Things are very serious up there, and they have not received the consideration that the long-distance stock freights require to be given. We have heard a great deal about turning the mythical corner. If we have turned the corner, I see no reason why some easement should not be given to the particular section of the community whose cause I am espousing. I have no objection to its being given to other people. I am as anxious as anyone else that all concerned should receive assistance.

Hon. C. B. Williams: Are you not putting a spoke in their wheel?

Hon. E. H. H. HALL: Certainly not. I am anxious that everyone who is deserving of consideration at the hands of the Government should receive it. I hope the Government will see their way clear to making this reinstatement. The people concerned have not many members of Parliament to voice their needs. I have tried my best to do so on their behalf. I hope when the Minister replies he will be good enough to touch briefly on the question of why the Government have not seen fit to give these people the necessary relief. I support the second reading of the Bill.

On motion by the Honorary Minister, debate adjourned.

House adjourned at 9.34 p.m.

Legislative Assembly,

Wednesday, 30th October, 1935.

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

QUESTION—NOXIOUS WEEDS, SKELETON WEED.

Mr. DONEY asked the Minister for Agriculture: 1, Has the appearance in this State of the skeleton weed been reported to his department? 2, If so, what action was taken by his department? 3, If the skeleton weed has not yet made its appearance, what is being done to prevent its introduction? 4, Are any educational methods being employed by his department to enable farmers and others to identify this weed and to understand its dangers? 5, If so, what are those methods?

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE replied: 1, Its possible introduction has been reported to the department in a few instances. 2, These were investigated, but fortunately its introduction has never been verified. 3, As close a watch as is practicable is being kept on all seed introductions. 4, Yes. 5, Descriptive illustrated articles on the weed and its dangerous character have been widely circulated through the agricultural, city and country Press. Further, the departmental field officers are keeping a close watch for its appearance and warning farmers of its dangerous character.

QUESTION—METROPOLITAN SEWERAGE WORKS.

Mr. McDONALD asked the Acting Minister for Works: 1, What was the capital

cost of all Government sewerage works in the metropolitan area, on the 30th June, 1935? 2, What is the estimated further expenditure to complete the sewerage works under the schemes now authorised? 3, What was the gross income from sewerage rates for the year ended 30th June, 1935? 4, On what total annual value was this assessed, and at what rate? 5, What will be the estimated gross annual expenditure on the sewerage works in the metropolitan area when the present authorised schemes are completed, including interest and sinking fund maintenance, renewals, and administration, and other usual charges? 6, What rate will be necessary to secure this amount on the basis of the present annual values of all property coming within these sewerage schemes?

The ACTING MINISTER FOR WORKS replied: 1, £1,582,863. 2, £1,092,000 (exclusive of capitalised interest). 3, £74,268. 4, £1,652,762. Rate, 10d. in the £. 5, In compliance with the Act, rates are assessed each year having regard to the capital involved and estimated working expenses. In view of the many factors involved it is not practicable at this stage to estimate the future rating with a reasonable degree of accuracy. 6, Answered by No. 5.

QUESTION—RAILWAYS, CLEANERS.

Mr. HAWKE asked the Minister for Railways: 1, How many applications were received for the position of cleaners when last advertised for? 2, How many of the applicants were approved? 3, How many have been employed? 4, Is it proposed to appoint an additional number in the near future?

The MINISTER FOR RAILWAYS replied: 1, 694. 2, 100. 3, Six. 4, Further appointments will be made as and when traffic requirements indicate such to be necessary.

QUESTION—TRAFFIC FEES.

Mr. SAMPSON asked the Acting Minister for Works: 1, What was the amount collected last year by way of license fees under the Traffic Act from that portion of the Armadale-Kelmscott Road Board district contained within the metropolitan area? 2, What amount was paid to the Armadale-Kelmscott Road Board when traffic fees were distributed for the same period?

The ACTING MINISTER FOR WORKS replied: 1, The information asked for is not available. 2, £1,987.

QUESTION—MARGARINE.

