmaker, as if it was the last minute they had to live. And then in order to put down this evil the late Government prohibited the bookmaker at the whippet race meetings; that is the sort of action we find the previous Government doing. I am replying to some of the statements made by the members opposite, and when these statements come home to roost the leader of the Opposition does not like it. Let me tell

him some other matters. We have the Western Australian Turf Club raising objections to-night. Let me say at once that this Bill does not deal with the control of racing either on the courses of the Western Australian Turf Club or on unregistered courses. It deals with the question of giving certain rights to clubs to use the totalisator for certain purposes. Let members ask themselves this question. Is it desirable to have a totalisator where people are congregated and permitted to bet, or to have the bookmaker? If people do have the totalisator then they ought to have it on unregistered courses as well as on registered courses. If it is not desirable to have the totalisator or the bookmaker then we ought to close down on the unregistered races altogether.

Several Members: Hear, hear.

The PREMIER: What was the late Government doing when the leader of the Opposition, as a member of the previous Government, said in his electorate that the Government were going to introduce a Bill to control racing? Where is the measure? And that was in 1905, six years ago, and members opposite were members of the Government until the last elections; and now they say, "Hear, hear," when I suggest that we should put down unregistered racing. I want to view the Bill from the standpoint of the totalisator. Why should the Western Australian Turf Club have the right to grant the use of the totalisator to whom they choose. They have what hon. members object to the Bill having, because, after all, as Colonial Treasurer I am only representing the people, and I take the responsibility in my uncontrolled discretion of saying whether it is desirable or not certain clubs should use the totalisator. I am not responsible to a few influential gentlemen who meet frequently in the Western Australian Club on the Terrace, or in the Weld Club. I am responsible to Parliament and to the people.

Mr. Frank Wilson: Caucus!

The PREMIER: It is very evident the Western Australian Turf Club have interviewed members since the Bill was introduced to Parliament.

Mr. Monger: It is absolutely inaccurate.

The PREMIER: I say it is not. To show the inconsistency of some of those members who spoke on behalf of the Western Australian Turf Club, Mr. Wickham, the secretary, had an interview in the newspaper the other day. He said they had no objection to the Western Australian Trotting Association being permitted to use the totalisator, but he said, "We would like to prevent proprietary clubs from making use of it." The Western Australian Turf Club has complete control to-day, and has granted to the proprietary clubs the use of the totalisator; and now they come along and ask that we should exclude proprietary clubs. There are three clubs that I know of registered by the Western Australian Turf Club who are permitted to use the totalisator by that body. The member for Northam is a member of that club, and was a member of the committee of the Western Australian Turf Club at one time.

Mr. Mitchell: That is so.

The PREMIER: And they have agreed to proprietary clubs making use of the totalisator.

Mr. Mitchell: I objected to it.

The PREMIER: The hon. member was in a Cabinet, and when he gets out of it he objected on every occasion to anything that was transacted there.

Mr. Mitchell: You do not get all your own way, or anything like it, in the Cabinet.

The PREMIER: I am somewhat surprised at the remarks of the member for Pilbara. His great objection was to the possibility of the Colonial Treasurer giving permits, or, rather, issuing licenses to proprietary clubs. He said, they ought to be precluded, but immediately before he made that utterance he said he was quite satisfied with the control being in the hands of the Western Australian Turf Club, and they are the people who first commenced to grant licenses or permits to proprietary clubs. There can be no objection to the words in the Bill that licenses may be granted in the uncontrolled discretion of the Colonial Treasurer. They are necessary to prevent any

litigation, not that it is feared there will be litigation, but to prevent litigation in the event of a club making application, and that club having complied with the Act, and the Colonial Treasurer refusing to grant a license. If the words, "uncontrolled discretion" were not there litigation could take place, and probably would, and the Colonial Treasurer would be compelled to grant a license, but if the words are in the Bill he can use his discretion, and it is in conformity with the law. Where the Colonial Treasurer refuses to grant a license to any club which he thinks undesirable he cannot be brought to book. That does not make the Colonial Treasurer an autocrat. We do many things more important than that where there is uncontrolled discretion, and the Colonial Treasurer is not called an autocrat for it. The Colonial Treasurer is not permitted to do just as he pleases; he has to answer for it to Parliament and to the people. But I say the Western Australian Turf Club committee is a nearer approach to an autocrat than the Colonial Treasurer can be under the measure. The position to-day is this. The Western Australian Trotting Association cannot be registered by the Western Australian Turf Club, their rules will not permit it. The law only provides that the Western Australian Turf Club may grant permits to clubs registered by them. That being the case the Western Australian Trotting Association cannot make use of the totalisator, yet the Trotting Association hold their trotting meetings on a registered club ground at Belmont Park. They hold their race meetings there, and on that ground is a totalisator machine, yet while they are holding their race meetings permitted by the Western Australian Turf Club under the existing law, the Trotting Association cannot use the totalisator machine.

Mr. Allen: They have used it there.

The PREMIER: The Trotting Association has not used it.

Mr. Allen: One of the clubs has.

The PREMIER: There is no intention on my part to extend the operations of the totalisator to other than the Trotting

Association, and I gave the assurance when I was moving the second reading of this Bill that until such time as Parliament has been given an opportunity to deal with the control of racing the operations would not be extended. As to the Western Australian Turf Club, it has many champions here, and I think it has more influence and control over members of Parliament than I anticipated, or I would not have dreamed of introducing this measure.

Mr. Mitchell: Is the Premier right in saying that?

Mr. SPEAKER: I am not aware of what he was referring to, but he should not say that any club has control over members, and further that such control directs members in this House.

The PREMIER: I have no desire to say that, and if I have given offence to any member or members I withdraw it.

The Minister for Lands: It is a mere coincidence, that is all.

The PREMIER: The member for Sussex to-night is very anxious to protect Parliament.

Mr. Frank Wilson: Have you, Mr. Speaker, not asked the member to withdraw his reference?

The PREMIER: I said I withdrew unreservedly. I would like to explain to the hon. member that he has ceased to be Colonial Treasurer.

Mr. Frank Wilson: What has that to do with the Bill?

Mr. SPEAKER: Nothing whatever.

The PREMIER: The Colonial Treasurer is mentioned in the Bill, and I am pointing out to the member for Sussex that he is not now Colonial Treasurer and has not uncontrolled discretion, and cannot call on me to apologise whenever he desires. I was pointing out that the Western Australian Turf Club apparently have been able to cause members to take some interest in this measure, more than they were able to take in others, and it is long since the member for York has waxed so warm on any measure as he did on this to-night. True, he waxed warm on Federation on the occasion when he read his long speech. I have no objection to the proposal, if the majority of

the House consider it desirable, that we should not permit licenses to be granted to unregistered clubs. But let me say again that so long as Parliament permits unregistered races I can see no reason why these courses should not have the same facilities as are given to the others, and I will not support an amendment such as that proposed. I want to give an absolute assurance, however, that every hon. member on this side may vote without the whip cracking around his ears. I thought I should make that statement before we went into Committee.

Mr. Mitchell: I told you it would be wise.

