

duals desired its introduction, but because I in conjunction with some other members saw that a wrong did exist and that it needed righting. I hope the House will pass the Bill so that we can control the racing body. It is not asking for very much; it simply says that the rules which have been made and the rules that will be made in the future shall be submitted for scrutiny, just as by-laws are at present. It does not necessarily follow that any of those rules of racing will be disallowed.

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

Ayes	15
Noes	14

Majority for 1

AYES.

Mr. Clothier	Mr. Raphael
Mr. Coverley	Mr. Rodoreda
Mr. Hawke	Mr. Sleeman
Mr. Marshall	Mr. F. C. L. Smith
Mr. Millington	Mr. Tonkin
Mr. Moloney	Mr. Willcock
Mr. Munsie	Mr. Cross
Mr. Nulsen	

(Teller.)

NOES.

Mr. Cunningham	Mr. Mann
Mr. Ferguson	Mr. Sampson
Mr. Hegney	Mr. Seward
Mr. Johnson	Mr. Thorn
Mr. Keenan	Mr. Watts
Mr. McDonald	Mr. Welsh
Mr. McLarty	Mr. Doney

(Teller.)

PAID.

AYE.	NO.
Mr. Collier	Mr. Latham

Question thus passed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

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

Third Reading.

Mr. TONKIN: I move—

That the third reading of the Bill be an Order of the Day for the next sitting of the House.

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

Ayes	14
Noes	15

Majority against 1

AYES.

Mr. Clothier	Mr. Nulsen
Mr. Coverley	Mr. Rodoreda
Mr. Cross	Mr. Sleeman
Mr. Hawke	Mr. F. C. L. Smith
Mr. Marshall	Mr. Tonkin
Mr. Moloney	Mr. Willcock
Mr. Munsie	Mr. Raphael

(Teller.)

NOES.

Mr. Cunningham	Mr. North
Mr. Ferguson	Mr. Sampson
Mr. Hegney	Mr. Seward
Mr. Johnson	Mr. Thorn
Mr. Keenan	Mr. Watts
Mr. McDonald	Mr. Welsh
Mr. McLarty	Mr. Doney
Mr. Mann	

(Teller.)

PAID.

AYE.	NO.
Mr. Collier	Mr. Latham

Question thus negatived.

House adjourned at 9.53 p.m.

Legislative Council,

Tuesday, 19th November, 1935.

	PAGE
Motion: Health Act, to disallow meat inspection regulation	1809
Papers: Mine Workers' Relief Fund, late E. J. Goldworthy's application	1815
Agricultural Bank, resignation of G. M. Cornell	1815
Bills: Reserves, IR.	1815
Lotteries (Control) Continuance, 2R.	1815
Constitution Acts Amendment Act, 1899, Amendment (No. 2), 2R.	1830
Electoral, Com.	1831

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

MOTION—HEALTH ACT.

To Disallow Meat Inspection Regulation.

HON. C. F. BAXTER (East) [4.33]:

I move—

That Regulation No. 4, made under "The Health Act, 1911-33," as published in the "Government Gazette" on 1st November, 1935, and laid on the Table of the House on 13th November, 1935, be and is hereby disallowed.

The framing of legislation is a serious responsibility that is placed on the shoulders of legislators. In many cases when Acts of Parliament have been passed through the

two Houses regulations are made under them. Some of these regulations are a matter of grave concern. The regulation I hope to have disallowed will prove dangerous in its effect, and will seriously inconvenience a section of the people and interfere with their livelihood. That is one of the last things that any Government should countenance. Meat that comes into the metropolitan area goes to two centres, Midland Junction and the Fremantle abattoirs. There are other places where stock is killed and the meat inspected, namely, at certain sale rooms in the metropolitan area. For the year 1933 there was an increase of 57,741 in the number of calves dropped in the State over the year 1926. That will show the necessity for allowing freedom of trade to the people concerned. This increase in the number of calves slaughtered indicates a great increase in the number of those engaged in dairying. It does not pay a dairyman, with few exceptions, to rear a male calf. Unfortunately for herdsmen one of our best dairy stock is the Jersey, which, however, is not suitable for killing. The increase in the number of calves is noticeable chiefly in the South-West dairying areas. There would be no appreciable increase in the cattle raising centres. Indeed, many cattle stations have gone out of existence. If this regulation is not disallowed the breeders in the South-West will be badly hit. I have here some figures showing the number of carcasses that pass through the metropolitan market. I did not get the figures for the Fremantle market, as I deemed the others would afford a sufficient guide. The figures are for the week ended the 1st November. They show 11 bodies of beef, 14 sheep, 75 pigs, and 285 vealers. All this meat before being offered for sale was rigidly inspected. In addition, many carcasses go to the Midland Junction abattoirs. In that particular week there were 50 bodies of beef, one pig, and 129 sheep inspected at that centre. As a fact, a large percentage of the meat offered for sale in the metropolitan area has already been inspected at Midland Junction. I am not concerned about that, but about the first lot I mentioned. Meat that has been inspected at Midland Junction and transferred to other centres for sale would all have to be inspected again, on account of the possibility of putrefaction through being held over. The more meat is handled the less good it is for human consumption and the quicker it goes

off. It is said that these regulations would apply in an economic way. Actually, not 3 per cent. of the calves sent in for sale go to the Midland Junction abattoirs. It would be impossible to send them there. I have a list of the carcasses sent in for sale on the 25th October. These came from outside the abattoir area. One firm, Nelson and Co., received 48 carcasses of pigs, 181 of veal, and 23¾ of beef, a total of 252¾ carcasses from no fewer than 62 different sending stations. The consignment represents at least 220 different growers. Ten carcasses might come from one station, but they may have been sent by eight or ten different people. The following is a list of the stations whence these carcasses came:—West Pingelly, Popanyinning, Serpentine, Cookernup, Mardella, Northam, Keysbrook, Armadale, Dwellingup, Mundijong, Muchea, Chidlow, Beverley, Wattle Grove, Toodyay, Queen's Park, Byford, Herdsman's Lake, Wagerup, Bullsbrook, Kulin, Kukerin, Chittering, Roelands, Wooroloo, Cunderdin, Waroona, Coolup, Yarloop, Brookhampton, Capel, Dardanup, Elgin, Piesseville, Kulyaling, Harvey, Brunswick, Benger, Balingup, Wandering, Redcliffe, Bunbury, Cannington, Boyanup, Donnybrook, Manjimup, Wokalup, Hamel, Pinjarra, Cuballing, Waterloo, Mt. Helena, Merredin, Brookton, York, Wyalkatchem, Pithara, Kelmseott, Meekering, North Dandalup, Katanning, Yornaning. Some of these places are more than 200 miles away from the city. The stock represented by the carcasses could not have been sent all that distance on the hoof.

Hon. A. Thomson: And the cost would have been too great.

Hon. C. F. BAXTER: Yes, more than the farmers would receive back. The inspection at Midland Junction and Fremantle abattoirs is controlled by the Health Department. There are also many small licensed slaughter houses inspected by the Health Department. The Metropolitan Meat Sales room is inspected by the City Health Inspector, and the Fremantle Meat Sales room is inspected by the Fremantle Health Inspector. These two rooms are mainly supplied by small producers who slaughter their own stock. Surely it cannot be said that the inspectors in charge of these rooms are not as well qualified as are the Government inspectors. They must be fully qualified to hold their positions. It is said that the regulations

have been made to safeguard the health of the public, but that claim cannot be substantiated. It is argued that the viscera must be with the carcase when the inspection takes place. If so, why is that not rigidly carried out at Midland Junction? I have seen slaughtering done there, and have seen the viscera going down the chute. How can the inspector connect up the viscera with the carcase, when he is not there all the time? How can anyone definitely say that the viscera must be with the carcase, and that the procedure adopted is a safeguard for the public health? Members know of the city health inspector, Mr. Franklyn Higgs. Surely he is a man in whom the community have confidence. He must know something about the inspection of meat, considering the time he has been associated with that activity. Certainly he is a man in whom the public have confidence as being able to determine whether meat is fit for human consumption. This is his statement:—

Definitely there is no danger to the public health because of existing conditions, nor is there likely to be any. Much is made in the Commissioner's letter of the condition in which carcase meat arrives at our depot, that is, without the viscera, the presence of which assists an examining inspector to determine the presence of disease. But it should be remembered that the only meat of this kind arriving at the depot is from settlers and farmers whose holdings are scattered over a very wide area in the country and quite remote from any abattoir, and furthermore the great bulk of the carcasses is that of calves, and to a much smaller extent pigs, sheep and steers are sent, and it can be definitely stated that for the 16 years that we have been examining meat as is done to-day, there has not at any time been found a carcase of veal in which disease has been present or where the absence of the viscera has hampered the examination of the carcase. Certainly there have been very many carcasses of veal condemned for other causes, such as immaturity and putrefaction, but these are not pathogenic and therefore are not affected by the reasons advanced by the Commissioner of Health.

It is agreed that occasionally pigs and steers have been found affected by disease, but the absence of the viscera has not been any bar to the proper examination of each carcase. Rather does it compel a more careful inspection, certainly as "rigid as at a recognised abattoir." It may be of interest to point out that the great bulk of the meat consumed in the metropolitan area is killed either at Government abattoirs or Government-controlled slaughter yards and under the supervision of Government inspectors, the amount coming from country centres being but a very small percentage of the whole. It will be necessary for our officers to inspect the meat sent to the wholesale mar-

ket already passed as free from disease by Government inspectors to ensure that no putrefactive changes have taken place.

In my view, that is a very sensible statement of the position. If that is not fully satisfying I will make use of another and greater authority. I will read extracts from Dr. Reid's "Practical Sanitation." That work has been used for many years past, and still is used as the text book for students who desire to become health inspectors. That practice is adopted not only in Australia and Western Australia, but throughout the whole of the British Dominions and Great Britain itself. In the circumstances, I think members will agree that they can regard the book as authoritative. On page 247 of his book, Dr. Reid states:—

The appearance of the interior of the chest is of the utmost importance, especially if the lungs cannot be examined, as most diseases affecting those organs leave indelible traces on the interior of the chest walls. In a healthy animal these should be perfectly smooth, and the ribs, with the intervening fleshy parts, should be clearly seen through a transparent membrane. On the other hand, if the interior of the chest wall is very rough, and the lining membrane cloudy, the animal has probably suffered from an inflammatory affection, and the chances are that other signs of acute illness, sufficient to condemn it, will be found in the carcase. Butchers, as a rule, take care to remove as far as possible the evidence of such inflammatory mischief from the chest walls, but no amount of manipulation will restore the normal appearances sufficiently to deceive an ordinary skilled observer. By carefully removing all trace of the inner covering of the chest (the pleura), the surface, after being exposed to the air, may not show much sign of having been interfered with, but if it be moistened with a damp cloth or sponge, the torn fibres will become opaque, and thus any doubt will at once be removed.