Mr. SAMPSON asked the Minister for Health: 1, In view of the importance of correct food both for children and adults, will he take steps to give publicity to the inadequacy of margarine as a substitute for butter? 2, Will he also take steps to prevent the artificial colouring of margarine, thereby misleading people who, because of its colour, are under the impression that it is butter; also that when fats other than butter are made to appear as butter they be fully labelled and described?

The MINISTER FOR LANDS (for the Minister for Health) replied: 1, Margarine has a very definite value as a food. It falls short of butter in its content of certain vitamins. This information has frequently been made public and will continue to be stressed. 2, There is already in the Dairy Industry Act a section which states "Colouring matter shall not be added to margarine either in the process of manufacture or after manufacture and margarine containing added colouring matter shall not be sold. Penalty two hundred pounds." Under the Pure Foods and Drugs Regulations, margarine must be fully labelled as such.

BILLS (3)—FIRST READING.

1, Marketing of Eggs.
Introduced by Mr. Fox.

2, Land and Income Tax Assessment Act Amendment.

3, Land Tax and Income Tax Act Amendment.

Introduced by Mr. Sampson.

BILLS (2)—THIRD READING.

1, Wiluna Water Board Further Loan Guarantee.

2, Pearling Act Amendment.
Transmitted to the Council.

MOTION—MONETARY AND BANKING SYSTEMS.

As to State Committee to prepare Evidence

Debate resumed from the 23rd October on the following motion by the member for Avon (Mr. Boyle):—

In view of the appointment of a Commonwealth Royal Commission whose terms of reference require it to inquire into the monetary and banking systems at present in operation in Australia, and to report whether any, and, if so, what alterations are desirable in the interests of Australia as a whole, and the manner in which any such alterations should be effected, this House, therefore, with the object of assisting such Commission, is of opinion that the Government should appoint a State Committee, whose duty it shall be to collect within the State such evidence in relation to the terms of reference of the Royal Commission as will assist the work of such Commission, and place its Committee's findings on behalf of the State in collated form before the Royal Commission.

HON. W. D. JOHNSON (Guildford-Midland) [4.39]: I did not secure the adjournment of the debate with the idea of discussing the subject matter of the motion, but I wanted to enter a protest against the introduction of motions of this kind, asking Parliament to take action in this particular direction. Every member knows that the State Parliament has no power over questions of this nature. If we bring them forward we are likely to be ignored, which is not pleasant, and we are also liable to be snubbed for our efforts. The matter is entirely one for the Federal Parliament. We should not interfere with questions that are outside our province. If the motion were carried we should be reflecting upon Federal members who are elected to do this kind of job. It is their province to attend to such a thing.

Mr. Sampson: Surely we can assist them.

Hon. W. D. Johnson: The Federal members are directly responsible to the same electors to whom we are responsible. We have been told by our Constitution that we have no power to deal with this question. It would be ridiculous for us to go before the electors in March or April next and discuss things of this kind. The intelligent elector would ask why we did so, seeing that we have no right to take action. We cannot further any measure for a general reform in this direction.

Mr. Sampson: The proposal is to assist the Federal Commission.

Hon. W. D. JOHNSON: The motion casts a reflection upon Federal members. It conveys the idea that they are not capable, or if capable are not as active as they might be, and that, although the Federal Government have taken certain action, it is not enough for this State. It suggests that our Federal representatives should have gone further, and that this State should be given a special opportunity to contribute to the investigation. That is to be deprecated. We should not interfere with the business of other people. The member for Avon suggests that the State Parliament should usurp the functions of another Parliament. The Federal Parliament has taken up the matter seriously, and I think all will agree that it is work of grave concern. Already the authorities are approaching it in a practical way. Why should we attempt to interfere with them? If there were some outstanding question affecting the welfare of this State, and the Federal Parliament had ignored it, or our Federal members were indifferent concerning it, I could understand the State Parliament directing attention to such a want of activity and consideration.

Mr. North: Would you object to the chairman of the Main Roads Board giving evidence?