The PREMIER: I have nothing further to say, except that I cannot for the life of me see any connection between the sermon I am supposed to have preached in a church some few Sundays ago, the Sunday picture show regulations, whippet racing, and so on, and the provisions in this particular Bill. But may I say at once that while I have never attended whippet races, I have always held, and still hold, that the action of the previous Government in making these regulations apply to whippet clubs alone was a most ridiculous one.

Mr. Frank Wilson: It had a splendid result.

The PREMIER: A marvellous result, and it would be interesting to hear from the leader of the Opposition in what direction it had a result. The hon. member ought to know that the only result has been to compel the people to bet on the sly, just as the Licensing Act to-day has the marvellous result hon. members anticipated of causing drinking on the sly.

Mr. Frank Wilson: No.

The PREMIER: Whippet racing has been going on ever since, and I am backed up in the opinion I have expressed with regard to it by the police officers of the State. The Inspector of Police at Kalgoorlie pointed out to the Commissioner of Police that the instructions with regard to betting were clearly understood, and would be complied with, but that to prosecute the promoters of whippet racing and allow others to offend would place the police in a ridiculous position. If the

previous Cabinet decided to put the betting laws into operation they should have put them into operation against every individual, and not against those who are conducting whippet racing on the gold-fields only.

Mr. Mitchell: Why did you not do it?

The PREMIER: Why did not the hon. member opposite do it? Why take action against one section of the community and not the remainder? We have no right to distinguish between one section of the community as against any other when we are putting our laws into operation. If it is illegal to bet on whippet racing grounds it is illegal to bet at Belmont or Ascot, or any other course controlled by the Western Australian Turf Club; and our friends opposite who were so desirous of putting down the evil had not strength to take action against the turf club, because when they found that action was going to be taken against the turf club they backed down from their position.

Mr. Mitchell: I never heard of that.

The PREMIER: The Kalgoorlie people were specially selected by the Cabinet in connection with the evil of betting.

Mr. George: You can put it right now.

The PREMIER: We have issued instructions which we have made public, that there is to be no discrimination shown and we have no right to discriminate, in connection with treatment of that kind. If Parliament is of opinion that betting should be prohibited on any race-course or any place, then we are prepared as a Cabinet to put the laws into operation, and we are not concerned whether the opposition will be strenuous from the turf club or from anyone else. I never considered the Western Australian Turf Club one moment. I go further, and say that the Secretary of the Western Australian Turf Club wrote me and asked for an interview, but I declined to grant it until the House had had an opportunity of dealing with the Bill. I hope that hon. members opposite who have been discussing and putting the turf club view before the Chamber will see the matter from the point of view whether it is desirable

that the totalisator should be made use of as against the bookmaker, and apparently there is no one in favour of the latter in this Chamber. There can be no danger in giving the control to the Treasurer, who is responsible to Parliament, and then to the people, in issuing licenses at his discretion. Therefore, I trust the Bill will pass in its present form.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

### *In Committee.*

Mr. Holman in the Chair; the Premier in charge of the Bill.

Clause 1—agreed to.

Clause 2—Definitions:

Mr. MITCHELL moved an amendment—

*That in line 2 the words "except in Section 14 any club, company or association incorporated or otherwise" be struck out and "Western Australian Trotting Association" be inserted in lieu.*

The PREMIER: It was not his intention to accept the amendment. The matter had already been discussed very fully, and he assured members that he had no feeling in the matter. The sense of the Committee might be obtained.

Mr. UNDERWOOD: In discussing the Bill he had done what he thought was right. The turf club had not influenced him at all, and he had never had any favour from the turf club, and resented the implication of motives. The Premier was somewhat illogical with regard to this amendment. He said he would decline to make any difference between the various clubs, and if he did not accept the amendment he would go back on the assurance that he had given that the privilege of using the totalisator would be extended solely to the trotting association. The Premier might inform the Committee exactly where they stood.

The PREMIER: An assurance had been given that the benefits of the Bill would not be extended to the unregistered racing clubs until Parliament had had an opportunity of dealing with the race clubs generally. He was prepared to adhere to that assurance, but as had

been pointed out by the member for Pilbara this Bill was not only for the guidance of the present Treasurer but for the Treasurer who might come after him. He believed that if we were going to have unregistered race clubs, they should have the use of the totalisator the same as the registered clubs, and the State should have the benefit of some of the profits accruing from the unregistered clubs. Therefore, he wanted the Bill to remain as it stood, giving the assurance that until legislation to deal with unregistered clubs had been considered by Parliament no licenses would be granted to them. Supposing that a Bill to deal with racing were to be introduced and in that Bill the unregistered clubs were recognised and it was proposed to have two controlling bodies, then so long as there were proper controlling bodies of both registered and unregistered clubs the evils of to-day might be removed. If such legislation were proposed it might be thought necessary to allow the unregistered clubs to use the totalisator, and in that event the provision would be already in the Act; but until that time arrived he did not intend to extend the operation of the totalisator to the unregistered racing clubs.

Mr. FRANK WILSON: When the legislation mentioned by the Premier was brought forward it would be time enough to seek the powers contained in the Bill. When the Premier brought forward legislation affecting the unregistered racecourses, he could include power to grant them the use of the totalisator. The Premier was to-day taking powers and giving a pledge that he was going to exclude certain sections of the community from the benefits of the Act.

The Premier: Following the bad example you set.

Mr. FRANK WILSON: Two blacks did not make a white. The Premier would find as he went along that he could not do exactly as he wished in the administrations of his laws, and that in certain contingencies he would not be able to be as severe as he was this evening. He would do well to accept an

amendment proposed by the Opposition side to extend the use of the totalisator solely to the trotting association, and that would relieve him from the unpleasant position in which he would otherwise find himself. The Western Australian Turf Club had not approached him in this matter, but the Premier had been approached and if he had been courteous he would have met the representatives of that body in the same way as he met Mr. Brennan on the racecourse. He (Mr. Wilson) had also attended one of the trotting meetings and Mr. Brennan had pointed out to him the pity it was that the totalisator could not be used in connection with trotting matches. He objected to the totalisator being used for the purpose of making profits for private individuals. The trotting association did not intend to distribute any profits amongst its members; in fact, the association would be in the same position as the Western Australian Turf Club in that respect. He hoped the Premier would be advised and accept the amendment confining the operations of the Bill to granting the use of the totalisator to the trotting association, which was the Premier's express desire.

The Premier: The Bill is particularly drafted not to affect the position of the Turf Club as it is to-day. That is why I did not see them.

Mr. FRANK WILSON: The Premier simply refused the secretary of the Turf Club an interview.

The Premier: How often did you refuse interviews to representatives of the whippet racing community?

Mr. FRANK WILSON: Never had he refused an interview to anybody, and always they had got a prompt reply.

Mr. B. J. STUBBS: While willing to do away altogether with unregistered racing, yet, while unregistered racing was in existence he saw no reason why a strenuous effort should not be made to abolish the bookmaker. It was to be regretted that the Premier had given way on this question.

Mr. Bolton: Weak.

Mr. B. J. STUBBS: The Premier had been weak in saying that he would not

grant the use of the totalisator to any unregistered clubs. The object to be kept in view was the abolition of the bookmakers from the whole of the racecourses.