Then again on page 259 under the heading of "Tuberculosis," Dr. Reid states:—

The appearances presented differ at different stages of the malady. Rounded growths, at first hardly visible to the naked eye, form in the tissues, and increase in size until they approach that of a pigeon's egg or even larger. This has given rise to the disease being known as "pearl disease" or the "grapes," among butchers. The favourite site for the development of these is on the surface of the lung and the walls of the chest, and they afterwards invade the interior of the lung, giving rise to an inflammatory condition of the organ. The little growths, on being cut into, have a yellow appearance, and cheesy consistency, although sometimes they are hard and gritty. As the disease advances, the lung is apt to break up, and abscesses may form in its substance. It does not follow, particularly in the early stages,

that the carcase should be emaciated, although as a rule, if marked evidence of the disease is present, the flesh is poor and lean. Unless the inspector should come upon the scene early, he will probably find that efforts have been made to remove all trace of the disease, but a careful inspection of the chest walls in the manner already described (page 247) will reveal that they have been stripped of their internal covering, and the characteristic deposits or abscesses may be found in other organs or tissues of the body if careful search is made for them. In addition to the lungs, the most likely sites for the development of the tubercles, or pearls, are the glands in connection with the bowels, and the glands about the neck, but the liver and other organs and tissues may also be affected. It is very evident from the statements made by Dr. Reid in his book, which, as I have pointed out, can be accepted as authoritative, that any inspector who knows his job can very soon come to a conclusion if any attempt has been made to pass meat that is not in a proper condition. With the rigid system of inspection that we have, I do not think much concern need be felt in that respect.

Hon. J. J. Holmes: Is not meat ever condemned in the sales room?

Hon. C. F. BAXTER: Yes, frequently. It is well at this juncture to explain who the interested parties are with regard to these regulations. First, there is the Agricultural Department and then there are the Midland Junction abattoirs, the Fremantle abattoirs, the Health Department and, last but not least, the wholesale butchers. The Agricultural Department naturally will welcome the regulations, because it will help the department to make up some of the leeway and losses incurred at the Midland Junction abattoirs.

Hon. G. W. Miles: What about policing the Droving and Brands Acts?

Hon. C. F. BAXTER: That could not assist in this matter.

Hon. E. H. Gray: That is behind the regulation.

Hon. C. F. BAXTER: Whatever is behind the regulation, that could not assist. If carcases were sent to the Midland Junction abattoirs, they could be traced there. The records of the meat sales room would be much easier from the standpoint of deriving information.

Hon. J. J. Holmes: Why is that?

Hon. C. F. BAXTER: If we compel the carcases to be taken to Midland Junction, we will find that the jobbers can go round with trucks and collect vealers for little or no payment.

Hon. J. J. Holmes: I am not talking about vealers.

Hon. C. F. BAXTER: What I say applies to any stock the hon. member chooses to refer to. These people will take truck lots at a time. The statement, from which I have already given members some information, furnishes the name of the place from which the meat was despatched, a description of every carcase brought in and so on. There can be no better record than that. I am out to help anyone who desires to stop the stealing that is going on, but I can see nothing in this particular regulation that will help along those lines to the slightest degree. I am not much concerned with the other portions of the regulations. I have not given them full consideration from the standpoint of whether they will assist in that direction, but from the casual glance I gave them, I do not remember noticing anything that would tend to help. With the control that exists to-day at the abattoirs and in the meat sales rooms, the knowledge I possess of the work convinces me that I could ascertain particulars regarding stock brought in much more easily from the records of the sales rooms than from the abattoir records. A certain amount of revenue will be derived, but I do not think it will amount to much, because the stock will not be sent forward. Local people will not cart to Midland Junction because it will not pay them to do so. I have already pointed out that the Agricultural Department will benefit as a result of the regulation and the Fremantle abattoirs will also be assisted to some extent. As regards the Health Department, as soon as the officials recognise that the regulation will assist to build up their department, bring in more revenue and so forth, they, in common with other departmental officers, will naturally favour it. It will assist the Health Department to do what has been desired for a long time, namely, do away with the health inspectors of the local governing bodies and place all the power in the departmental health inspectors. Naturally it would suit the Health Department to have the full control placed in the hands of the departmental officials. Then again the wholesale butchers will derive great benefit from the regulation because both the sales room in Perth and the one at Fremantle are disliked by them as the small butcher can go to those rooms in the morning when auctions are conducted and secure his supplies. That system

keeps the price of meat in check; there is no question about that. If we remove the sales rooms, the small man will be thrown into the hands of the wholesale butchers. Members can draw their own conclusions.

Hon. A. Thomson: The most important part is the effect the regulation will have on the producers in the country districts.

Hon. C. F. BAXTER: I am coming to that point in a moment. I have indicated the people who will benefit from the imposition of the regulation, but who are the people that will suffer? The Agricultural Bank will suffer. It must be a great relief to the bank commissioners to know that their clients can, under their authority, send stock in and secure a few shillings in order to assist in maintaining their property. The Metropolitan Markets must be interested in this matter. I have not heard from those in control but they should be interested, because they built a special section for handling meat and the work involved a fairly substantial amount. Nelson and Co. have the lease of the premises and pay £420 3s. per year. The Honorary Minister, when speaking the other night, referred to the necessity to make up losses incurred at Fremantle. That is one way by which revenue is derived; and then the Health Department secures inspection fees as well.

The Honorary Minister: Is that the statement I made?

Hon. C. F. BAXTER: I am referring to the Press report of the Minister's speech. I suppose the report was condensed. If the report was wrong, the Minister will have an opportunity to correct it, but that is the information upon which I am going. If the regulation is to apply, Nelson and Co. will immediately forfeit the lease, and that, of course, will be done. In those circumstances, the Metropolitan Markets should be concerned, for I do not know to what other use the building, which has been erected, could be put. Then there is the business established by the meat salesmen. One has spent 26 years in building up his business, and now the ground is to be cut from under his feet. On the other hand, I am not so much concerned about these particular people. Those I am concerned about are the producers and the consumers. I have already placed before members a list showing to what extent the markets are used and I do not hesitate to say that it will not be possible for the producers to send their stock to the Fremantle or Midland Junction abattoirs

for sale in the metropolitan area. These people who sell carcass meat look to the present system as a means by which they can secure their living, and I cannot understand the Government allowing departmental officers to submit regulations such as that under discussion, seeing that it will serve to injure the small struggling producers. They are the men to whom the regulation will mostly apply, and they include men operating close to the metropolitan area and as far afield as 200 miles away. They have been accustomed to getting rid of the surplus head of stock in order to secure some ready money. If they want a few shillings with which to procure the necessities of life, they kill a pig or a calf and take it to the metropolitan area for disposal. They will not be able to do that any longer if the regulation is not disallowed. In my district I know that dozens of small men have killed stock at Balingup in that way, and Mr. Craig can bear me out when I say that calves, even heifer calves, have been disposed of in that manner, even though it was considered it would not pay to send them along. How are the local people to put calves or pigs in a conveyance and send them to Midland? Look at what the cost would be.

Hon. H. Tuckey: They would turn it down.

Hon. C. F. BAXTER: The proposal will cut the ground from under the feet of those people, and they will be deprived of getting the few shillings that in the past they have been able to secure from this surplus stock.

Hon. J. Nicholson: Will not the regulation permit killing on the farms?

Hon. W. J. Mann: It is designed to prevent it.

Hon. C. F. BAXTER: The responsible Minister has made it very clear where he stands in this respect, and may I say that I feel sorry for him. We know how very keen Mr. Munsie is where the improvement of the department he controls is concerned. But in this instance he has been led astray by his department. We can commend him for invariably doing what in his opinion is right, but he has been badly advised. In a statement Mr. Munsie had this to say—

In the metropolitan area the meat inspection is not satisfactory by any means. If I had my way the Perth Municipal Council would not employ one inspector. I would have every inspector under the control of the Health Commissioner.

That is exactly what I have said. All control will be under the Public Health Department. In what way—I should like the Honorary Minister to tell me—are the City Council health inspectors lacking? I have seen those inspectors at work and I know that their inspections are most rigid. The officers never fail in their duty and I have seen them condemn meat in the metropolitan area. Mr. Munsie went on to say—

Many beasts going through the markets, if sent on the hoof to Midland, would not be passed.

Why would they not be passed? We have qualified inspectors at the sale rooms equally competent with those at Midland. Why should such a statement be made by the Minister, that the beasts would not be passed? Mr. Munsie went on—

The abattoirs were originally established because of the butchers' attitude towards meat for human consumption.

There may be a good deal in that.

One butcher went so far as to kill horses and put the flesh on the market as beef.

That is a statement made by Mr. Munsie, and it is quite correct. But what Mr. Munsie was not told was that the horseflesh had been inspected and passed by the Government inspector at the abattoirs. That is what Mr. Munsie should have known, and if he had been made acquainted with that fact he would not have said what he was reported to have said.

Hon. J. M. Macfarlane: Where was it killed?

Hon. C. F. BAXTER: I do not know, but I know that it was passed by a Government inspector.

Hon. J. Cornell: I'll bet that inspector never saw active service.

Hon. C. F. BAXTER: I do not suppose he did. I am astounded that the Government should have permitted a regulation like this to become gazetted. The only effect it will have will be to inflict tremendous injury, and probably put out of business many small producers. The authorities should have realised also that consumers are going to suffer the moment we cut down the sales of beef in the metropolitan markets, and that from that moment the butchers will take advantage of the opportunity and increase the price of meat. The regulation will not mean that public health will be rendered any safer, because, as I have already said, the inspection to-day is quite rigid, and

there is no danger from that point of view. The danger lies in the harm that is going to be done to the small producer, and the increased cost that the consumer will have to pay. The Minister should withdraw the regulation instead of forcing us into the position of asking the House to disallow it. I hope members will see the force of the arguments I have advanced and that they will support me to protect the small producers by agreeing to the motion I have moved.

HON. J. M. MACFARLANE (Metropolitan-Suburban) [5.7]: In seconding the motion I can only express regret that it was necessary to bring it before the House. I was hopeful that we might have been able to come to an arrangement to obviate the necessity of submitting it to members. I support it on economic grounds and because also it will create difficulties and cause a section of the community to suffer, particularly the section who rear calves and those who trade in them from week to week. I have had a good deal of experience in connection with the consignment of carcasses from farms in various parts of the State. In the spring, during the milking period, calves are sent in in large numbers. They come mostly from farmers who kill their own calves and market them by direct consignment to the metropolitan area. These calves are sent down, not in large numbers, but singly and in pairs. If the regulation were permitted to go through, what would happen? The effect would be disastrous for the small producers. It is said that the object of the introduction of the regulation is to prevent stealing or dishonest practices; but I have never heard of stealing in connection with this particular business. I do venture to say, however, that if the regulation is passed there will be something heard of it later on. We have heard of efforts that have been made to prevent illicit dealing in sheep on the part of certain owners of motor trucks, and it has been stated that this happens in respect of some calves that find their way to the market, where they are slaughtered and sold. But that is not so, and there are two or three reasons why that cannot happen. In the first place, the calves are very young when sent to market, and they could not possibly stand up to the racking they would be subjected to by certain types of motorists in the manner suggested. Even so, the farmer would get

so little that he would declare that it was not worth bothering about, and rather than go to all the trouble, he would probably knock the calves on the head at the farm. Trading genuinely, however, he can make a few shillings, and the revenue he gets in this respect helps in the conduct of the farm. So that, if the regulation is to be permitted to remain in force, the only effect will be the hardship on the small farmer, reference to which was made by Mr. Baxter. Further than that, if it is desired to take advantage of the market in the way that has been suggested, the stock would have to be sent by rail, and there again the age of the stock would prevent their being put into trucks, and in addition the expense would be prohibitive. Thus the owner would be placed at such a disadvantage that it would not be worth his while to attempt to send the stock away. Generally speaking if the regulation is carried it will amount to so much economic waste. Why should farmers be prevented from sending their young stock to market especially when there has been no question at all about the efficiency of the examinations? Moreover, the public health point of view has been well attended to, and again it is generally understood that in respect of young calves there is very little danger of transmission of disease. More rigid inspection may be required where the fully-grown animals are concerned, but it is not so with calves. The regulation will also affect those in the metropolitan area who are licensed in a small way to kill stock and send it to market. All this, too, is done under Government inspection. If the regulation is permitted to go through, all stock will have to be taken to Midland to be killed and brought back to the metropolitan area to be sold. The arguments advanced by Mr. Baxter for the disallowance of the regulation ought to convince the Minister that it would be a mistake to let the regulation go through, particularly as it applies to calves. In these difficult times, the producer has quite enough load to carry without imposing additional burdens on him. I regret that I have to support the motion in favour of the disallowance of the regulation: I would have preferred to satisfactorily convince the authorities by private treaty, but that having failed I have no alternative but to vote in favour of the disallowance.