Hon. W. D. JOHNSON: No, he could not refuse to give evidence if called upon to do so. The Federal Parliament is not neglecting this matter. It is not a question of whether we feel aggrieved about any inquiry, but it is suggested that we should interfere with work which is being undertaken and is in progress. Banking and currency and all relative matters come within the sphere of the Commonwealth Parliament. It alone can direct activities or action concerning such questions. By the Financial Agreement of 1928 we definitely agreed that the powers of the Commonwealth should be extended on this question. The State has never tried to limit the Commonwealth in these important matters, but definitely voted by a substantial majority in favour of their powers being extended. By that vote, which was taken comparatively recently, when one considers matters political, we definitely agreed that the Federal Parliament should function in regard not only to matters covered by the Commonwealth Constitution as first framed but to an extension and alteration regarding the surplus revenue provisions. Not only did we agree that the surplus revenue should be distributed in an-

other way, but we extended the powers of the Commonwealth with regard to loan-raising. I felt like informing the member for Nedlands (Hon. N. Keenan) last night when he spoke about recklessness in loan-raising. When he spoke as he did he forgot to remind members that loan-raising is checked up. Formerly the State Parliament could do as they liked with reference to the raising of loans, but they cannot do so to-day. The State Government and the State Parliament can propose, but the decision is for Australia to make, and the representatives of Australia exercise their right in checking up proposed loan requirements of the different States. It is always worthy of emphasis that to-day the State Parliament is not alone the deciding factor in such matters. There is a more important body that directs and checks up. In those circumstances, if we are reckless to-day with regard to loan expenditure compared with what happened in the past, then it is not only a reflection upon the Government, if the allegation be correct, but a definite reflection upon the Loan Council. Finance, of course, is the very foundation of government. Someone once stated that government is finance and finance is government. Therefore, the Federal Government to-day, by their proposed action, are going right to the foundation of government. They intend to probe, by way of investigation, in order to ascertain whether the foundations of the Commonwealth are sound or require strengthening or alteration.

Mr. North: This will be the first inquiry of its kind.

Hon. W. D. JOHNSON: Yes, and it is one that no doubt the hon. member, with me, cordially welcomes. I believe we will get quite good results from it. The member for Avon (Mr. Boyle) suggests in his motion that the investigation regarding the financial foundations of the Commonwealth should be contributed to in some way by a State inquiry. If the State did conduct such an inquiry, what contribution could be made? The member for Avon suggests we should appoint a committee to take evidence that would be collated and conveyed by the committee themselves as evidence to the Federal Royal Commission. We know perfectly well that no Royal Commission would agree to that form of evidence being submitted. Second-hand evidence is of no value in any investigation. The hon. member suggests that in an all-important matter of this description we should have representatives appointed by the State to collect evidence from individuals, assess the value to be attached to that evidence, consider the evidence as a whole, and decide what part shall be submitted to the Federal Royal Commission, and what shall be left out. In other words, the members of the body he suggests are to be called upon to prepare the case for Western Australia, as distinct from the rights of the various electors throughout Australia. I emphasise the fact that the Commonwealth proposal is for an Australian inquiry; it is not a matter for an inquiry from the State's point of view. It is not suggested that the Federal Commission will inquire into the financial relationship or stability of New South Wales or any other State. Their function will be to review the financial stability and financial standing generally, particularly with reference to banking and currency, as affecting the whole of the people of Australia, not one section only. I submit—this is why I rose to speak particularly—that motions of this description are misleading to the people. We have been prone in recent times to discuss what are purely Federal matters. In doing that, we lead the electors to believe that we are responsible for matters in respect of which we have no authority whatever. In those circumstances, we not only interfere with other people's business but tend to mislead the electors and invite them to submit matters to us in respect of which we have no power to help or direct.

Mr. North: We can give them some hurry up in that regard.