Mr. O'Loughlen: If you do abolish them betting will still go on.

Mr. B. J. STUBBS: It was a weak argument to say that a crime could not be stopped.

Mr. O'Loughlen: Did they stop it in Adelaide?

Mr. B. J. STUBBS: If it was not stopped it was because the law was not administered as it should be. Racecourses existed for the purpose of betting, and there was not the slightest doubt that not one-third of the people who patronised racing nowadays would go to the racecourse if it were not for the betting.

Hon. W. C. Angwin (Honorary Minister): If there were no betting there would be no racing.

Mr. B. J. STUBBS: That was so, and as it seemed impossible at the present time to prevent betting, members should seek to regulate it and that could best be done by substituting the totalisator for the bookmaker. If unregistered courses were to continue they should have the use of the totalisator the same as the registered clubs. If, later, legislation were introduced on the subject, he would support the abolition of unregistered clubs, and the further limitation of the number of racing days even on registered courses.

Mr. GEORGE: If the member for Subiaco was willing to support the abolition of unregistered racecourses why did he not support the amendment of the member for Northam? And if the Premier was not going to apply the Bill to any other body than the trotting association until amending legislation was introduced to deal with the racing clubs generally, why did he oppose the amendment? As the Premier had stated that intention, there could be no objection to an amendment which exactly showed it. Certainly it would be putting it beyond the power of tempting any future Treasurer, who

might seek to raise revenue by licensing unregistered racecourses.

Mr. MITCHELL: The Premier was ungenerous in regard to the insinuation that members were approached by the Western Australian Turf Club. No member of the turf club committee had seen him, though certainly he had interviewed the secretary to gain some information he sought for in regard to the manner in which people got access to the racecourse. No doubt, while the Premier was Treasurer, unregistered clubs would not be licensed, but the Bill permitted it. The amendment would accord with the Premier's desires in this respect, and would relieve him from the possibility of litigation.

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

Ayes	..	..	..	18
Noes	..	..	..	26
Majority against				8

#### AYES.

Mr. Allen	Mr. Monger
Mr. Broun	Mr. A. E. Plesse
Mr. Carpenter	Mr. A. N. Plesse
Mr. George	Mr. S. Stubbs
Mr. Harper	Mr. Taylor
Mr. Lefroy	Mr. Underwood
Mr. Lewis	Mr. F. Wilson
Mr. Male	Mr. Wisdom
Mr. Mitchell	Mr. Layman

(Teller).

#### NOES.

Mr. Angwin	Mr. Lander
Mr. Bath	Mr. McDowall
Mr. Bolton	Mr. Mullan y
Mr. Collier	Mr. Munste
Mr. Dooley	Mr. O'Loughlen
Mr. Dwyer	Mr. Price
Mr. Foley	Mr. Scaddan
Mr. Gardiner	Mr. B. J. Stubbs
Mr. Gill	Mr. Swan
Mr. Green	Mr. Thomas
Mr. Hudson	Mr. Turvey
Mr. Johnson	Mr. Walker
Mr. Johnston	Mr. Heilmann

(Teller).

Amendment thus negatived.

Clause put and passed.

Clause 3—Totalisator licenses:

Mr. MONGER moved an amendment—

*That in line 2 after "clubs" the words "duly registered by the Western Australian Turf Club" be inserted.*

The opportunity could be taken for thanking the Premier for the unfair inference that he (Mr. Monger) was in any way influenced by the Western Australian Turf Club. He had not been interviewed by any member of the committee of the turf club. The Premier accused hon. members of the Opposition—

The CHAIRMAN: The hon. member should have risen at the time and taken exception.

Mr. MONGER: The opportunity could not be allowed to pass without letting the Premier know the appreciation members had of the remarks referred to. The amendment would prevent unregistered clubs from being licensed.

Mr. DWYER: The effect of the amendment was really to reduce the law into its present condition. Would the Chairman give his ruling as to whether it was in order in view of the amendment which had been previously moved?

The CHAIRMAN: The amendment was in order. It would allow the Treasurer to issue licenses.

Mr. DWYER: The Western Australian Turf Club in its constitution could not possibly register the trotting association. Any club registered by the turf club was allowed to use the totalisator, and the amendment proposed to again confer that right. The trotting association was not registered by the turf club. The objection we might have had to the Bill disappeared after the assurance the Premier had given that he would introduce a comprehensive measure next session. All the clubs duly registered and licensed would come under the provisions of this Bill, and it would be found a very useful measure to have. The amendment of the member for York would leave matters as they were before, including the destroying of the right of the trotting association to use the totalisator because the turf club could not register them.

Mr. GEORGE: At the present time it was the turf club that could issue licenses, and under the Bill it would be the Treasurer who would issue them.

Mr. TAYLOR: There was no justification for the amendment. The Committee had decided the question on the previous

clause so far as the trotting association was concerned, and the further amendment on this matter could really not be discussed. The turf club already had the power, and why say, "We shall allow you to continue to have it." If the Committee carried the amendment the turf club would have no power to grant licenses to the trotting association, so that the cardinal features of the Bill would be lost.

Amendment put and negatived.

Mr. MONGER moved a further amendment—

*That in line 2 the word "clubs" be struck out and "W.A. Trotting Association" be inserted in lieu.*

The CHAIRMAN: The amendment was out of order. The hon. member had already moved an amendment after the word "clubs" and he could not go back.

Mr. B. J. STUBBS moved a further amendment—

*That the following stand as Sub-clause 4:—"Provided that all profits accruing to any club from the use of the totalisator shall be expended in the increasing of stakes or improvements to the racecourse."*

Every hon. member would be in favour of the amendment because they recognised that where any proprietary club had the use of the totalisator the profits derived from it should go towards improving the convenience of patrons and increasing the stakes to encourage the improvement of the breed of horses.

Mr. DWYER: Was the hon. member moving the amendment in conjunction with the definition of the word "clubs," The definition of "clubs" was, all clubs except the Western Australian Turf Club, or a body registered under the Western Australian Turf Club. The effect of the amendment would be that all clubs, except the turf club and those clubs registered by that body, would have to use the funds only in the way the hon. member mentioned. All the clubs registered by the Western Australian Turf Club could, under the amendment, do as they pleased with their profits.

Mr. Bolton: It is an absurd amendment. Why not wait until the comprehensive measure is introduced?

Mr. DWYER: Who was to get the balance sheet of these clubs to ascertain what profits they had made? It was a sort of pious wish of the member for Subiaco and it seemed rather impracticable.

Mr. FRANK WILSON: The clubs using the totalisator now had to make returns for the Taxation Department.

Mr. Dwyer: The returns to the Commissioner of Taxation are confidential.

Mr. FRANK WILSON did not think so. The principle the hon. member was aiming at was a good one.

Mr. Dwyer: It could be done by way of a separate clause.

Mr. FRANK WILSON: It would be an easier matter to report progress and have a new clause drafted.

Mr. Dwyer: Why not wait for the comprehensive measure?

Mr. FRANK WILSON: Why leave everything until next session? Why should there be a bad Bill passed into law because something better had been promised for next session?

Mr. Dwyer: We already had to patch up a lot of bad work of the past Government.