On motion by the Honorary Minister, debate adjourned.

BILL—RESERVES.

Received from the Assembly and read a first time.

PAPERS—MINE WORKERS' RELIEF FUND.

Late E. J. Goldsworthy's Application.

Debate resumed from the 14th November on the following motion by Hon. C. B. Williams:—

That the file dealing with the application of the late Ernest J. Goldsworthy, of Johnson Street, Boulder, for relief from the Mine Workers' Relief Fund, together with all papers in connection with any application made by Mrs. Goldsworthy, or by any person on her behalf, for relief from the same fund, be laid on the Table of the House.

THE CHIEF SECRETARY (Hon. J. M. Drew—Central) [5.18]: I have no objection to the motion.

Question put and passed.

PAPERS—AGRICULTURAL BANK.

Resignation of G. M. Cornell.

Debate resumed from the 12th November on the following motion by Hon. H. S. W. Parker:—

That all files and papers, including the file of the Public Service Commissioner, relating to the employment of George Meredith Cornell (No. 547, Public Service List, 1934) by the Agricultural Bank, his resignation, and long service leave salary be laid on the Table of the House.

THE CHIEF SECRETARY (Hon. J. M. Drew—Central) [5.19]: I offer no objection to this motion.

Question put and passed.

BILL—LOTTERIES (CONTROL) CONTINUANCE.

Second Reading.

THE HONORARY MINISTER (Hon. W. H. Kitson—West) [5.20] in moving the second reading said: This is a Bill to continue the operation of the Lotteries (Control) Act for a further period of 12 months. The existing Act expires on the 31st December next. The consultations which have been promoted by the Commission during the past year have continued to receive the approval and support of the

public generally, and, as hon. members are aware, have proved highly successful. The profit derived by the Commission from those consultations has been distributed amongst various charitable and deserving institutions and objects. It can safely be said that in many, many cases, had it not been for those consultations there would have been very little money indeed available for the good purposes to which I have alluded. The Commissioners have been diligent in the discharge of their duties with respect to applications for permits to conduct small sweeps and affairs of that kind, and also in regard to the general conduct of the lotteries or consultations promoted by the Commission itself. Further, I am pleased to note that evidently the chairman of the Commission meets with general approval. He seems to have gained the confidence of all persons and organisations in any way associated with the lotteries, more particularly as to the distribution of the funds arising from the activities of the Commission. A review of those activities discloses some interesting figures which I think it well to quote. This year there have been ten consultations finalised up to the 8th October last. In addition, there was a big consultation on the Melbourne Cup; but the actual figures are not available pending audit. Members know, however, that this was a most successful consultation, the whole of the tickets having been sold before the day of the race. As regards the ten consultations audited and finalised, the total amount subscribed by the public was £172,551 10s. Prize money allocated amounted to £82,828 10s., equivalent to 48 per cent. The expenses totalled £26,064 7s. 5d., or 15 per cent., inclusive of 10 per cent. commission paid to ticket-sellers.

Hon. G. W. Miles: That should be reduced. Ten per cent. is too high. It should be cut in half.

The HONORARY MINISTER: The hon. member may have his views on that point, and will have an opportunity to express them. The profit realised by the Commission was £63,658 12s. 7d., being 36.8 per cent. available for distribution. In addition, a balance of £53,111 18s. 8d. was carried over from 1934, making the total available for distribution this year £116,770 11s. 3d. Of this sum £62,345 7s. 11d. was paid out in donations during the current year, leav-

ing a balance of £54,425 3s. 4d. against this account. There are commitments amounting to £40,196 18s. 8d., including £20,000 for the King Edward Memorial Hospital and £1,413 for the Children's Hospital. A balance of £14,228 4s. 8d. is now actually available for further distribution, plus whatever balance of profit there may be from the sweep on the Melbourne Cup. The Commission have supplied between 40 and 50 refrigerators to hospitals throughout the State, at a cost of over £4,000. With assistance of nearly £6,000 from the Commission, X-ray plants have been installed in 29 hospitals. These last two items cover the period of the Commission's existence. The State-wide appeal on behalf of Youth and Motherhood has been assisted by the Commission to the extent of £10,000 this year. Besides receiving X-ray plants and refrigerators hospitals have been assisted financially to the extent of £15,361 during this year. Nearly 3,000 pairs of blankets and 1,350 pairs of sheets have been given for distribution to the indigent and needy through the medium of various relief committees during the current year. Apart from this bedding, a sum of £3,170 has been spent on the relief of distress through the same agencies. Then again, a sum of £650 has been made available this year for the Child Welfare Department to enable them to provide necessary articles of household furniture in the homes of widows with children dependent on the department for the means of living. A hospital social service has been introduced with the aid of the Lotteries Commission this year, and the funds already allocated total £1,265. The following orphanages have this year received allocations totalling £4,423 from the Commission:—Castledare Home, Clontarf Orphanage, Swan Boys, Anglican Girls, Parkerville Home, St. Joseph's and St. Vincent Foundling Homes. Other institutions have also been assisted as follows:—

	£
Flying Doctor Fund	1,100
Aborigines Department	1,425
Ugly Men's Association	1,500
Beagle Bay Mission	300
Bickley Disaster Relief	628
Mental Hospital After Care Committee	525
Returned Maimed and Limbless Men's Association	650
Returned Soldiers' League	1,500
Lady Lawley Cottage	336
Chandler Boys' Farm	1,000
Tardon Boys' Farm	1,000
W.A. School for Deaf and Dumb	600
Housing Trust	2,400

Drysdale River Mission	170
Infant Health Centres	844
Kindergarten Union	545
School for the Blind	2,500
Silver Chain Nursing League	850
St. John Ambulance Association	2,525
Sister Kate's Home	250
Braille Society	500

The Commission's activities have been subject to a good deal of criticism, but from my reading of the position it appears to me that at present the Commissioners are giving satisfaction to most people. The Government are desirous that they should continue their activities for a further period, limited to one year. The limitation is made mainly with the object of meeting the wish of this Chamber, expressed on a previous occasion, that there should be no extension for any period beyond one year. I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

HON. E. H. H. HALL (Central) [5.29]: I understand there is no alternative to passing the Bill in its present form, but I wish to reiterate my protest of last year, when a similar measure was before the House, against the amount paid away in commissions to ticket-sellers.

Hon. G. W. Miles: Yes, indeed!

Hon. E. H. H. HALL: This session Mr. Seddon asked a question which I asked last session. No one can plead ignorance of the huge amounts paid away to ticket-sellers.

Hon. H. Tuckey: Does not that payment help to make a success of the enterprise?

Hon. E. H. H. HALL: It has been asserted that if the rate of commission is reduced, small sellers will not be able to make a living. That argument does not influence me one atom. What does influence me is that the Government of the day, when bringing down the original measure, were impelled to do something to raise money for the assistance of charities. When we find that an agent can make as much as £400 on one sweep, it is clear that the commission he receives is too high. The matter should receive the attention of Parliament. We are frequently told it is not of much use criticising unless one can produce criticism of a constructive nature. I find myself wondering why the Government, who are opposed to private enterprise, or perhaps I should say they prefer to run things by Government control—

Hon. G. W. Miles: State trading.

Hon. E. H. H. HALL: That is it—State trading. I wonder why they do not carry out their ideas in this direction. I think it would be worth trying. I have in mind the case of a man who, I think, ought to be allowed to sell these lottery tickets, for his physical condition will not permit of his doing hard work. He is a married man with five children. He was a sustenance worker, but as the result of his work he injured himself and has since undergone three operations. Finally he was compensated by a lump sum and, having spent that, he has come back on to light relief work. He was given a job on the roads, the only job available, but has found that he cannot do the work. He is at present making application for rations to the Child Welfare Department. I do not wish to put over any sob stuff, but I can assure the House that this man is in every way a desirable citizen and has met with his disability through no fault of his own. He is an excellent citizen, and I should like to see the Government take that into consideration and permit him to sell these lottery tickets. He is not the only man in that category, for there were many others who could be selling these tickets and so earning a living.

Hon. J. Nicholson: Has this man applied for a license to sell the tickets?

Hon. E. H. H. HALL: As to whether he has applied for a license, he has no business premises, he has no money, and the hon. member who interjected must know that unless a man has some sort of a business stand he will not be granted a license for the sale of lottery tickets. I have been approached by a man in business in Geraldton, a man of excellent character, who was refused a license, and I was given to understand that the only grounds for the refusal was that there were sufficient licenses in existence. That is my reply to the hon. member who interjected asking whether this man had tried to get a license. There may be something to be said for this 10 per cent. commission, if only because there are always two sides to every question, but I understand there are several agents, particularly in the city, who are thus getting too big a rake-off from these lotteries. The original purpose of the lotteries was to raise money for charity, so why should the Government permit these agents to secure so big a rake-off? Let me give an

experience of my own. A fine big strong able-bodied young man came down from the country, and I saw him knocking about the city for some weeks. At last he approached me and said, "Do you know Mr. Clydesdale?" That was when Mr. Clydesdale was chairman of the Lotteries Commission. I replied that I did know Mr. Clydesdale, whereupon this young fellow said, "How are you with him?" I said, "What do you mean by that?" He replied, "Well, I am after one of these agencies for the sale of lotteries tickets, and I thought you might have a word with him and put in some good work for me." I told him forthwith that I could not put in any good work for him or anybody else, because I did not believe in licenses being granted; and especially would I not attempt to put in any good work for a big able-bodied chap such as he was. I happen to know that that man waited about the city, and presently he paid £200 or £300 for the purchase of a stand, where at present he is selling lottery tickets.

Hon. A. M. Clydesdale: I bet he has lost his money.

Hon. E. H. H. HALL: I should like to tell the hon. member, who knows a lot more about betting than I do, that that man is making good money. Why should these agents who have no stock to carry and run no risks be rewarded with so substantial a commission? I think the majority of people are with those members of Parliament who are against this commission of 10 per cent. on something which we do not want. There is far too much advertising of the lotteries. None of us are what we should be, but this thing is getting too big a hold upon the community. I say it is not necessary to advertise the lotteries. I know it will be said that the money would then go to the Eastern States, but I do not believe that, for I remember when it was said that if we were to get rid of the then chairman, the public would lose confidence in the lotteries, and so the charities would suffer.

Hon. A. M. Clydesdale: Who said that?