Hon. W. D. JOHNSON: I will help the hon. member in that respect, but when he refers to giving the Royal Commission some hurry up, he must remember that the hurry up will be for the Federal people, not this Parliament. We can speak only as electors, for we have no power as a Parliament. Of course, we can submit resolutions to the Federal Parliament and take the risk of their being ignored or of this Parliament being snubbed. All the power we possess is that of individual electors. If the member for Avon has special knowledge or has studied the issues involved, and if he has matters that he desires to place before the Federal Commission for the purpose of influencing reform,

this is not the place for him to submit his evidence. His duty is to submit his information to the Federal Minister in charge of such matters. He should communicate either with the Prime Minister or the Federal Treasurer and convey to him the matters he dealt with in this Chamber. Otherwise it is a sheer waste of effort. It can be of no value, unless, of course, the hon. member proposes to send copies of "Hansard" to the Federal authorities in the hope that the volume will be perused and the matters he discussed taken into consideration by the Federal Ministers concerned. Just now I said that we were misleading the people when we dealt with such matters. I have some regard for the activities of the Douglas Social Credit movement. I have a good deal of sympathy with that agitation, and have much in common with them so far as they go. The difference between the Social Credit reformers and me is that there is no finality, no definite decision indicated by them. They deal with the rotten social system of to-day and educate public opinion regarding the unsoundness of the capitalistic system as it operates, but do not suggest any remedy. I have not been able to discover any remedy in their teachings so far. I have read as much as I could of their literature, and I heard Major Douglas endeavour to explain the position at his meeting in the Perth Town Hall. I left that meeting disappointed because I had not been able to obtain any knowledge as to how the Social Credit advocates hope to accomplish reforms. When the question was put definitely to Major Douglas as to how he would control or reform the banks, his reply was that public opinion, if concentrated, unanimous and determined—I do not suggest these were his exact words, but this is what he conveyed—expressed itself in united action through organisation, it could influence banks to reform in accordance with public desires. He said definitely he believed the banks could be best administered by bankers, and he did not propose to interfere with banking administration but desired to influence it to operate as he thought it should operate. That does not appeal to me as a method of reform. The Labour movement, with which I have been associated for years, has been endeavouring for many years past, by combined organisation much stronger than that possessed by the Social Credit movement to-day, to secure reforms, but has made little impression upon banking institutions or the banking policy of Australia. As a matter of fact, on one special occasion it was made an issue at the Federal elections. An appeal was made to the electors of Australia to give the then Federal Government a mandate so that they could take up this matter seriously, and introduce reforms. The people were not prepared to give any mandate of that description. I will admit that the Social Credit movement is much stronger now than it was then, and I am of opinion that the refusal and want of knowledge displayed by the electors on the occasion I refer to, gave a great fillip to the new organisation and strengthened it in its numbers, so that to-day it has become a greater influence. Nevertheless, that influence, to my mind, is purely educational and that is why I have a good deal of respect for the movement. People are studying economics to-day who did not do so before. Meetings are now held at which matters of public finance are discussed. The anomaly of poverty in the midst of plenty is more seriously considered by people than ever before. The Labour movement has been hammering at this sort of thing for years, but sections of the people were indifferent to such matters. To-day, through the Social Credit movement, people are giving thought and consideration to them. The weaknesses of the present social system can be stated, the unfairness of methods of distribution exposed, the anomaly of poverty in the midst of wealth emphasised and so forth, but when it comes to a question of actual reform in order to remove these defects, it is the Federal Parliament that has to undertake the task, not the State Parliament. Therefore I do not believe in motions such as the one now under discussion, nor do I believe in the attention of the House being directed to matters in respect of which we have no power or influence. If we support a motion such as this moved by the member for Avon, where will the practice stop? If we encourage discussions on purely Federal matters, we might go into the effect of the Navigation Act, the reform of customs and excise taxation, compulsory military training, and such like. Surely we have enough work within the limits of the State Constitution to occupy our minds without devoting attention to extraneous matters. Then, again, if members are to interfere in