Mr. FRANK WILSON: The hon. member never patched up any bad work of the present Government.

Mr. Dwyer: I helped to do so.

Mr. FRANK WILSON: Never. The member for Subiaco believed in the principle, and so did he (Mr. Wilson) that the clubs should not expend the profits made out of the totalisator for their own personal benefit. If members opposite agreed with the principle it would be a simple matter to have the clause redrafted. He would support the amendment.

Mr. MITCHELL: The provision should apply only to proprietary clubs, because in the case of clubs registered with the Western Australian Turf Club the whole of the funds were expended either in stakes or on the grounds. Therefore he hoped that if the amendment were agreed to it would be made to apply only to pro-

proprietary clubs, for there was no reason at all why the ordinary race clubs should be put to the bother of making the necessary returns.

Mr. BOLTON: The Premier had made it pretty clear that he desired to lessen the bookmakers and increase the facilities for the use of the totalisator. The amendment would tend to abolish the totalisator on proprietary courses because of its harrassing conditions. Every bookmaker had to pay a license fee for the day, and naturally enough if the amendment were carried the proprietary clubs would dispense with the totalisator and issue an increased number of licenses to bookmakers. He hoped the hon. member would not press the amendment.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: The Bill was only the beginning of the putting into practice of something which hon. members professed to desire, but which when put before them they bitterly opposed, namely, the control, by representatives of the people, through the totalisator, of betting on racecourses. He hoped the member for Subiaco would not press the amendment.

Mr. FRANK WILSON: It was not right to say that the Opposition had been bitterly opposing the Bill because it proposed to legalise the totalisator. The Premier had said he did not propose to license the totalisator for any but the trotting association, notwithstanding which power was being taken to extend the totalisator to any other course. The Opposition had suggested that the Premier should leave the further powers he was taking until such time as he dealt with the whole question in a comprehensive measure, and in the meantime to take power merely to license the trotting association to use the totalisator. It was because it had been taken so much further than was intended that opposition was being shown to the Bill. Certainly there might be some difficulty in carrying out the purport of the amendment, but that could be overcome by redrafting. What the Opposition desired was to restrict betting, which everybody agreed could not be absolutely abolished. The Premier

should refrain from taking the wider powers he proposed to take until such time as he brought down the promised comprehensive measure.

The Minister for Lands: It will simplify matters later if he take the wider powers now.

Mr. FRANK WILSON: That was scarcely so. If the Premier would be content merely to issue a license to the Western Australian Turf Club to use the totalisator, all opposition to the passage of the amendment would be withdrawn. He hoped the member for Subiaco would press his amendment. If the principle were affirmed further amendments could be drafted for carrying into effect the object of the present amendment.

Mr. B. J. STUBBS: The intention of the amendment was a thoroughly good one, but after having heard the various arguments he believed that the amendment might have the effect of defeating the object he had in view. He believed the argument put forward by the member for South Fremantle was a fairly sound one and in view of this he would ask leave to withdraw the amendment.

Amendment put and a division called for.

Mr. B. J. STUBBS: Was the Chairman not aware that he had asked permission to withdraw the amendment?

The CHAIRMAN: The hon. member could not withdraw the amendment now that a division had been called for.

Mr. GEORGE: Could not the vote of the member for Subiaco be claimed by those supporting the amendment? The member for Subiaco was actually voting against his own amendment.

Division taken with the following result:—

Ayes	..	..	..	13
Noes	..	..	..	24

Majority against .. 11

#### AYES.

Mr. Allen	Mr. A. E. Plesse
Mr. George	Mr. A. N. Plesse
Mr. Hudson	Mr. Underwood
Mr. Layman	Mr. F. Wilson
Mr. Lewis	Mr. Wisdom
Mr. Male	Mr. Swan
Mr. Monger	(Teller).

#### NOES.

Mr. Angwin	Mr. Mitchell
Mr. Bath	Mr. Mullany
Mr. Bolton	Mr. Munsie
Mr. Collier	Mr. O'Loghlen
Mr. Dooley	Mr. Price
Mr. Dwyer	Mr. Scaddan
Mr. Foley	Mr. B. J. Stubbs
Mr. Gardiner	Mr. Taylor
Mr. Gill	Mr. Turvey
Mr. Johnson	Mr. Walker
Mr. Johnston	Mr. Heilmann
Mr. Lander	(Teller).
Mr. McDowall	

Amendment thus negatived.

Clause put and passed.

Clause 4—agreed to.

Clause 5—Application for licenses:

Mr. MITCHELL: What amount did the Treasurer propose to charge by way of fee? The Government already collected a large amount from the totalisator, and the fee should be as small as possible. It was a matter of importance to many of the country clubs to know what fee the Government proposed to charge.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: The Treasurer had not determined on the amount of the license fee; that would be fixed by regulation, but as the regulations had to be laid on the Table, if members thought the fees were exorbitant they could review them.

Mr. MITCHELL: The Government should know their intentions in submitting a Bill of this character. The Government already received 2½ per cent. of the 10 per cent. collected by the clubs in connection with the totalisator, and he would protest if it was proposed to make more than a nominal charge under this Bill. It would be unsatisfactory to deal with the matter after the regulations had been made, when, perhaps, some of the licenses had been taken out.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: The member for Northam could rest assured that the fee would not be an unjust one. The hon. member was asking for information in regard to the amount, such as was not given in other measures where the fees were prescribed by regulations.

Clause put and passed.

Clauses 6 to 14—agreed to.

Title—agreed to.

Bill reported without amendment; the report adopted.

# BILL—PARLIAMENTARY ALLOWANCES ACT AMENDMENT.

## *Second Reading.*

The PREMIER (Hon. J. Scaddan) in moving the second reading said: This measure will require very few remarks from me, except to explain that the Bill provides for the insertion of a clause in the Parliamentary Allowances Act of 1911, similar to the section which was dropped by the previous Administration, when they passed that measure. We have always held, and still hold, that members were not acquainted with the intentions of that Bill when they permitted it to pass in the form in which it was placed on the statute-book.

Mr. Frank Wilson: Absolutely.

The PREMIER: No.

Mr. Frank Wilson: Of course you did.

The PREMIER: I assert again that the Government took the opportunity of using their position so that members had either to accept the Bill as they found it, or else lose that for which they had been fighting for a number of years.

Mr. Frank Wilson: Does the Premier say that he did not know what was in the Bill?

The PREMIER: No, I did not know.

Mr. Frank Wilson: Oh!

The PREMIER: The leader of the Opposition waxes warm. Let me repeat what I have said previously, that neither the ex-Premier nor the ex-Minister for Lands, when they consulted me in accordance with the promise they made, that they would consult me as leader of the Opposition in regard to the Bill when it was being drafted—

Mr. Frank Wilson: I never promised to consult you in regard to the drafting of the Bill.

The PREMIER: When the resolution was carried in 1910 in regard to the increase of members' salaries, the then Premier told the House that he would consult with the leader of the Opposition when the Bill was being drafted.

Mr. Frank Wilson: I did tell you what was in the Bill.

The PREMIER: The leader of the then Government did consult with me in regard to the matter, but in the usual manner of consulting with the leader of the Opposition—by telling him what he intended to do, with the exception that he never told me that he proposed to drop the clause in the previous Parliamentary Allowances Act, so that Ministers might draw salaries as members in addition to the Ministerial salaries.