Hon. E. H. H. HALL: It was said in both Houses of Parliament. But here a civil servant who has had no experience in running this kind of thing has won golden opinions from those who know anything about it. I cannot see the necessity for having so large a Commission. There is a

secretary-manager, and he runs the staff. The whole thing should be under the Auditor-General.

Hon. H. S. W. Parker: Mr. Cerutti?

Hon. E. H. H. HALL: We should be better off if we had a few like him. I certainly consider that the Auditor-General should do the auditing for the lotteries. There is no more necessity to employ so many men on the Commission than there is to pay 10 per cent. on the sale of the tickets. I hope members will express their opposition to continuing this rate of commission.

HON. A. M. CLYDESDALE (Metropolitan-Suburban) [5.40]: As one who has taken a considerable interest in these charity consultations, I may say it is gratifying to know that they have been such a success. The amount subscribed from the inception of the lotteries to date is £603,628, and the amount distributed for the same period is £237,057. I well remember waiting on the late Mr. Scaddan and telling him that if he would introduce this measure we would within five years show a profit of £50,000 annually. All he said was that I was a super-optimist. Yet during the last three years we have averaged approximately £70,000. I know the general impression regarding the 10 per cent. commission on the sale of tickets is that it is altogether too much. However, I have here the returns of a number of agents selling tickets. During the sweep which closed on the 5th October there were 829 agents selling tickets, and of that number only ten are making over £5 per month.

Hon. G. W. Miles: It is not a full-time job.

Hon. A. M. CLYDESDALE: It is with some of the men who employ staffs. These people are not getting the whole of their receipts for themselves. One man has quite a large staff. I propose to read out the returns of ten of these agents, as follows:—

From the last sweep, No. 1 received in commission on the tickets he sold, £384 15s. 9d.; No. 2 received £97 2s. 6d.; No. 3 £51; No. 4, £43; No. 5, £43; No. 6, £40; No. 7, £25; No. 8, £24; No. 9, £13; and No. 10, £12.

So only eight of them receive over £6 per week. They have to pay all their expenses out of those totals. The one agent who is earning the largest amount of money advertises well. He receives his tickets under the same conditions as the others, but in

consequence perhaps of his advertising, he sells them all. When I was chairman of the Commission we decided to open a shop for the sale of tickets. We did so, but we lost money on it, and so we closed it up.

Hon. J. Nicholson: Has your successor tried it?

Hon. A. M. CLYDESDALE: He would be just as successful, and with one exception he would receive all the encomiums that I received. At present there are over 800 agents. For the 10 consultations this year they have received £15,651 in commission, or an average of £18 17s. 7d. each for a period of nine months. During the sweep which closed on the 5th October there were 829 agents, who received £1,513 in commission or an average of £1 16s. 6d. each for the four weeks. Out of the 829 agents the following earned much less than that:—

Sixty-four earned 25s. per month; 59 earned 20s. per month; 124 earned 15s.; 209 earned 10s.; and 217 earned 5s. for their month's work.

So 673 out of 829 agents earned less than 6s. per week. What would be the use of reducing the commission from 10 per cent. merely because a few are earning relatively good money? I am quite sure that if it were reduced to 5 per cent. a majority of the agents would not bother to sell tickets. Would members want to bar a man merely because he has a little more business acumen than his competitors?

Hon. J. Cornell: Was the Lotteries Commission constituted in order that the ticket sellers should earn more than the basic wage?

Hon. A. M. CLYDESDALE: Some of them are not earning a living at it.

Hon. J. Cornell: Why should they? It was never intended that they should.

Hon. A. M. CLYDESDALE: But quite a number who are unfitted for hard physical work are trying to get a living out of it. Apart from the two men at the top, I doubt if 5 per cent. on the sales would pay the agents to continue. Another criticism levelled against the Commission is that they spend too much money on advertising. When I was connected with the commission we kept a barometer, which showed that immediately we reduced the advertising, our sales fell. That is a positive fact. Every time we increased the advertising, we reached the average of sales once more. That is an answer to the statement that the commission should reduce the expenditure on advertising. Here the

amount spent on advertising is trifling compared with the expenditure on sweeps in the Eastern States.

Hon. W. J. Mann: It is not nearly enough.

Hon. A. M. CLYDESDALE: If it were greater, it might suit the hon. member's business. I consider that the time has arrived when the duration of the Act should be extended to three years. I agree with Mr. Hall that the commission have given every satisfaction, but they should be granted three years in which to frame a policy. At present the commission are showing a profit of over £70,000 a year, and there is a danger attached to that, because efforts will be made to get the money by people who are not entitled to it. I put this proposition to the Government when I was connected with the commission. A new public hospital is badly needed in Perth and the Lotteries Commission should be instructed to set aside £20,000 per annum to build it. They could easily find the money and should make a start at once. There is no need to wait; plans could be drawn up immediately and a start made, because it could be financed at once. The commission have at least £20,000 of money to their credit and have had as much as £50,000 or £60,000. While I was chairman, we gave the King Edward Memorial Hospital, Subiaco, £15,000, but that sum has been lying there for two or three years. There is always £20,000 or £30,000 of money available. One of our bankers approached me and told me we could have any money we required for that purpose. If the commission were saddled with such a liability, it would operate as a brake against their being too generous in their distribution of the funds. As I pointed out, there is a danger in that direction. Consider that those men have £70,000 to distribute according to their own discretion, though they do consult the Minister. A public hospital, built under such conditions would be very different from one built by the Government, because, on being completed, it would be handed over free of cost. It would not be burdened with charges of £5,000 or £6,000 a year to meet interest and sinking fund. I tell Mr. Hall that had I continued as chairman of the commission, the construction of the new hospital would have been begun. Under an award of the Arbitration Court the Government have to provide additional nurses, and additional quarters are needed to house them. To provide those quarters the Government have to

find the money. New quarters cannot be built on the old site, and therefore the work of building a new hospital should be begun at once. I hope that the Government will see that £20,000 a year is set aside, so that in five years time we shall have a new public hospital free of debt and consequently unburdened by any interest charges.

Hon. G. W. Miles: Why is it not done from year to year?

Hon. A. M. CLYDESDALE: It could be done, but the present commission could not bind the incoming commission to continue to provide the money. Tenders should be called for half the work, for which the money would be available and the other half could be built later. I support the second reading.

HON. J. CORNELL (South) [5.49]: It is extraordinary how the lotteries have developed. The control measure was originally introduced in order to curtail lotteries—

Hon. G. W. Miles: And to curtail street appeals, too.

Hon. J. CORNELL: And after a few years they have developed into a State business pure and simple. Protagonists of lotteries control put their fingers in their ears when legislation is mooted to regulate shop betting, but I can see no fundamental difference between the two forms of gambling. The sooner shop betting is brought under control as a business, just as the lotteries have been, the better it will be for the decency and well-being of the community. Occurrences connected with shop betting at present constitute a farce, a scandal and a disgrace. Under the eyes of the law a man may legally sell lottery tickets every hour of the day and every day of the week, but if he indulges in a little shop betting he is prosecuted for an offence. As I remarked, I can see no difference between the two forms of gambling, and anyone who would draw a distinction must be blind to facts or must be indulging in hypocrisy.

Hon. C. F. Baxter: One is for charity.

Hon. J. CORNELL: I venture to say that if the Government Actuary were asked the chances of getting a return for one's money invested in shop betting as compared with a lottery, he would be told they were about 200 to one in favour of shop betting. Lotteries control legislation was passed to authorise a certain number of sweeps each year, the object being to control this form

of gambling. But what happened? The commission have not exceeded the number of sweeps but the subscriptions to sweeps have been almost 50 per cent. up. Thus there are more ways than one of killing a pig. The lotteries have developed into a business to which the present and previous Government have given their blessing. They set out to minimise this form of gambling, but have merely brought it to fruition by creating a great monopoly which has more than doubled its ramifications.

Hon. C. F. Baxter: It has provided money for charity.

Hon. A. M. Clydesdale: And the money has been kept in the State.

Hon. J. CORNELL: Some remarkable distributions in the name of charity have been made by the commission. I maintain that members of this House would more nearly fill the definition of a charitable institution than would some of the bodies to which the Commission have made grants. My chief quarrel with the Lotteries Control Act—and I have been consistent right through—is that the people who raise the money should not be the people to spend it. One body should be charged with the business of controlling the lotteries, and the profits should be handed over to some hospitals committee or public health officials for distribution. Day after day we read in the Press that the Lotteries Commission have been pleased to donate so much money to a certain object on the application of the hon. Mr. So-and-so. That sort of thing is prostituting charity; there should be no need whatever for that kind of business. If the Lotteries Commission undertake the spending as well as the raising of the money, they should not give a cheap advertisement to any Parliamentarian. I know that Mr. Clydesdale will agree with me on that point. If members of Parliament approach the Commission and urge the needs of some charity, they should leave the rest entirely to the Commission and should not seek to obtain an advertisement from it.

The Honorary Minister: You say such advertisements appear in the newspapers.

Hon. J. CORNELL: Yes; I have seen them on various occasions. Mr. Clydesdale made an admirable chairman of the Commission, and I think that if he spoke his mind, he would admit that that phase of the administration was the most embarrassing of all. I hope that in future no member of

Parliament will so demean himself as to endeavour to get an advertisement for obtaining a grant for charity. I hope that a new spending body will be constituted. It is too late in this session to make such an alteration, but I think the work of the Commission should be restricted to raising the money. We do not pay the commissioners much for their work; the total sum paid them is £1,000 a year, but I wish to stress that the money should be spent entirely on building, equipping and maintaining a thorough and up-to-date hospital system throughout the State. A prominent member of the R.S.L. who has travelled extensively over Australia, has informed me that the strength of the Queensland lottery system lies in the fact that the people who raise the money do not have the spending of it. The money raised there is used for the building, maintenance and equipment of hospitals, with the result that Queensland to-day has the finest system of hospitals in Australia. I hope a similar course will be followed here. If that were done, I would have no objection to making this legislation permanent. While the present system obtains—one body not only raising but spending the money—and knowing as we do the effect of the whirligig and pressure of politics, the only safeguard is to renew this legislation for one year. Remove the single control and have one raising and one spending authority and there is no reason why the Act should not be made permanent. I hope that the commission, in their efforts to raise money, will not resort to too much publicity, because it is impossible to say what extremes will be reached if they continue as they have been going during the last 18 months. I cannot conclude without referring to an important official of the commission, namely, the secretary. I have known the secretary for a long time. No man in the State has given his services more ungrudgingly and more consistently in the cause of charity than that gentleman. If we searched Australia I doubt if we could find a better man for the position. Unfortunately like many of us he is getting older, but age does not dim his activities nor dwarf his aspirations for the work in which he is engaged. I hope he will long be spared to fill this position.

HON. C. F. BAXTER (East) [6.1]: As a factor in controlling sweeps, this Bill

has always been well received in this Chamber. When it was first dealt with it was carried by a substantial majority of 18 votes to seven. I suggest that the main reason why the majority of members voted in favour of it was that it provided a means whereby people who had been conducting sweeps all over the country could be controlled.

HON. E. H. GRAY: And paying 25 per cent. commission in some cases.