such extraneous matters, will that not lead the electors to a realisation of the limitations of a State Parliament and encourage them to think that State members are not fully engaged, that their work within the State is not sufficient to keep our minds occupied, that the State Parliament itself has not enough work to keep it going, that State members have to interfere with other people's jobs, that they have to try to use the State Parliament to influence or speed up matters that are purely Federal? And the impression is conveyed that the State Parliament is not fully occupied dealing with matters within the scope of its Constitution. I should like also to point out the dangers of interfering in these financial matters from a State point of view. We have under our Constitution certain rights, and under the Financial Agreement Act we have fairly well defined relationships between the States and the Commonwealth, but before we start to interfere with that, I remind members that Mr. Lang in New South Wales attempted it. He tried to administer the affairs of his State as he desired they should be administered, but he encroached upon the rights of the Commonwealth. I do not think he was as guilty as Mr. Lyons and others tried to make out, nor do I think they had power under the Constitution to do the things they did. Nevertheless they did them, and the High Court of Australia endorsed their action. I do not think the High Court had a legal right to endorse that action, but the decision probably was based upon public policy rather than on legal rights. But whatever it was, Mr. Lang tried his best, and I do not know that I find much fault with his ambition. He tried to administer his State in a way he thought to be in the best interests of New South Wales. The reason why I have some respect for Mr. Lang is the knowledge I have that he did a considerable amount, as the Douglas Social Credit movement is doing to-day—in exposing the weaknesses of our social system. Mr. Lang also exposed the unjust burden that Australia was carrying in its relationship with the Mother Country, as for instance, the question of the conversion of loans. Mr. Lang was the first to raise that matter. He instructed Mr. Willis, the Agent General for New South Wales, in definite terms to make inquiries into the possibility of the conversion of Australian loans to a lower rate of interest. Mr. Willis was able to make a valuable contribution as a result of his inquiries, and to convey to the Commonwealth that it could be arranged. Also he did certain good work in popularising the idea in the Old Country. Mr. Bruce came along afterwards and followed the trail that had been blazed by Mr. Willis, and succeeded in getting a lot of kudos for what he did accomplish. I do not care who accomplished it, it has been a very fine thing for Australia, but I do not forget that the first real agitation that took place was what I read and heard of, namely the stand taken on the subject by Mr. Lang and his Government. Again, in regard to the interest on our war debts, Mr. Lang was the first to collate all the details of the consideration that was given by the British Parliament to the foreign nations, while exacting the full amount from Australia. All that was related here by the then member for South Fremantle, when he contributed a speech based on the material collected by Mr. Lang and his organisation. We know that that was ridiculed for a while, but ultimately it was realised, and to-day Australia is enjoying great relief from the suspension of the interest on our war debt. But while Mr. Lang did all this in a genuine attempt to improve the conditions of his State, the question of debt conversion was a matter affecting his State, and the question of interest was a matter affecting his State, and the Commonwealth Government were not active in that regard. So I say Mr. Lang was quite justified in tackling a problem of that kind when he felt his State was suffering, and that he could get results and that Australia would benefit in consequence. But this motion before the House is not a motion of that kind, it is merely an attempt to rush in after the Federal Government have appointed a Commission and the Federal Parliament has endorsed that action and the Treasurer has been instructed to get ahead with the job. Now it is that we are to suggest that it could be done much better if we gave them a hand. Really the only way we can give them a hand is as electors, as individuals. We are all electors of the Commonwealth with a right to a voice and a right to approach our representatives in the Federal Parliament, and we can do it only in that way. I admit that we could carry the motion and forward it on, but as I say it would be dangerous to make the attempt because Federal members would resent it, and in my opinion the

Federal Government would ignore it. I should like again to point out the danger of misleading the electors. We have to-day circulating throughout a great part of the State a pamphlet issued by the Douglas Credit organisation whose ambition it is to abolish poverty. One can read right through this pamphlet, and certainly any man with any sympathy would agree with all that is in it; but the pamphlet is careful all the time to refer to Australia. The whole of it is carefully prepared from an Australian point of view, but still there is evident a desire to convey to the people that by submitting certain questions to members of the State Parliament some reform can be speeded up.

Mr. North: There is the same pressure in the other States.

Hon. W. D. JOHNSON: I never object to demands being made when one is really in earnest.

Mr. Marshall: And when you yourself make the demand.