Mr. Frank Wilson: I did.

The PREMIER: He did not.

Mr. Frank Wilson: I say I did.

The PREMIER: And I say that the ex-Premier did not mention it to me, and I say that the ex-Minister for Lands, when he consulted with me, did not mention that provision of the Bill to me, and no member on the Opposition side knew at that time anything about it until the present Minister for Lands drew attention to it, when the Bill had proceeded a fair way on the second reading.

Mr. George: What about the references of the Premier in introducing the Bill.

The PREMIER: I was not in the Chamber at the time, but I believe that the then Premier made no reference to it, and it was the present Minister for Lands who first drew our attention to it. I say that the then Government were taking advantage of the position, that members had pledged themselves to an increase of the salaries of members, to increase their own Ministerial salaries, notwithstanding that they had pledged themselves to the country to reduce their salaries.

Mr. Frank Wilson: Nothing of the sort.

The PREMIER: What is the use of ex-Premier denying that the Government—

Mr. Frank Wilson: I say that we did not use our position to force this through the Chamber.

The PREMIER: Members were forced into the position of accepting this, or else the Government would have dropped the Bill. Moreover, the country had not

given the Government or Parliament a mandate to increase the salaries of Ministers.

Mr. Frank Wilson: The country did not give you a mandate to increase your own salaries.

The PREMIER: No, but we took the responsibility and the country has endorsed it. Moreover every member then sitting in opposition was pledged to an increase of members' salaries whenever an opportunity presented itself. Now let me say further that we accept the position that the country did not give any mandate to the previous Administration to increase Ministers' salaries, and we have not had any mandate to continue to accept the increased salaries, and, therefore, we are now submitting an amendment to prevent Ministers from drawing salaries as members in addition to their salaries as Ministers.

Mr. George: Very creditable, indeed.

The PREMIER: I do not know that there is anything very creditable about it, but having objected during the general elections to the increase of Ministerial salaries, we now take the first opportunity of asking Parliament to reduce them. In regard to the other clauses in the Bill, there was no question ever raised that the Speaker or the Chairman of Committees in the Legislative Assembly, or the President, or the Chairman of Committees in the Legislative Council, should receive a salary greater than the amount previously provided by special Act, and I do not think there has been any mandate from the people at the last general elections.

Mr. Bolton: Why should they be specially exempted from the increase?

The PREMIER: They are not. The position is just this. I want to tell the member for South Fremantle—

Mr. Bolton: Why me?

The PREMIER: Well not the hon. member particularly but the public generally—there is no comparison between the work and responsibilities of the Speaker and President and Chairmen of Committees and those of Ministers of the

Crown. There is not the same call upon them in their positions; and to ask Ministers of the Crown to take the responsibilities they have at the salary they get, and at the same time to bring the Speaker to practically the same amount, is an absurdity.

Mr. Bolton: What do you mean by "the same amount"? The Minister gets £1,000 and the Chairmen of Committees get £500.

The PREMIER: The Speaker gets £700, and under the present proposal it will be £600, as provided previously. There was never any desire on the part of members; there was not a member in the Chamber that I know of, including the member for South Fremantle, that raised his voice in favour of an increase to the Speaker.

Mr. Frank Wilson: They never objected.

Mr. Bolton: I expected he would naturally get the increase provided for other members.

[Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.]

The PREMIER: I did not hear it whispered by any hon. member that the salaries received by these respective gentlemen should be increased.

Mr. Bolton: With other members.

The PREMIER: I am not making any complaint. If the member for South Fremantle, and other members, consider the salaries are not in conformity with the duties these gentlemen perform, I shall not object to any amendments; but I am going to be consistent and say that I know of no member on either side of the House that went to the public and told them he was endeavouring to see an increase to these salaries.

Mr. Bolton: With other members.

The PREMIER: I am saying what the public authorised members of Parliament to do, to increase the salaries of members, but I never heard at any time mention of an increase to Ministers' salaries, or to the salaries of officials of the House; and I hold we would not be consistent as a Ministry in reducing Minis-

ters' salaries because the people did not endorse the increase if we did not at the same time make an effort in this measure for a reduction of the salaries of the Speaker and President and Chairmen of Committees. I still hold the opinion that we are justified in bringing down these reductions as well as the others, and I therefore move—

*That the Bill be now read a second time.*

Mr. FRANK WILSON: I move—

*That the debate be adjourned.*

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

Ayes	..	..	..	16
Noes	..	..	..	26

Majority against	..	10
------------------	----	----

# AYES.

Mr. Allen  
Mr. Bolton  
Mr. Broun  
Mr. Doolley  
Mr. George  
Mr. Harper  
Mr. Holman  
Mr. Lefroy

Mr. Male  
Mr. Mitchell  
Mr. Monger  
Mr. A. E. Piesse  
Mr. A. N. Piesse  
Mr. F. Wilson  
Mr. Wisdom  
Mr. Layman

(Teller).

# NOES.

Mr. Angwin  
Mr. Bath  
Mr. Collier  
Mr. Dwyer  
Mr. Foley  
Mr. Gardiner  
Mr. Gil  
Mr. Green  
Mr. Hudson  
Mr. Johnson  
Mr. Johnston  
Mr. Lander  
Mr. Lewis

Mr. McDowall  
Mr. Mullany  
Mr. Munsie  
Mr. O'Loughlin  
Mr. Price  
Mr. Scaddan  
Mr. B. J. Stubbs  
Mr. Taylor  
Mr. Thomas  
Mr. Turvey  
Mr. Underwood  
Mr. Walker  
Mr. Heltmann

(Teller).

Motion thus negatived.

Mr. FRANK WILSON (Sussex): The Premier in moving the second reading, has, I maintain, gone out of his way to make a most cowardly and offensive attack upon myself and my colleagues of the late Administration. He has not the manliness to stand up in the House and own up that he was a party to the passing of the measure as it exists to-day.

Mr. Price: Is the leader of the Opposition in order in referring to any member as cowardly?

Mr. SPEAKER: The term is not in order.

Mr. FRANK WILSON: I referred to a cowardly attack. Hon. members on the Government side have used that expression on scores of occasions.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member can make use of the term "cowardly attack."

Mr. FRANK WILSON: I hope the member for Albany is satisfied.

The Premier: The hon. member is making a cowardly reply.

Mr. FRANK WILSON: The Premier had not the manliness to own up to his being a party to the passing of the measure, and to knowing what it contained. Playing to the gallery as usual, he takes up the attitude that the Bill went through last session and he was not conversant with its contents. Even if I could not prove that to be wrong by Hansard, hon. members on this side of the House would not believe that the then leader of the Opposition did not know what was in a measure of this description which he was so anxious to see passed himself. The Premier says he had no knowledge of the intention of the then Government, and further makes the charge that I used my position to force an increase of Ministerial salaries.

The Premier: I said you used the position hon. members were in.