HON. C. F. BAXTER: Yes, and in other cases fleeing the public because the concerns were not run as they ought to have been. This legislation to a large extent did away with the many iniquitous small sweeps, which were such a curse in the country, and had the effect of keeping within the State a great deal of money that was going to other States. Of course it has not cured gambling, and never will succeed in doing that. Mention has been made of the huge amount of money that is now going into these lotteries. The amount is steadily increasing. The lotteries are well established, the prize money is greater, and the people have confidence in them. They are not now sending their money out of the State to the extent they were doing, and doing it illegally, so that fewer contributions are now going to the Golden Casket and Tattersalls. A reference has also been made to the 10 per cent. commission that is paid to agents. Some of these agents advertise extensively. In the case of Whittys, people think that is a lucky shop. I do not know that it is quite right that there should be all this advertising to the effect that this or that shop has sold so many prize tickets, as I am informed that in some cases such sales have not been effected. I am told that in one case where the agent was advertising the prizes he had sold, no prizes had been sold in that particular lottery by that particular agent. I cannot see that it would be possible to adopt a sliding scale for these agents. Nor can we tell these agents they must only sell a certain number of tickets. If some agents are more successful than others, there must be a reason for it. If we adopted a sliding scale there would be no incentive to them to push the sale of tickets. Every seller does not earn a wonderful lot of money out of the business. I congratulate the Lotteries Commission. When, as the representative of the Government of the day, I

brought the first Bill before the Chamber, I was assured that the expenses of the Commission would not exceed 16 per cent., and they have lived within that amount ever since. The advertising of the Lotteries Commission does not compare with the amount of advertising that is done by the tradespeople of the city, who frequently take whole pages in the newspaper, a space that would last the Commission for many months. The lotteries must be advertised. There are many charitable institutions that are well situated to-day because of these lotteries. They have brought wonderful relief, more especially during the years when the Government of the State could not possibly find any money for them. The Commission, out of the profits made, have been able to help many institutions which would otherwise have had to go without. The present chairman of the Commission is doing very good work, and I for one appreciate it. I am fully in accord with the remarks of Mr. Cornell concerning the secretary. I have known the latter for many years, and I look upon Mr. Cornell's remarks as fully justified in every way. The secretary has been associated with charitable institutions to my knowledge for the past 30 years, and he is a man who stands high in the esteem of the public. My one regret is that he is getting older, although there is a lot of service still left to him. I also regret that the man who was responsible for the establishment of the lottery system in the first place, namely, Mr. Clydesdale, should no longer be associated with the institution. It took him many months to convince the authorities of the wisdom of establishing the State lottery system, but he kept at it, and his reward has been—

Hon. G. W. Miles: To get the sack.

Hon. C. F. BAXTER: —that he has seen much good come out of the scheme. I should have liked to see him continue in control of the lotteries. Mr. Clydesdale need take second place to no man in Australia as an organiser of this class of business. He passed out of the Commission with the confidence of the people and the good feeling of every member of the House. I support the Bill, and trust that the success already achieved will be continued for the good of the charitable institutions of the State.

HON. R. G. MOORE (North-East) [6.10]: Members who want to know my views on this question need only turn up "Hansard," where they will see them printed in black and white. My chief reason for opposing the measure is that I think the Government should make an effort to control or minimise gambling as much as possible, whereas, on the contrary, they have done all in their power to encourage it.

Hon. C. F. Baxter: These lotteries have curtailed gambling.

Hon. R. G. MOORE: It is easy to make a statement but difficult to prove it. I do not agree that these lotteries have curtailed gambling, and do not know why Mr. Baxter should make such a statement.

Hon. J. M. Macfarlane: Gambling is less patent in the streets.

Hon. R. G. MOORE: I do not know about that. The Commission have lost no opportunity to encourage gambling in this form. It has been increasing ever since the Act was passed. Mr. Clydesdale said that the Commission had curtailed their advertising for a while, and that immediately the lotteries ceased to be shoved under the noses of the people for breakfast, dinner and tea, the sales began to fall off.

Hon. A. M. Clydesdale: I said, at breakfast only.

Hon. R. G. MOORE: They were advertising in the evening and Sunday papers as well. They then resorted to more extensive advertising to encourage the public to buy these tickets.

Hon. A. M. Clydesdale: To keep the money in the State.

Hon. R. G. MOORE: Is it to be imagined that people sent more money away when the advertising decreased and less when it increased?

Hon. A. M. Clydesdale: The State was flooded with literature from the Eastern States.

Hon. R. G. MOORE: It is remarkable what imaginations some people have. I see no harm in a man buying a lottery ticket, but it should be the business of the Government to minimise what all right-thinking people regard as an evil, namely excessive gambling. The Government make no attempt to control it, and this is gambling. The authorities impose fines on people now and again, and get some revenue out of doing so. The fines are not inflicted with the idea of preventing gambling, because if a man

is fined in the morning, he is at the business again by the afternoon.

Hon. A. Thomson: It is said that these gamblers know when a raid is going to be made.

Hon. R. G. MOORE: The business is carried on quite openly. There is a blackboard in the shop showing exactly what is doing, although because of the crowds outside it is often difficult to get near enough to look at the blackboard. There is no secrecy about it all. Now and then the police make a raid and impose a few fines.

Hon. C. F. Baxter: Are you referring to two-up schools?

Hon. R. G. MOORE: The hon. member knows quite well to what I am referring. It is remarkable the knowledge some people seem to possess when they want to be helpful. There is an art in knowing what not to know when you don't want to know. I am not worried about the 10 per cent. commission that is paid to the agents. From the business point of view that is not too much. Motor car agents, for instance, may be making a fortune out of their commissions, and other agents may scarcely be paying their way. A great deal of money has been raised for charities. Notwithstanding this, I think it is the duty of the Government to look after the sick and the invalids, and they should not have to resort to gambling to do this.

Sitting suspended from 6.15 to 7.30 p.m.

HON. G. FRASER (West) [7.30]: I support the second reading of the Bill, and congratulate the Lotteries Commission on the excellent work that has been conducted from the inception. My congratulations are not only from the point of view of the successful carrying out of the consultations, but have reference to the manner in which the profits have been distributed. In view of the large amount available for allocation from time to time, it might be expected that complaints would be received from institutions or bodies that considered they had claims to greater assistance than had been rendered by the Commission. So far as my knowledge serves me, I know of no institution or body that has complained regarding the treatment meted out to them by the Commissioners. That speaks volumes for the manner in which the allocations have been made during the four or five years the Commission have been in existence. We are

aware that quite a number of individuals have expressed dissatisfaction. No doubt many of them have applied to the Commission for help, but wisely the Commissioners refrained from assisting anyone in an individual capacity. If they were to start rendering assistance along those lines, they would soon be deluged with applications. The Commissioners have operated on right lines in dealing only with institutions and public bodies in the allocation of the proceeds. During the debate references have been made to the payment of 10 per cent. commission to agents who sell tickets. When one considers the answers furnished by the Chief Secretary to questions that were asked in the House recently, the amount paid from one sweep to a particular individual may certainly be regarded as excessive, but one swallow does not make a summer. The commission earned by that one individual was quite outstanding. Mr. Clydesdale furnished interesting figures showing the number of agents operating, and the amount that each individual or group of agents received from the Lotteries Commission. No doubt the 10 per cent. returned in one instance an amount that was never anticipated when we were dealing with the legislation, and I do not know whether that result was a tribute to the outstanding business capacity of the individual concerned. It will be recognised, however, that the amount received by that individual does not indicate the earning capacity of selling agents generally. Letters have appeared in the Press in opposition to the 10 per cent. commission, but I believe that if that commission were reduced, quite a number of sellers would not be in a position to handle tickets, because the returns would be too small. The majority of the agents are merely small sellers, and no matter how small the amount received from them may be, the work of the agents has helped materially towards the success of the consultations. I have no general objection to the payment of a 10 per cent. commission, particularly when I remember the commission that had to be paid prior to the passing of the Lotteries (Control) Act, in order that those promoting sweeps could secure the sale of their tickets. Some comment has been voiced regarding the volume of advertising indulged in by the Commission. To my mind, there has been nothing excessive regarding the advertising done by the Commission. The greater proportion has been inserted by the agents, not by the Commis-

sion. If we take into consideration the cost of conducting the various consultations, I do not think there is any cause for complaint. The total expenses represent about 15 per cent., and, as 10 per cent. has to be paid to the agents who sell the tickets, it means that the cost of running the sweeps by the Commission is 5 per cent., which includes advertising. In view of the various methods of advertising adopted, I do not think we can regard it as excessive. While there is a lot of advertising over the air and in the Press, it is mostly done by the agents themselves. It has been pointed out that one of the objectives in the establishment of the Lotteries Commission was the financing of hospitals and charitable institutions, but another objective was to retain within the State the money that formerly went elsewhere for investment in lotteries and sweeps. While the Lotteries Commission have not been 100 per cent. successful in the latter respect, their work has gone a long way towards retaining within the State money available for investment in lotteries. The most pleasing feature to my mind is that not only have we retained within the State money that formerly was invested elsewhere, but we have attracted money from the other States for investment in our lotteries. When in the Eastern States recently I received a number of inquiries regarding our consultations, and was informed from several different sources that the individuals who spoke to me were contributing towards our lotteries. That applied particularly in Victoria. That was a high compliment paid to the manner in which the Commission have conducted the State lotteries. They have not only gained the confidence of our own people, but of those residing in other States. That was particularly gratifying to me because some of this money was invested by people in States that are themselves running lotteries. Thus we have to a large extent stopped the drift of that capital and have encouraged the investment of outside capital. My only regret regarding the Bill is that it has a duration for 12 months only. This legislation has gone far beyond the experimental stage, and the time has arrived when the Commission should be placed on a more permanent basis. When the Bill is introduced next year, I hope the life of the Commission will be extended for at least three years.

HON. E. H. ANGELO (North) [7.40]: During my Parliamentary career, I have never cast a vote in favour of legalising gambling, because I consider gambling in any form is one of the weakest and most objectionable traits in the Australian character. When I was a boy I encountered directly instances of great distress caused through gambling, and during the last 50 years, day by day and week after week, I have heard of great hardship and distress caused by this evil. I do not altogether object to a man who fancies a horse in a race putting 10s. or £1 on it, if he can afford to do so. I do not think there is any very great harm in a man backing his opinion within the limits of his financial capacity, but the trouble is that once a boy or girl makes a bet and, perhaps, wins—that is generally when the trouble commences—they keep on until they bet beyond their means, and then someone has to suffer.

Hon. A. Thomson: Who is to determine their financial capacity?

Hon. E. H. ANGELO: Exactly; and for that reason I have always voted against any proposal to legalise gambling. When people wager beyond their financial capacity, someone has to suffer, and generally it is the woman or the children.

Hon. G. W. Miles: Or the widow.

Hon. E. H. ANGELO: Sometimes it is the widow. At the same time, I am very pleased at the respectable manner in which this objectionable activity is carried on in this State.

Hon. A. M. Clydesdale: Respectable gambling!

Hon. E. H. ANGELO: Anyone who does not object to gambling cannot find much fault with the activities of the Lotteries Commission. Anyone desirous of making an investment is assured that the speculation will be conducted in an honourable and straightforward manner. We have not heard of a single instance in which suspicion has been aroused regarding the manner in which the sweeps have been conducted.

Hon. H. Tuckey: And that is worth a lot.

Hon. E. H. ANGELO: Yes, I am making little excuses for my objection to gambling.

Hon. E. H. H. Hall: You would not expect anything of that sort with regard to Government-controlled gambling.

Hon. E. H. ANGELO: Perhaps not.