Hon. W. D. JOHNSON: Yes. But here in this pamphlet we get, "I demand that you as my elected representative——." The only thing they neglect to put in there is the word "Australian" to make it read, "my Australian elected representative." The whole of the pamphlet refers to Australia right through, and it conveys by that demand that one being an elected representative, the individuals responsible for the pamphlet are right in coming to us and claiming that we are their representatives. That is all very well, but we are not their representatives in matters of this kind, and therefore the pamphlet is misleading. The representative of a State cannot help them at all, but the pamphlet conveys that we do have some power and that State members should be active in regard to the matter. This is misleading, and the hon. member's motion is simply adding to that difficulty. He is trying to convey—not wilfully of course—that there is a means by which members of this House can influence the present Parliament to do the job better than the Federal Parliament is doing it. In conclusion, I submit that if the Social Credit movement wants reform, if they can see the legislative action that is necessary, I would direct them to those people who can really help them, namely, the Federal Parliament. This State Parliament cannot help them at all, and if the hon. member who moved the motion will submit his views to the Federal authorities and help them in their efforts——

Mr. Marshall: But he will go before the Royal Commission.

Hon. W. D. JOHNSON: No doubt he will, but I submit that the Commission will come to this State, collect its own evidence in its own way, arrive at its own conclusions, and submit its report to the Federal Parliament. The evidence collected here, no doubt, will be much the same as that collected in the other States, and the whole of the evidence will influence the framing of the Commission's report to be submitted to the Federal Parliament as representing the whole of the people of Australia, and which has power to deal with the subject matter contained in the hon. member's motion. I will vote against that motion as being one outside the scope of this Parliament, and which this Parliament should not encourage by even discussing it, for it is only misleading.

MR. NORTH (Claremont) [5.11]: While I agree with much that the hon. member has said, it is possible to imagine a situation in which official evidence should be given to this Royal Commission. By official evidence I mean evidence that affects the State as a State, but which would come ill from individuals. I may be wrong in this suggestion. At present we have hundreds or thousands of men working on the roads, and making good roads too. But it is known in the engineering sense that the methods those men use are quite out of date, although they are better than they were. It is quite well known that in view of the machinery available to-day our men are only wasting their time. But the State, under the present financial system, is bound to adopt those methods, and in doing so is doing the right thing. Therefore, would it be advisable for the Chairman of the Main Roads Board off his own bat to go before the Commission without authority of the Government and suggest that improvements might be made in the financial system with a view to enabling him to utilise the most modern machinery for the making of roads? It is well known that to-day there is available road-making machinery which, using only two or three men, can make six or seven miles of first-class road per day. The only reason, presumably, why this State does not use that

machine is that we are so heavily taxed that we must go on as before.

Mr. Sleeman: Why work men for eight hours a day if the work can be done in two?

Mr. NORTH: If the motion were carried, it would mean that the State would collect evidence of that kind and then submit it to the Commission in a friendly way, not force it down the throat of the Federal Government, but submit official evidence which affects the State in cases such as I have referred to, where, to put it in a definite phrase, there is required some financial technique to facilitate the introduction of more and better machinery. We cannot do it to-day, although of course we would like to do it. In many directions our State operations could be improved. We could use more plant and fewer men, but the whole policy of the State is that we should use as many men as possible. I think such evidence would come far better from the Government if they called their officers together to submit instances of that nature and presented them to the Royal Commission. Other States could do the same. In that sense the member for Avon has advanced a good line of argument. I quite agree with the member for Guildford-Midland that for the State to try to follow like a clown in a circus and only half do the job is not intended. The second point I suggest is that the State is faced with the problems referred to by the member for Nedlands last night—the problem of increasing the debt to keep things going and the problem of high taxation. Those surely are official State matters. No individual could say to the Royal Commission that Western Australia was increasing its debt heavily year by year, increasing its taxation and raising by emergency tax a sum of nearly £700,000 a year. That would not come well from an individual. If it came from a reform society, which need not be the social credit organisation, but which might be the Henry George League or other reform movement, it might be acceptable, but it would come best of all from the State Government—the fact that we are facing this snow-balling of taxation and debt. It appears to me that the Royal Commission will be influenced largely by the evidence submitted. That has not been the case with other banking commissions. Hitherto banking commissions have been largely white-washing commissions. I am glad that this proposal emanated from a conservative Government because that shows a general desire for a change. We know that the Labour Party also want a change in the monetary system. Hence we are satisfied that the present Royal Commission will not be a white-washing commission. The States have every right to submit their official evidence quite apart from evidence that might be tendered affecting private industry. There are three or four other questions which should be brought before the Commission. The third issue which must be settled by the Commission, if their work is to be of any real value, is that of designing some financial technique which will permit of consumption in Australia expanding to the limit of production. Herein lies one of our troubles. We have enormous plant in the shape of factories and farms, but they are operating as it were only on quarter throttle. Everyone is aware of that fact. We need some financial technique to enable factories and farms to expand their rate of production in order to secure 100 per cent. of consumption. I cannot see how that question affects the State except in so far as we have State enterprises. We have State sawmills and other State trading concerns, and they could well give official evidence through their officers if such a committee were set up. I realise that this work could be done through the Cabinet direct without the House passing any motion, but why should not the member for Avon bring the matter forward? A vital issue is involved, and we do not want to allow these important matters to go by the board. The fourth point is that some financial technique should be designed to finance the enforced leisure of citizens. I say enforced leisure because no one would say that people should receive dividends if there is work for them to do and they will not do it. But there are thousands of Australians—I do not refer to those who are or should be on invalid or old-age pensions—who, although young and healthy, have considerable enforced leisure and some technique must be designed to finance that leisure. Some members might suggest a national insurance scheme. That matter could well be considered by the Royal Commission. It is one that affects the State, and it also affects persons such as those