Mr. FRANK WILSON: I took a note down at the time that the Premier used the words that I used my position to force an increase of Ministerial salaries. I emphatically deny both of these charges. I am going to prove to the House, before I sit down, that there is no ground for any such suggestion, and that if the Premier did not have knowledge of what was in the Bill, then he has only himself to blame, but I am going to prove that he had a knowledge of what was in the measure, and knew full well that Ministerial salaries were to be increased, together with those of the Speaker, the President of the Legislative Council, and the two Chairmen of Committees. The question first

came up in October on a motion by the member for Pilbara, the present member, who moved—"That in the opinion of this House it is desirable that members' salaries be increased from £200 to £300 per year, such increase to have effect as from the commencement of the present financial year." That motion was submitted in due course by a short speech of the hon. member, and it was replied to by myself. I pointed out that I would like to have further time to inquire into the suggestion, and that I hoped the hon. member would not press his motion to a division that night. I acknowledged that I had always been opposed to the payment of members, but went on to say that it was an undoubted principle that had been adopted right throughout the Commonwealth, and that as we had adopted the principle—I am not using the exact words but I shall quote them now—

If we are to pay members, as we do in this Assembly and have done for many years past, I am not one to advocate a starvation wage. I believe in members being paid an adequate remuneration for their services. I say also that Ministers should be paid an adequate remuneration, I do not consider they get anything like a reward for the hard work they have to do and for the long hours they have to work, and also for the severe criticism they are subjected to from time to time by members of the Opposition. There is another aspect of this question I have been thinking about considerably for the last few months, that is, that the leader of the Opposition should receive some extra remuneration. It is an important post he fills. He has, during the session of Parliament at any rate, very long hours to work and very arduous labours to perform, inasmuch as he has to criticise nearly every measure that comes before the House, whereas we have a number of Ministers to make a study of these measures and we can distribute the work among many. Altogether I feel that if we are to take this step, first of all it should not be made retrospective.

Then the present Attorney General interjected, "Why not?" and I went on to say—

I think at any rate, if any step is taken it should be for the next financial year, if not from the beginning of the new Parliament, in order that immediately afterwards we may appeal to the country to get the endorsement of the electors. I would prefer it to date from the beginning of the new Parliament.

Then I made some further remarks, but that is about the gist of what I said with reference to Ministers' salaries, the increases to ordinary members, and the increase to the leader of the Opposition. Strange to say, right throughout the subsequent debate in which the present Attorney General took part, and in which the member for Murray also took part, and several other members, including the members for Brown Hill, Mount Margaret, Perth, East Perth, West Perth, Swan, and Roebourne, although the present Premier was in the House, I do not see that he made a speech. He was certainly in the House because he interjected during the whole of that debate, and there was never the slightest objection taken to the suggestion that Ministers should have increases to their salaries.

The Minister for Lands: Was any reference made by those other members?

Mr. FRANK WILSON: Not the slightest reference.

The Minister for Lands: It was never taken seriously.

Mr. FRANK WILSON: And yet the hon. member took the reference to the leader of the Opposition seriously.

The Minister for Lands: If you will read the speeches which follow you will see that the matter of the leader of the Opposition is referred to.

Mr. FRANK WILSON: At any rate, the hon. member was the only member who referred to the leader of the Opposition.

The Minister for Lands: I was not leader then.

Mr. FRANK WILSON: I am pointing out that I made equally pertinent references to the question of Ministerial

salaries, and if the hon. member opposed it and thought it was wrong he should have referred to it.

Mr. Mitchell: Did it not come back from the Upper House after debate there?

Mr. FRANK WILSON: Yes. This was in October, 1910. The present Attorney General took great exception to hon. members wishing to postpone the date upon which the increase ought to come into operation, and he also took exception to anyone suggesting that the electors throughout the State should be consulted, because, I think it was on an amendment by the then member for Swan that a referendum should be taken, that the Attorney General became indignant at the idea.

The Attorney General: I said we had already done it.

Mr. FRANK WILSON: The hon. member said that members of his party had mentioned it on the hustings, and that the Labour Congress had decided that the salaries of members should be raised to £400, and he took strong exception to £300. His remarks were—

What are the first principles of the Labour party; they are that a man shall receive the full payment he is deserving of.

And then he went on to say that we had to be just to ourselves, and he quoted those well-known lines—

To thine own self be true;

And it must follow, as the night the day,

Thou canst not then be false to any man.

I outlined in my speech the intentions of the Government. I said just as much on the question of Ministerial salaries as I did on the question of the salary of the leader of the Opposition. Hon. members, some of them on the Opposition at that time, took up the question of the leader of the Opposition's salary, but refrained from mentioning or stating anything with regard to the proposal to increase the Ministerial salaries. If a man allows a matter of that sort to go by default then he acquiesces. Let me go a little further, and in passing let me say at once that I am not opposed to this Bill; do not let hon. members think that I am making

this speech with the object of blocking the passage of the Bill. I believe in a man being paid according to his value—the Attorney General's own words—and I am not going to dispute for one moment the value hon. members opposite set upon themselves. I believe what they propose is quite sufficient for the present occupants of the Treasury Benches. When I have the honour to again occupy a seat on that bench, and the opportunity will come again very shortly, I shall take care that the salary is adequate for my services. Let me say that I distinctly told the leader of the Opposition every provision of the Bill, as I promised the House I would do at that time. I do not know that my colleague, the member for Northam, ever had a conference with the hon. member; he certainly had a conversation.

The Premier: That is all you ever had.

Mr. FRANK WILSON: I stated what I intended to put into the Bill.

The Premier: You did nothing of the kind.

Mr. FRANK WILSON: I do not want to use any harsh words.

The Premier: Say what you feel inclined to say; do not keep anything up your sleeve.

Mr. FRANK WILSON: I will say anything that I think is right, and which will be within the Standing Orders of this House; the hon. member need not be afraid about that. I will tell him that he has made a wrong statement to-night, and I will prove it out of *Hansard*. No matter what went before in October, we will pass that by for the moment. Let us now consider what was said when I introduced this measure on its second reading, and when it was explained fully. The Premier would have us believe to-night that I did not explain, and purposely left out or refrained from explaining, that this measure included an advance of Ministers' salaries; at least, that is the interpretation everyone must put upon his words. These are the words that I used in moving the second reading of this measure. I will omit the introductory paragraphs, and come right down to the question of

Ministerial salaries. Talking about members' salaries, after mentioning that payment of members would be an accomplished fact in the House of Commons at no distant date, I went on to say—

Admitting that position, I often have to ask myself as to whether we are paying members a reasonable salary for their services; and I feel that we command work from members in this House at any rate of our Legislature, which is strenuous in the extreme. At any rate during the last three or four months it has been strenuous so far as members on the Government side are concerned, and I believe that members on the Opposition side have made it very strenuous for themselves.