Hon. G. W. Miles: And at any rate you cannot stop gambling.

Hon. E. H. ANGELO: If people object to gambling, then the lotteries represent probably the best way in which individuals may be allowed to have their bets. People who do take a ticket have the satisfaction of knowing that no person who is not acting straightforwardly will benefit from them at all. The profits are being devoted in the best manner possible towards the assistance of charities. If the lotteries are to be continued, I hope that before very long the hospital mentioned by Mr. Clydesdale will be constructed from the profits. For the moment I cannot understand why, if there is £20,000 in hand, the Government cannot say to the Lotteries Commission, "We cannot guarantee that the Lotteries (Control) Act will continue for all time, but it looks as if it will. You hand over to us the £20,000, and we will guarantee the rest of the amount." The Government would have to do it in any case, if the Commission should not make the money available.

Hon. A. Thomson: Then the Government should do it.

Hon. E. H. ANGELO: Yes, and the Government would be well advised to accept the £20,000 and get on with the job straight away, with a promise from the Commission that as long as they function they will provide the funds necessary for the erection of the hospital. Something has been said about the commission that is paid. I am not speaking from the gambler's point of view, but from the business point of view when I say that I feel definitely certain that if we reduce the commission below 10 per cent. the results will not be as satisfactory as they are to-day.

Hon. R. G. Moore: In what way?

Hon. E. H. ANGELO: The sales will not be half as good. If you are going to expect people to do well in any class of life you must pay them well. In the course of my business career I have always found that if you want to get results you must pay well. After all, the proof of the pudding is in the eating, and the payment of the 10 per cent. commission has made a big success of the lotteries. I am certain, therefore, that we would spoil the result if we cut down the commission. Let them cut down the commission to 2½ per cent. and the lotteries will be wiped out. Another question is the tenure of the Act. I am glad to see that it is to be for one year

only. We are aware that the lotteries have done a great deal of good during the last few years, but we must not lose sight of the fact that a certain amount of harm is also being done by them. I have heard of hundreds of cases of people in poor circumstances spending too much money on lottery tickets, money that they can ill afford to invest in this form of gambling. I have heard of the wives of men who buy a ticket every time they come to the city, and in some cases the result is that the children have to go without food. That is one of the evils.

Hon. A. M. Clydesdale: Did you say hundreds?

Hon. E. H. ANGELO: Yes, hundreds I have heard of. One has only to go to storekeepers and ask their private opinion of this form of gambling, and whether they know of cases of hardship arising as a result of investment in these consultations. He will tell you of dozens of cases. That is the reason why I want to see the Bill brought up for review every year. We want to see that the evils that follow the lotteries do not overshadow the benefits. At the present time the benefits are probably greater than the evils, and so I should like to see the position reviewed every year, and learn whether the benefits are still greater than the evils. So that on the question of one year or three if it should come to a division I shall vote for the one year.

HON. H. S. W. PARKER (Metropolitan-Suburban) [7.49]: I am surprised to hear some members talking about the evil of gambling. I have a recollection of one hon. member who spoke being a director of a company, and so far as I know there is no greater form of gambling than the purchase of shares, no matter in what form. Take our goldmining industry, and in fact in every walk of life gambling in one form or another takes place. Our whole life is a gamble. It is all a question of degree. My recollection is that when the lotteries began the object firstly was to prevent money pouring out of the State into the lotteries of Tasmania, Queensland and New South Wales. It was quite obvious that a great amount of money was being sent to those States, and the desire was to prevent that. Even now money is sent for the purchase of tickets in the Irish Sweep and in

the Calcutta Sweep on the English Derby. We cannot stop people gambling, and the question that presented itself was the desire to harness it to an extent. At that particular time there were consultations of all sorts and sizes being conducted everywhere, and they were good, bad and indifferent, but mostly bad and indifferent. One could hardly walk about the streets without having a ticket in some form of sweep thrust under his eyes. I am surprised to hear members speak of the success of the present lotteries. We know that the object of the State Lotteries was to prevent the exploitation of the people, as they undoubtedly were being exploited at about that time. We agree also that the lottery is not the best form of gambling. There is so much money lost; we know that only 50 per cent. of the money that is invested is returned in the form of prizes. It was never intended to make these lotteries, as they have been described, a huge success; the intention was to keep within reasonable bounds the gambling instincts of the people, to induce them to invest their money here rather than send it elsewhere. Now, however, we find that the object is to get as much money as possible for perhaps good purposes, but at the same time we are getting that money through the gambling instincts of the people, and we are pushing those instincts.

Hon. G. Fraser: If the Lotteries Commission wanted to do so they could run more sweeps than they are doing now.

Hon. H. S. W. PARKER: Parliament has decided that only a certain number shall be conducted each year. But the Commission have overcome that difficulty by excessive advertising. They have made a feature of advertising. In any Western Australian newspaper that one picks up he will find the lotteries advertised, not in an ordinary way, but in a catch way, that is to say an advertisement that is made attractive. Even when one walks along the streets he will see posters proclaiming the advantages of investments in the lotteries. In fact every inducement is made to the people to invest in the lotteries. I do not agree with Mr. Angelo that the lotteries are responsible for hundreds of cases of distress. I go to places where people gamble, where I am sure Mr. Angelo does not put in an appearance, and where there is a much more certain and quicker form of gambling than by purchasing a ticket in the lottery and having to wait a month for the result. One has

only to go on a Saturday night to the place to which I refer to see for himself. Then there is the starting price bookmaker whose premises are open throughout the week. Let the people gamble who want to gamble, because it is impossible to stop them, and if, as Mr. Angelo has told us, many women gamble to excess, that their children have to go short of vegetables, I am quite sure that a number of their husbands who also gamble have to go short of their pots of beer. I am sorry there has been so much advertising of the lotteries, and I should like to see an amendment to the Act to prevent agents advertising, and in that way encouraging gambling. With regard to the starting price bookmaker, he is a far greater evil than the gambling that takes place in connection with lotteries. With the lotteries someone does derive a benefit, but with the starting price bookmaker, nobody does. He encourages around his premises a class of people that should not be induced to stand outside hotels or the betting places. Those people should be taking a different interest in life. I would very much like to see the Government handle that aspect of gambling. Most aspects of gambling have in fact been handled by the Government from time to time. We have the Companies Act which deals with scrip and we have the Totalisator Act. There are also other Acts and I certainly think we might quite easily harness the betting on horse races by permitting a race club that runs a totalisator on its racecourse to extend its operations into certain parts of the city and country towns. In this way the Government would get their percentage and the race club would also get their percentage, and the gambling would be under proper control. It is impossible to my mind to license starting price bookmakers, because one has to determine whether it is the building or the individual that has to be licensed, and then vested interests come in.

Hon. G. W. Miles: What about wild-cat mines?

Hon. H. S. W. PARKER: The hon. member will have an opportunity to speak and he can tell us his experience of them. With regard to betting on horseraces, the totalisator could be established in the city and controlled by the racing clubs. This I understand is done in France, where every person can make a bet under proper conditions and without having to sneak into a

building and run the risk of a prosecution as is the case now. We know that every person in the community has a bet from time to time.

Hon. G. W. Miles: Excuse me, I do not.

Hon. H. S. W. PARKER: I suppose in one form or another the hon. member has a bet in many ways. What seems to me an excellent suggestion occurred to me this evening with respect to the disposal of the proceeds. We have been told that up to the present there have been no complaints as to the distribution. I personally have not heard of any; but I can readily understand that institutions which have made a request for, say, £500 and have received only £100, though feeling fully convinced they are entitled to the larger amount will not complain, because of a feeling that if they do complain they will not receive any further contributions. In my opinion it would be a wise precaution for Parliament to settle definitely the purposes to which the proceeds may be applied. The Commission have a difficult task to perform in that respect, and sometimes members of Parliament have a difficult task in the same connection. Generally speaking, members of Parliament take an interest in the charitable organisations operating in their districts, and it is members of Parliament who are always asked by the various committees to prefer requests to the Lotteries Commission. It is then the duty of the member of Parliament to make the request. Although one goes along as a member of the committee, nevertheless one's position is invidious in respect of being a member of Parliament. I do not think that procedure is right. In my opinion a member of Parliament should not put forward such requests. It places the Commission in an invidious position also. I should like to see the Act tightened up as to distribution of moneys. It would be an excellent idea if the persons charged with distribution had nothing to do with collection of the moneys.

Hon. C. F. Baxter: You want another Commission?

Hon. H. S. W. PARKER: I do not think another Commission is necessary. There could be a certain body or organisation for the purpose. True, it would be another Commission in one sense. I do not intend to suggest, without further consideration, in which way the moneys should be distributed; but the body that collects should not be the body that distributes. That is a matter for serious

consideration. I am sure the Lotteries Commission would be extended for more than a year were it not for the general feeling that the life of that body should not be extended beyond 12 months at a time in case the persons charged with distribution of the money should not distribute it in accordance with the desires of Parliament. I believe that is the reason why extensions have not been granted for more than 12 months.

Hon. A. M. Clydesdale: The distribution of the money is the main portion of the Commission's job.

Hon. H. S. W. PARKER: Therefore they should not have anything to do with the collection of the money, but should let the secretary run the sweeps.

Hon. A. M. Clydesdale: He really does.

Hon. H. S. W. PARKER: Let the distribution committee be cut entirely away from what I may term the collection Commission. There should not be much difficulty in bringing down next session a Bill embodying these views, which I regard as correct. I support the second reading.

HON. H. V. PIESSE (South-East) [8.7]: I welcome the Bill, and as I gave it every support last session I am now sorry that the term is not being extended by three years. I advocated that period last year; and I still hold that as we have a good Commission, it would be well to give the Commissioners a substantial further term. When Mr. Clydesdale was chairman of the Commission, he, together with the well-known and highly respected secretary Mr. Buscombe, set up a scheme of working for the Commission. Undoubtedly the example thus set has been followed well by the present chairman. Many complaints have been heard regarding the 10 per cent. commission allowed on the sale of tickets, but any business man desirous of carrying on successfully would pay the agents employed by him a reasonable commission inducing them to put in active work and thus obtain large results. The agent who makes a lot of money is to be commended for the manner in which he carries out the job entrusted to him. I know of many agents for the sale of consultation tickets whom it takes all their time to sell one book per month. In the country particularly, some agents do not sell more than four or five tickets in each consultation. I daresay such agencies should

be cancelled, as Mr. Thomson has suggested. However, one cannot get one hundred per cent. efficient business from all employees or agents.

Hon. E. H. H. Hall: The sale of tickets is not a business at all, but a mere sideline.

Hon. H. V. PIESSE: The Commission itself will be called a side line presently. I speak feelingly on behalf of country districts. Where would those districts be for hospitals and charitable institutions but for the great help rendered by the Lotteries Commission? The Katanning hospital is a fine institution. With assistance from the Lotteries Commission and the Health Department the Katanning district has built up a hospital of which it has every reason to be proud. When members of Parliament apply to the Commission for pecuniary assistance for hospitals and charitable institutions in their particular districts, they realise that those in charge of the Lotteries are men of sound commonsense, knowing exactly where money is most urgently needed.

Hon. E. H. H. Hall: Cut that out! You must be after another contribution.