under the Child Welfare Vote and the Unemployment Vote, which are handled through the Government and not through individuals. The fifth matter is that raised by the Federal Minister for Health. He is trying to secure thousands of pounds, perhaps hundreds of thousands of pounds, to finance destitute motherhood. We cannot say he is asking for the money in order to finance motherhood that is not destitute because presumably the mothers, married or otherwise, who have sufficient money can obtain the best advice available and should not need financing. A big fund is being established to try to raise the birth-rate and keep Australia for Australians. That seems to me to be an official question with which the State might well deal. We have, as State Commissioner of Public Health Dr. Atkinson, but we have to admit that the relations in health matters between Federal, State and local authorities are very intertwined. Perhaps it should not be so, but the fact remains that it is so. Lastly it seems to me that some financial technique should be designed by the Royal Commission to finance those industries which the people of the State, under the public policy of the day, deem desirable, but which, without a subsidy of some kind, could not possibly carry on. I refer to such industries as dried fruits and butter. To-day those industries are being fostered under taxation, and that condition of affairs cannot continue very much longer. Upon those six propositions. I think it would well be worth while collecting evidence, perhaps through the Government direct. Maybe the Government have that intention, but I do not see why Ministers should not welcome the initiative of the member for Avon in bringing the matter forward. Another question which I think should be dealt with is that which was brought forward in the House two sessions ago. A resolution was forwarded through the then Minister for Works to the Federal Government to the effect that the present economic crisis should be investigated by the Federal Government. We expressed the view that the Federal Government should inquire whether the crisis was due to the unequal distribution of money in the community or whether it was due to a shortage of purchasing power or to a combination of both those evils. I believe that that resolution carried weight with the Federal Government. We were the only State Parliament that took action at that time and it was action for which the world was looking. At present we are probably leading the world in this matter. It may seem a small thing; passing events often do seem small. As one who has given a good deal of thought to the subject, I express the opinion that the Royal Commission will be epoch-making. It cannot be denied that we have a genuine Commission.

Mr. Tonkin: Mr. Casey's statement would not lead one to believe that.