Then I went on to point out—

I have provided in this measure that for the new Parliament at any rate, because I do not approve of voting members an addition to our salaries, and seeing we are to have a general election within a few months' time, ordinary members in the Legislative Assembly shall receive £300 per annum. In addition to that I have considered very carefully the position of the leader of the Opposition; and, recognising the strenuous work he has undoubtedly to perform and the continuous attention he has to give to public business—because through his hands pass all the measures that emanate from half a dozen Ministers—of course I do not for a moment suggest that he, or any other leader of the Opposition could go into the whole details of the Acts as Ministers have to do that are put through this Chamber and another place, still at any rate he needs to have a fairly accurate knowledge of what is going on in order that he may fill the role of critic, and in order that he may make suggestions and generally lead his party in a wholesome criticism of the measures that are put before the House for their approval—recognising this, as I say, I must admit that the leader of the Opposition is not adequately remunerated at the ordinary salary of a member of Parliament; and I have provided in this Bill that, in addition to the ordinary salary of £300

per year, he shall receive extra remuneration to the extent of £200 a year, giving him a salary of £500 a year. Then we have put in a clause in which we have looked after Ministers of the Crown also, and we provide that Ministers shall in addition to their salaries be able to draw their salaries as members.

The Premier: You did not put the clause in.

Mr. FRANK WILSON: I amended the original Act by striking out certain words. I went on to say—

This will increase their salaries by the amount of £300 per annum which they will draw after this Bill passes.

Can there be anything plainer than those words, and yet the Premier will have us believe that the Bill slipped through without any reference to the matter and that he was unaware of it. The thing is preposterous. Then I went on to explain the several items of the Bill, and I said—

It is provided in Clause 3 that the Chairman of Committees in the Assembly and the Council shall each receive an allowance of £500 per annum.

Mr. Bolton: That was an advance of £100, and it was a perfectly legitimate advance.

Mr. FRANK WILSON: Yes. I concluded as follows:—

These briefly are the clauses of the measure, a Bill which I think will receive the approval of the majority of members of this Chamber, and also I hope of another place.

I went on to say—

I have no party concern in it. My colleagues agree with me that it is a reasonable proposition to put before the Assembly, and I leave the measure in the hands of the House to deal with it as they may deem best according to their conscience.

Are these the words of a man who wished to smuggle a Bill of this importance through the Chamber? Are they the words of a man who was using his position to force an increase of his own salary and the salaries of his colleagues, or are they the words of one who left the whole issue in the hands of hon. members to decide

for or against, according to their consciences? Then the leader of the Opposition got up and made his speech also in connection with the measure and, referring to the salary of the leader of the Opposition, in which at the time he was interested, he said—

I would like to say to that, so far as the position I occupy is concerned, I regret very much I cannot make the salary of the leader of the Opposition retrospective for the past five years. The Premier will recognise it will not apply to me. Every member will agree that there has been no person, irrespective of who has held the position of leader of the Opposition, who has applied himself more closely to his duties as leader of the Opposition, while not actually obtaining a majority of the electors, but yet representing a party almost equal to that occupying the Treasury benches, than did the ex-leader of the Opposition (Mr. Bath).

We all agreed with that, but of course we could not make it retrospective. Then the leader of the Opposition went on to say—

The responsibility for making the increase will rest with members of this Parliament, and having accepted the responsibility I contend we are justified in asking that the increase should apply to members of this Parliament as well as the members of the next Parliament.

Immediately afterwards he said:

We have already decided, on the 19th of October last, that we are not adequately paid for the services we render, and it is not asking too much to say that the increase should apply three months later than this decision, namely from the 1st January.

Not only was I very explicit, as I pointed out here, in explaining exactly what the Government intended to do, but a similar explanation was given in another place. The then Colonial Secretary, in introducing the Bill in that House, said—

This measure makes provision that payment of a member shall not cease because a member becomes a Minister. This power exists in the Fed-

eral Parliament. The Minister can draw his salary as a private member as well as that of a member of the Executive.

Is there anything stronger that I could quote?

The Premier: Where was that?

Mr. FRANK WILSON: In another place.

The Premier: After it had left us?

Mr. FRANK WILSON: But it came back to us with that provision made, and we accepted it. The point I want to make is that the Premier poses here as having had no knowledge of what we intended to do. I have proved to him that I mentioned it in October and I have proved to him that the mention in similar terms of the salary of the leader of the Opposition was taken seriously by his colleagues although not mentioned by himself. I proved to him that even if he were not aware in the month of October, still when the second reading of the Bill was introduced, which is the time when a Minister fully explains the details of proposed legislation, I explicitly explained every clause in the Bill and what its effects would be, pointing out that Ministers would receive the extra £300 per annum; and although the hon. member took much longer to discuss the second reading of the measure on the same day I introduced it, he did not take the slightest exception to any clause in the Bill. His only concern was to see that the Bill passed, and to make it retrospective to the 1st January. Now, am I not entitled to claim that he acquiesced in every clause of the measure? If hon. members will treat the thing from a fair standpoint they will certainly agree that when a responsible member of the House, such as the leader of the Opposition, in discussing a measure allows a statement by the Premier that Minister's salaries are to be increased to go by without mention, it is idle for him to come here now and complain that he was hoodwinked, and that the measure was passed through with ulterior motives. I reject with the scorn it deserves the insinuation that I used my position to force the measure

through with the one purpose of increasing my own and my colleagues salaries. The words belie the hon. member who uses them, and I stoutly and emphatically give the refutation to the foul slander the Premier would have the House accept in regard to myself and my colleagues.

Mr. SPEAKER: That language is not in order.

Mr. FRANK WILSON: I do not know; I think it is used in many other Houses of Parliament.

The Premier: Chair! Chair!

Mr. SPEAKER: I am not inclined to follow slavishly the words which are taken exception to in the British House of Commons, as set out in the list I have before me, but my own common sense leads me to pick out words which to my mind are not words which shall be used in the Chamber; and, with all due deference to the leader of the Opposition, I think the words "foul slander" should not be used in the Chamber.

Mr. FRANK WILSON: In deference to your ruling, Mr. Speaker, I withdraw the words "foul slander" and say base insinuation, or base charge, charge which has no foundation in fact, and which, certainly, the hon. member himself must recognise is a wrong charge to make against anybody on either side of the House. I do not desire to labour the question further; I simply want to clear the imputation cast upon me and my colleagues that I used my responsible position in such a way. I left the matter of the Bill to the conscience of members. I cared not whether or not the Bill was carried, as I proved by the expressions used when introducing the measure. Every member of the then House had equal opportunity of knowing exactly what was in the Bill. I did not leave it to the reading of the clauses. I explained it in explicit words. For the Premier to come here to-night and say that he was hoodwinked is idle, because no member can accept such a statement. Let me say in conclusion that I do not intend to oppose the Bill, at any rate so far as reduction in Ministerial salaries is concerned.

Mr. Price: Be consistent.

Mr. FRANK WILSON: I am consistent, absolutely. I believe with the Attorney General in the great principle of the Labour party that a man should be paid according to what he deserves. I am not going to dispute the value which hon. members opposite place upon their services to Western Australia, or the value the Premier puts upon his own services.

Mr. Heitmann: The electors put a fairly correct value on your services.

Mr. FRANK WILSON: No, but the electors have done that to the party the hon. member belongs to, and they will do it again. The pendulum will assuredly swing, and the time will come when I and my colleagues shall again fill those positions; and then, I can assure the House, I will see that the true value is placed upon the services of myself and my colleagues.