Hon. H. V. PIESSE: That is all right. Mr. Parker said he objected to members of Parliament going to the Lotteries Commission with requests. That attitude is all very well for Mr. Parker, who is a representative of the Metropolitan-Suburban Province. The Province of which I am a representative extends for hundreds of miles. From Denmark to Nornalup and to Corrigin is a matter of about 300 miles across country. When travelling through that province one gets many requests put up by different bodies—boys' clubs, hospitals, and charitable organisations. One is asked as a member of Parliament to place those requests before the Lotteries Commission.

Hon. G. W. Miles: Is not that the duty of members of another place, and not of members of the Council?

Hon. H. V. PIESSE: I acted for a member who was absent—my uncle, Mr. Arnold Piesse—and thus came into close contact with the Lotteries Commission on behalf of the Katanning electorate. Moreover, one is anxious to assist Assembly members in explaining to the Lotteries Commission the reasons for requests put up. Requests I have made to the Commission have been turned down, and justly so, and there is no favouritism shown by the Commission to any member of Parliament.

Hon. G. W. Miles: Do you put up requests that you expect to be turned down?

Hon. H. V. PIESSE: I have put up requests which have been turned down, and I can quite understand Mr. Miles never having a request turned down.

Hon. G. W. Miles. I never ask for anything that is not fair and reasonable.

Hon. H. V. PIESSE: Of course not. It has been stated this evening that the secretary to the Commission controls the sale of tickets and the collection of money. It must not be forgotten that the present secretary has had such a vast experience of charitable institutions that his knowledge must be most valuable to the Commission. The Commission are bound to be pleased with the splendid help rendered them by the secretary. Mr. Clydesdale has said that he, when Chairman of the Commission, advocated the setting-aside of £20,000 annually for the erection of a hospital in Perth. If an extension of three years were given to the Commission, that matter could be easily arranged. Mr. Clydesdale has stated he feels sure the money could be obtained even from a bank if an extension of three years were given to the Commission. I would support an increased lease of life for the Bill. I support the second reading, and shall give the Bill my wholehearted support.

HON. A. THOMSON (South-East) [8.14]: I would not have spoken but for the references made by Mr. Clydesdale, Mr. Piesse, and Mr. Fraser to the allocation of £20,000 annually towards the erection of a hospital in the metropolitan area. I doubt whether under their Act the Lotteries Commission have power to make such an allocation. They are authorised to render assistance only to hospitals actually in existence. I have always been, and am now, a strong supporter of the system of lotteries, in view of the fact that large sums of money went out of the State year by year to Queensland. That State set an excellent example in the matter of assisting hospitals. For that reason I strongly support the system of lotteries. But I am not in favour of extending the period of the Commission, and so giving them a free and untrammelled control of the money they raise, and allowing them to spend it as they please. Mr. Clydesdale has said that if he had remained chairman of the Commission we

would have had £20,000 per annum for a new hospital in Perth. But I want to know why there should be this special differentiation in the method of constructing hospitals as between the metropolitan area and country districts. Local authorities in the country have to provide, or pledge themselves to provide, half the capital cost of even a Government hospital, whereas in the metropolitan area the local authorities refuse to subscribe to that principle. During the past 12 months there has been a great deal of discussion as to who should bear the cost of erecting the infectious diseases hospital. In that regard I congratulate the Health Department on their attitude towards that question. I consider that this Bill coming before us each year gives Parliament control of the money raised by the lotteries, for in that way we are enabled to see how the money is being expended. The point raised as to the 10 per cent. commission paid on the sale of tickets leads me to believe that 10 per cent. is more than a reasonable sum to pay. Out of every ticket sold, no less than 3d. goes to the seller of the ticket. I should rather see the rate of 10 per cent. commission reduced.

Hon. E. H. Angelo: To what extent?

Hon. A. THOMSON: To 5 per cent., which would be a reasonable rate.

Hon. A. M. Clydesdale: In all the Eastern States 10 per cent. is paid.

Hon. A. THOMSON: The original Bill was brought in to prevent the money going to the Eastern States. At that time the lotteries were costing far too much and were run largely in the interests of those behind them. I want to throw out the suggestion that the Lotteries Commission should reduce their three main prizes, and with the money thus saved provide a few more £15 and £20 prizes. That would help those people about whom Mr. Angelo was so much worried, one of whom had to go without vegetables in order to be able to purchase a lottery ticket. I agree with Mr. Parker that there should be a restriction on advertisements. I do not mean the advertising done by the Commission, but I take strong exception to seeing columns of advertisements inserted in the newspapers by certain agents who proclaim that they have sold the winning tickets. I think a regulation should be brought in prohibiting the

agents from advertising to the extent they are doing. That should be left for the Commission to attend to. The inauguration of the lotteries has been very beneficial to country hospitals throughout Western Australia. Another reason why I object to the sum of £20,000 being allocated to one hospital is that it means the whole of the profits of one consultation would have to be spent on one hospital, and, in consequence, other hospitals would not get any assistance from that consultation.

Hon. A. M. Clydesdale: But it means £50,000.

Hon. A. THOMSON: Still, I object to so large a sum being allocated to one hospital.

Hon. G. W. Miles: But the Perth Hospital serves districts in all parts of the State.

Hon. A. THOMSON: That is not so. Moreover, Mr. Miles himself would not be permitted to enter the Perth Hospital. We have in the country districts what are really intermediate hospitals, where people can enter and be attended to even in a Government hospital. But here, if my memory serves me correctly, it was the intention to provide this £20,000 for a hospital in the metropolitan area, which would also be an intermediate hospital for paying patients. I do not think the Act would permit of that. But I object to the position altogether, for I consider that what is sauce for the goose should be sauce for the gander. If in the metropolitan area increased hospital accommodation is required—and God knows it is so—the Government should compel the local authorities in the metropolitan area to do as the country local authorities have to do, namely provide funds for the hospital.

Hon. A. M. Clydesdale: There is no necessity for that.

Hon. A. THOMSON: But there is necessity for the country hospitals and, in addition, there is the compulsion by the Government. So if the Government compel country local authorities to find money for hospitals, the same principle should apply in the metropolitan area. If, as Mr. Clydesdale suggests, there is no need for local authorities to provide hospital funds because there is that £20,000 available, I say it should be distributed amongst other charitable institutions. I object to so large a sum of money as £20,000 per annum being definitely earmarked by the Commission for any particular hospital, and I would strongly oppose

the continuing of the Act beyond a period of 12 months.

HON. C. G. ELLIOTT (North-East) [8.25]: I fully appreciate my colleague's integrity and honesty of purpose in opposing the continuance of the Lotteries Act, but I wholeheartedly support it because I consider the work it has already done in the shape of repairs to and appliances for the various hospitals, and the assistance rendered to the infant health centres, fully warrants that continuance. I am sure the extension has been amply warranted. I do not intend to discuss gambling, other than to say that as long as the world has lasted there has been gambling, and presumably it will last so long as the world continues. I fail to see that people are doing any more harm in putting half-a-crown into a lottery consultation than in putting it into any other form of gambling, especially when we know that the half-crown, or a large proportion of it, will go to assist some charitable institution. I have no objection to the 10 per cent. commission paid on the sale of tickets. If one wants an object-lesson as to the good the State lotteries do to various charitable institutions, including hospitals, I would recommend him to pay a visit to Brisbane, Queensland. I happened to be in Brisbane in the early part of this year, and I can assure the House I was surprised at the wonderful work that has been done with the money received from the Golden Casket lotteries; and that in connection with the hospitals. The main hospital which was building in Brisbane during my visit there was to cost £120,000. The condition of the infant health centres over there is ideal, and up to date, and as a result they are doing a wonderful lot of good work. I sincerely hope and trust that the State lotteries in Western Australia will achieve the same fine results. I would have preferred to see the Government insert in the Bill a clause extending the period of the Act to three years, for I consider it is necessary that an institution like the Lotteries Commission should have at least three years in order that it might formulate a programme and put it into effective operation. Certainly that would be in the best interests of the State, and also of the hospitals. I will support the second reading.

On motion by Hon. G. W. Miles, debate adjourned.

BILL—CONSTITUTION ACTS AMENDMENT ACT, 1899, AMENDMENT (No. 2).

Second Reading.

Debate resumed from the 14th November.

HON. W. J. MANN (South-West) [8.30]: When the select committee were appointed to investigate the Bill originally introduced, I had hopes that they would be able to arrive at a solution of the problem. Apparently they were not able to do so, or, if they were, the solution is not embodied in the new Bill. The portion of the Bill which causes me some disappointment is that which does not make clear just how far members of the Legislature may carry on legitimate trading with Government institutions. It has been said, and probably will be said again, that no member of Parliament should have any business dealings at all with the Government. If that is desired, I think we should state it straight out. Then, when a man aspires to Parliament, if he has any business connections in the shape of trading with the State, he must cut them out. I suppose it is difficult to arrive at a solution of the problem, but the position created by this Bill does not place us on any better standing than we occupied last session. In a number of callings in life, men are practically forced to trade with State instrumentalities. I heard to-day of a member of the Legislature who is interested in a blacksmith's business, and members may be surprised to know that he is compelled to drop a phase of his business that might have been lucrative and quite legitimate. The custom is for the Police Department to call for tenders for shoeing police horses, and that member could not submit a tender for the work, along with other people in the district in which he lives. Can anyone say that that is just, or that it was ever intended? I do not think so. Practically every newspaper in the country is called upon to insert Government advertisements. This does not apply to me at present because I do not happen to own a newspaper, but would anyone say that because a member owned a newspaper he should not insert Government advertisements, simply because he was running the business on his own account or with a partner, whereas if the paper were run by a company of 20 persons he would be exempt? I do not think there is

any logic in that, and it is a state of affairs that should not be permitted to continue. I would much rather have it stipulated that a man who aspired to Parliament should say goodbye to all dealings with the State. One could multiply instances.

Hon. J. J. Holmes: Under the Bill, a member could buy from the State but not sell to the State. Is there any logic in that?

Hon. W. J. MANN: I am glad of the interjection, which reminds me of an incident that occurred not long ago. A Government Department approached a newspaper proprietor asking for large space spread over a period. The official said, "Seeing that we are going to be large users of space, we think we should get a reduction in price." The newspaper proprietor, who conceded reductions to ordinary clients, was compelled to refuse on the ground that he would be entering into a contract with the Government. There might be some doubt as to whether he would be liable merely for inserting advertisements supplied by the Government, but there would be no doubt whatever as to illegality on his part if he entered into a contract with the Government.

Hon. J. J. Holmes: Will this Bill rectify that?

Hon. W. J. MANN: No; that is one of my objections to the Bill, and for that reason I shall vote against the second reading. There is another matter to which the Honorary Minister might reply. According to Subsection 1 of proposed new Section 32, anyone who accepts any pension during pleasure or for a term of years payable out of public moneys of the State or the Commonwealth shall be incapable of being chosen or of sitting as a member of either House. Then the next paragraph states that paragraph (h), imposing the disqualification, shall not apply to the office of any Minister of the State liable in accordance with this Act to be vacated on political grounds, or to any member of the sea, land or air forces of His Majesty or of the Commonwealth whether on full, half or retired pay. That seems to contain an anomaly. Apparently a person who accepts a pension after having served the State would be prevented from standing for Parliament, but if he happened to be a member of the sea, land or air forces, and on full, half or retired pay, he would be eligible to become a member.

Hon. J. Nicholson: You will find that in the Commonwealth Act.

Hon. W. J. MANN: Perhaps so, but it seems to create an anomalous position which the Minister might deal with in his reply. I do not wish to appear unkind to the select committee; I am sure they were faced with a very difficult task, but I do not consider the new Bill very much improvement on the old one, and I would have preferred to see the matter dealt with in a much bigger way. I shall vote against the second reading.

On motion by Hon. E. H. Gray, debate adjourned.

BILL—ELECTORAL.

In Committee.

Resumed from the 13th November. H. J. Nicholson in the Chair; the Chief Secretary in charge of the Bill.

Clause 117—Provision where voter is blind or disabled or cannot write:

Hon. J. CORNELL: I move an amendment—

That all the words after "shall" in line 5 of Subclause 1 be struck out, and the following inserted in lieu:—"together with any scrutineers who may be present and who may so desire, retire with him into an unoccupied voting compartment and there mark the paper according to the instructions of the elector. (2) Such presiding officer shall sign his own name at the foot of the ballot paper, and if so required by the elector, allow the scrutineers to inspect the ballot paper before depositing it in the ballot box. (3) The presiding officer shall thereupon deposit the ballot paper in the ballot box."

The object of the amendment is to restore the clause to the phraseology in the Bill as introduced and in the existing Act. The Royal Commission did not suggest any amendment. The Speaker in another place secured an amendment to provide that where a blind, incapacitated or illiterate person could not vote, he should be escorted into the cubicle by the husband, wife, brother, sister, son or daughter, provided that person had reached his or her majority. Where a relative could not be found, the presiding officer would act. The presiding officer has been entrusted for 30 years to undertake this duty, and might well be allowed to continue.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: I do not oppose the amendment. From what I can gather the intention is to re-enact the old provisions. It seems to be a waste of time to show opposition in the face of so vast a majority in favour of that proposal.

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

Clause 118—Spoilt ballot papers:

Hon. J. CORNELL: The last few words of this clause are new, and were inserted in another place.

Clause put and passed.

Clauses 119 to 123—agreed to.

Clause 124—1907 No. 27, Section 133 (1) as amended by 1911 No. 4, Section 33:

Hon. J. CORNELL: The amendment I had to move on this clause is consequential on the postal voting provisions. I suggest that further consideration be postponed.

On motion by the Chief Secretary, further consideration of the clause postponed.

Clause 125—agreed to.

Clauses 126 and 127:

On motion by the Chief Secretary, further consideration of these clauses postponed.

Clauses 128 and 129—agreed to.

Clause 130:

On motion by the Chief Secretary, further consideration of this clause postponed.

Clause 131—agreed to.

Clause 132—Declaration of poll and return of writ:

The CHIEF SECRETARY: I move an amendment—

That in Subclause 1 the words "conveniently may be" be struck out, and "practicable" inserted in lieu.

Amendment put and passed.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: I move an amendment—

That in line 1 of Subclause 3 "conveniently may be" be struck out and the word "practicable" inserted in lieu.

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

Clause 133—Returning Officer to forward to Chief Electoral Officer statistical return:

The CHIEF SECRETARY: I move an amendment—

That at the commencement of paragraph (g) the "(g)" be struck out and "(2)" inserted in lieu.

The object is to convert paragraph (g) into Subclause (2).

The CHAIRMAN: There is no Subclause (1).

The CHIEF SECRETARY: That is merely a matter of drafting and will be inserted in the Bill by the Clerk.

Amendment put and passed.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: I move an amendment—

That at the commencement of the concluding paragraph of the clause "(3)" be inserted.

The effect of the amendment will be to convert the final paragraph into Subclause (3).

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

Clauses 134 to 136—agreed to.

Clause 137—Penal provisions relating to electors failing to vote:

Hon. J. CORNELL: The clause does not affect the Legislative Council, but embodies the penal provisions in connection with the Legislative Assembly elections. This may cause some heartburnings among the electors and members of the Council may be asked by their constituents how it will affect them. If members desire to say anything regarding the matter, now is the time.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: I wrote to the Chief Electoral Officer and asked him why the provision was not for compulsory voting for the Legislative Council and he supplied me with a list of reasons.

Hon. J. Cornell: Of course there are plenty.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: The letter in reply was written by Mr. Gordon, the former Chief Electoral Officer, who is now Under Secretary for Law, and was as follows:—

In reply to your request for some notes in regard to compulsory voting for the Legislative Council, I forward the attached remarks for your information. If the franchise in both Houses were the same then, of course, there should be no objection to both compulsory enrolment and compulsory voting of Council. Compulsory voting presupposes compulsory enrolment, and thus many persons who refrain (although qualified) from enrolling for more than one province would be compelled to enrol for all qualifications and then there would be a big increase in multiple enrolments for provinces. The Commission did not recommend universal suffrage for the Council; if such were adopted then the State would be in the same position in regard to the Council as the Commonwealth is in regard to the Senate. For the Assembly the personal-cum-residential qualifications are continuous and these are ascertainable, but if

inquiries had to be instituted as to ownership of land, then the work of the officials at election time would be interminable, and much controversy would arise. Compulsory enrolment for the Council could only be applied when there was personal qualification as in the case of householders who have to be resident in the province. There would be many complications arise if compulsory voting were passed for a province as a Council elector might acquire or lose his qualification by the transfer of land, and before the officials could take any proceedings for not voting, these transactions would have to be called for and examined.

Where property is one of the essential qualifications for enrolment, it is necessary to establish some period of rest in regard to the electoral roll to enable an election to be held. The transfer of land between electors cannot be foreseen or controlled from an electoral viewpoint, and whereas a person may be properly enrolled to-day he may have lost or divested himself of his property qualification to-morrow.

So far as the Assembly is concerned, the elector's qualification for a district is preserved for a period of three months, and an endeavour is being made in the Bill to apply in some measure the same principle to a province elector. A province elector may claim enrolment under any one of four different headings—in the present Act it is six different headings, those deleted being persons on the electoral lists of municipalities and road boards respectively. A province elector may lose his qualification, whereas an Assembly elector always retains it for some district except, of course, in the case of imprisonment, insanity, etc.

Hon. J. Cornell: He is quite right. Compulsory voting could not be applied with justice to the Legislative Council with this penalty clause.

Clause put and passed.

Clauses 138 to 154—agreed to.

Clause 155—Electoral expenses:

Hon. J. CORNELL: I move an amendment—

That at the end of the clause the following words be added:—"Where expenses are incurred on behalf of a number of candidates, each candidate shall, for the purpose of this part, be responsible for a fair and reasonable proportion of such expense."

The intention of the Act was that every candidate should submit a return, cooked or otherwise. In recent years the practice has been for parties to submit returns for a multiplicity of candidates. The National, Country and Labour Parties each submit returns. The whole thing has developed into a farce. Perhaps it was inaugurated from the standpoint of economy, but I do not know why. The amendment is reasonable and in conformity with the Act. It

boils down to this, whether it is to be a party return or an individual return.

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

Clauses 156 to 161—agreed to.

Clause 162—Definition:

Hon. J. M. MACFARLANE: I move an amendment—

That in line 4 the word "furnishing" be struck out and "hiring" inserted in lieu.

In the original Act the words that were used ran back to the fifteenth century and to-day a candidate could easily become involved if "furnishing" remained; so I suggest that "furnishing" be struck out and "hiring" be substituted.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: When I first saw the amendment I came to the conclusion that Mr. Macfarlane was not aware of its possible effect. I find now that he is so aware. The effect would be that a man who owned a car would use it on the day of an election, and if he had wealthy friends he could get the free use of their cars. Consequently, he would have a very unfair advantage over the individual who had not wealthy associates.

Hon. J. CORNELL: I think the use of the word "furnishing" instead of "hiring" was an error on the part of the draftsman. It was not intended that a candidate should not be able to hire a conveyance. There is no question about the meaning of "furnishing." If I owned a motor car and I said "You can have the use of it," that would amount to bribery and corruption. Hiring is the word in the old Act and it should remain.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: The provision in the old Act was nonsense. What was meant by supplying a horse or carriage hire?

Hon. J. M. Macfarlane: Paying the cost of hiring for the day.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: To my mind it does not convey that and it has never been interpreted as such. It has, however, been interpreted to mean that it would have a sweeping effect.

Hon. H. S. W. PARKER: This is really a pious clause which can have no effect. If, however, a person were convicted of "furnishing," he would be prevented from sitting in Parliament for two years. Really the clause is meaningless because it could never be proved that it was used to influence

a vote. Whether the word be "furnishing" or "hiring" does not matter. The difficulty can be got over by striking out "or the furnishing of any means of conveyance for any voter whilst going to or returning from the poll."

Hon. G. FRASER: I intended to put forward the same phase of the question as Mr. Parker has just done. It really makes no difference whether a person "hires" or "furnishes" in connection with an election. The clause would be quite ineffective, so why retain it? It would be impossible to prove that anyone had committed an offence.

Hon. J. M. MACFARLANE: I will withdraw my amendment so that Mr. Parker may move the amendment he suggested.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Hon. H. S. W. PARKER: I move an amendment—

That in lines 4, 5 and 6 the words "or the furnishing of any means of conveyance for any voter whilst going to or returning from the poll" be struck out.

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

Clause 163—Undue influence:

Hon. J. CORNELL: I move an amendment—

That the following proviso be added to the clause:—"Provided that in relation to any charge under paragraph (d)—(1) no person shall be convicted if he proves that he had reasonable ground for believing, and did so in fact believe that defamatory statement to be true; (2) the person charged may elect to be tried by a jury, in which case all the laws relating to committal and trial of offenders on indictment shall apply."

I fail to understand why another place struck out that provision, with regard to which the Commission are unanimous and which follows the Federal Act.

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

Clauses 164, 165—agreed to.

Clause 166—Disqualification for bribery or undue influence:

Hon. J. CORNELL: Subclause 3, which is printed in italics, represents a highly necessary amendment. The two-years disqualification would not apply to a person acquitted.

Hon. H. S. W. PARKER: I move an amendment—

That in Subclause 2 the words "at the time of the conviction or finding" be struck out.

These words contradict what precedes.

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

Clauses 167 to 182—agreed to.

Progress reported.

House adjourned at 9.42 p.m.

Legislative Assembly.

Tuesday, 19th November, 1935.

	PAGE
Question: Wireless sets	1834
Bills: Adelphi Hotel, 1R.	1834
Reserves, 3R.	1835
St. George's Court, 2R.	1835
Industrial Arbitration Act Amendment (No. 2), 2R.	1835
Public Service Act Amendment, 2R.	1838
Public Service Appeal Board Act Amendment, 2R.	1838
Legal Practitioners Act Amendment, 2R.	1838
Annual Estimates, 1935-36, Votes and Items discussed	
State Batteries	1838
Cave House	1838
Lands and Surveys	1838
Farmers' Debts Adjustment	1838
Education	1839
Agricultural Bank, Industries Assistance Board, etc.	1846
Education	1855
Police	1874

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

QUESTION—WIRELESS SETS.

Mr. NORTH asked the Minister for Railways: 1, Have the Government been approached by the Australian Broadcasting Commission to legislate in the direction of minimising electrical interference with wireless sets? 2, Is any action contemplated?

The MINISTER FOR RAILWAYS replied: 1, No application has been made for the introduction of legislation. 2, When any interference is brought under notice locally it is remedied where possible.

BILL—ADELPHI HOTEL.

Introduced by Mr. Tonkin and read a first time.