Mr. TAYLOR (Mount Margaret): I have pleasure in supporting the second reading of the measure. At the same time, may I express my sorrow that I have to do so. Certainly one who has belonged to the party I belong to, and read the speeches of its members during the last campaign, cannot help supporting this measure brought down by the Premier. There is no doubt that a very large number of members of this party made a great deal of capital on the platform out of the increase of Ministerial salaries.

Mr. Frank Wilson: And very wrongly.

Mr. TAYLOR: I am wholly exempt; my electors never interrogated me on the point, and it was never mentioned. So far as I am personally concerned I am free in that particular to act as I choose, but after reading the speeches against the increase of Ministerial salaries made by my friends on this side of the House, we must, if we are honest in those pledges, bring down a Bill for the reduction of the salaries.

Mr. Frank Wilson: You can do that without making accusations.

Mr. TAYLOR: The Premier will have to answer for his own accusations—I made none; but I am sorry that attitude was taken up by the Labour party during

the campaign for this reason: I am not going to stand in this House to-night and say I was not aware that Ministers were going to receive, under the Bill brought forward last session, their Parliamentary salary in addition to their Ministerial salary, because the very title of the Bill is sufficient for hon. members to see that. The second clause in the Bill states, "The Payment of Members Act, 1900, is hereby repealed," and there are only four short clauses in the repealed Act, and not any of these clauses have any subclauses attached to them. Section 4 in the 1900 Act says—

No member whilst in receipt out of the Consolidated Revenue of any official salary or annual sum shall be entitled to receive any such payment as aforesaid, except in so far as such payment may exceed the amount of such official salary or annual sum.

That Act was repealed, and hon. members must have known if they had followed the debate and listened to the then Premier when introducing the Bill and discussing it, that the measure provided for Ministers receiving their Parliamentary salary in addition to the Ministerial salary. I was perfectly aware of it, and I was of opinion until I read the speeches delivered on the hustings that all the other members on the Opposition side were aware of it too. On account of that attitude I am supporting the reduction, and I am glad that I have an opportunity of speaking in regard to the Act which provides for the payment of members' salaries, because I intend, while supporting the second reading of this Bill, to move the following amendment when we reach Committee—"New clause: Paragraph (a) of Section 3 of the principal Act is hereby amended by the omission of the word 'three' and the insertion of the word 'two' in lieu thereof." If hon. members will read the section of the Act they will see that it reads as follows:—"Each member of the Legislative Assembly shall receive an allowance at the rate of £300 a year." I am compelled, as a private member, to move for the reduction, because I cannot move for an increase, but if the members are with me in striking out the word "three" with the object of inserting "two"

—and I am doing that only because I cannot move to strike out "three" with a view to inserting "four"—further action will rest with the Premier. The insertion of the word "four" would mean an increase of taxation, or a further draw from Consolidated Revenue, and that requires a Message from the Governor. I am going to move this amendment so that the Premier can then report progress and bring down a Message from the Governor, which will enable the word "four" to be inserted. In doing that, the Premier would be doing what the Labour party were told to do by the congress which sat at Bunbury. A motion was moved that £300 a year should be the salary of members of Parliament, and that was amended by making the amount £400, which figure was supported by several members of this House, including Mr. Holman, the member for Murchison, Mr. Troy, the Speaker of to-day, and many other members of the congress, and delegates from the women's leagues, including Mrs. W. D. Johnson, the wife of a member of Parliament, who said that the salary was inadequate and that it should be £400. That is a mandate from the highest labour tribunal in the State, and we are pledged to carry out those proposals laid down by that congress; indeed, we are bound to carry them out.

The Premier: We are not pledged.

Mr. TAYLOR: We are pledged to certain fighting planks, and we are bound to carry out the resolutions of congress whenever an opportunity presents itself.

The Premier: No.

Mr. TAYLOR: That is my view, but apparently the Premier takes a different view. It is for those who composed that congress to say whether the Premier's view or mine is correct. This is a question that was thoroughly threshed out, and the opinion of the representatives of the workers at that congress was that £400 was a salary suitable for the position of a member of Parliament. They were fighting obstacles then, and they did not carry that resolution with any idea other than that of getting their representatives in Parliament to carry it into effect. I believe that the onus rests on those who

alone have the power to carry it out. Private members have not the power to increase the amount to £400, and I am leaving it open so that if the House is not anxious to carry £400 they will not strike out the £300, but if they strike out the "three" with the object of inserting "two," the Premier can bring down the Message from the Governor, which is necessary before "four" can be inserted. I leave the onus of carrying into effect the wishes of congress on those who have the power in this House to carry them out.

On motion by Mr. Heitmann, debate adjourned.

*House adjourned at 11.20 p.m.*

## Legislative Council,

*Wednesday, 13th December, 1911.*

	PAGE.
Papers presented .. .. .	843
Sitting day, additional .. .. .	846
Mining Companies and local shareholders .. .. .	846
Personal explanation: Sir J. W. Hackett and Public Works Committee Bill .. .. .	846
Bills: Divorce Amendment, Sol. Com. extension .. .. .	843
Agricultural Bank Act Amendment, 1R. .. .. .	846
Shearers' Accommodation, 1R. .. .. .	846
Totalisator Regulations, 1R. .. .. .	846
Industrial Conciliation and Arbitration Act Amendment, 2R. .. .. .	846
Health Act Amendment, Com. .. .. .	869

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

### PAPERS PRESENTED.

By the Colonial Secretary: 1, Map showing the centre line of proposed Hotham-Crossman Railway, with limits of deviation; 2, Map showing the centre line of the proposed railway from Yilliminin to Kondinin; 3, Annual report of Commissioner of Taxation; 4, Report of fisheries and oyster fisheries, Shark Bay; 5, Land and Surveys Department, report by Surveyor General.

### BILL—DIVORCE AMENDMENT.

#### *Select Committee Extension.*

Hon. J. D. CONNOLLY (North-East) moved—

*That the time for bringing up the report be extended until Tuesday, the 19th December.*

The committee had held three sittings and had examined five witnesses. It was proposed to sit practically all day to-morrow, four witnesses having been set down for that day, and up till now three for Friday. It was hoped that would be all the witnesses necessary to be examined. The committee had restricted the witnesses as much as possible. Half a dozen letters or more had been received from societies, branches, and kindred societies, and in writing a reply to these societies they were informed that they would have to meet and decide on one common witness. If witnesses from each society were allowed there would be dozens to be examined; therefore, the witnesses had been restricted considerably. The four witnesses to-morrow would in the ordinary course have been 16 witnesses. The Committee was appointed this day week and held the first meeting on the same day. Mr. McKenzie and himself had to go into the country the next day, but in order that there should be no delay in the proceedings two other members were added to the committee, so that there would be a quorum to sit and take evidence, and the sittings of the committee went on in the absence of himself and Mr. McKenzie. It was only in the mornings the committee could meet, as *Hansard*, through the other House sitting early in the afternoon, could not attend with any degree of convenience in the afternoon; but the committee would be practically sitting all day to-morrow, or as long as the House would permit, and on Friday. The committee would be able, therefore, to report on Tuesday.

Hon. Sir E. H. WITTENOOM (North) seconded the motion.

Hon. A. G. JENKINS (Metropolitan): It was to be hoped that the House would not extend the time until Tuesday, and he intended to move that the time be ex-