Mr. NORTH: The terms of reference are evidence of genuineness, and I am sure the member for North-East Fremantle will support them. The terms ask for suggestions for any improvements which can be made to the financial system and the best method of effecting those improvements for the benefit of the whole of the people of Australia. Nothing could be more open and above board than that statement. It is an absolute triumph for democracy, because it has so long been contended that anti-Labour Governments were boodlers' Governments and that sort of thing. That may have been true at one time, but it is certainly not true to-day. I trust that the House will support the motion because, apart from the action we took of our own volition two sessions ago, we will be giving a lead to other State Governments to move forward in this matter which involves an issue of a completely financial nature and one which in a sense does not concern individuals as such. Let me sum up my remarks. The need is to find some improved technique suitable to bankers and suitable particularly to the central bank, because it is with the central bank that the trouble lies. Private banks are very efficient and will administer any scheme presented to them by the Government under the law of the country, but we have to invent a technique to draw upon the unused capacity of Australia, whether in the shape of factory or farm, without getting further into debt. We have to design some antidote to this national debt which is snowing us and the world under. We have to find some method of financing enforced leisure, meaning unemployment. People who are willing to undertake work should be kept in health so that when a job becomes available they will be capable of doing it, not, as at present, allowed gradually to slip down hill during enforced leisure. A highly placed officer of health in New South Wales startled Sydney a week or two ago by giv-

ing evidence that 40 per cent. of the school children of Sydney were suffering from malnutrition. That surprised me; I did not think the percentage was so high. When an officer for health makes such a statement, something must be done. Of course this State is not involved in that assertion.

The Minister for Lands: A few years ago a statement was made by a Government medical officer that children were suffering from malnutrition and when inquiries were made the statement was not borne out.

Mr. NORTH: I am aware that a lot of people might have plenty of food, but might still be sick. That question is being taken up in quarters other than where it originated. The Federal Minister for Health is showing considerable activity. That statement from Sydney tempted me to ask a question here, but I did not do so because I believed that the comparable figures for Western Australia would not be anything like so high. However, the statement shows the need for action in that direction also. The last point is that we need a people's policy in finance administered by the existing interests. It is possible to admit that the present financial system, as operated in the administrative sense, is highly efficient. It does what its shareholders ask; it makes good profits, and handles its affairs in an admirable way. The Royal Commission will no doubt discover that the policy of Australia is more intimately related to the financial system than to anything else. Until the depression came upon the world, it was hardly realised that that was so. It may be said that banking is improving all the time, week by week; and I hold that even without the Royal Commission many developments and improvements are possible. But that does not relieve us of our duty of advantaging the Royal Commission in all those aspects which affect us as a State in the four or five ways I have suggested. Therefore I have pleasure in supporting the motion, although I fully admit that many of the contentions of the member for Guildford-Midland are not merely correct but should be taken into consideration.

MR. MOLONEY (Subiaco) [5.31]: I oppose the motion, but whilst doing so desire to compliment the mover on his zeal in bringing the matter forward. The contentions of the member for Guildford-Midland in my opinion are correct. The arguments advanced by the previous speaker are a sufficient indication that the member for Guildford-Midland is on the right lines in his analysis of the Commission's intentions as to securing evidence.

Mr. Thorn: It is not often you two agree!

Mr. MOLONEY: I am prepared at all times to agree with those who put forward contentions with which I am in accord, and this happens to be a case in point. I was rather impressed with the formidableness of the words "financial technique" and their repetition. An analysis of the term—particularly as the hon. member said he would be definite—might have proved highly edifying to hon. members. We were told that if the motion was not carried, the result would be to prevent a case being presented to the Commission on behalf of this State. Yet the hon. member who declared that the Commission itself would be impotent to secure this information without the aid suggested by the motion belongs to the legal profession, the members of which know that Royal Commissions have the right to summon any person whom they desire to submit evidence. Further, if a Commission desired the evidence of any State official, a Cabinet representative of the Labour movement in Western Australia would never dream of allowing that official to refuse to give evidence. I am sure that long before the hon. member, or the cult of which he is a disciple, put forward anything in the nature of monetary reform, Labour's policy was declared clearly and definitely. The Commonwealth Bank Act had been passed, and in 1921 a Commonwealth Bank note issue began, and there was also the instituting of our national bank. At the last Federal elections Labour declared emphatically that one of its planks was the nationalisation of banking. There was the initial pioneering work done in the elections by the Labour Party in instilling its views into the minds of people outside the Labour movement. The success of that propaganda showed that in the minds of the people there was the conviction that financial iniquities were being practised. As an earnest of that let me read from the "West Australian" of the 9th August of this year from the report of a speech made by the chairman of the Commercial Bank—

> Notwithstanding the result of the last Federal election, criticisms are still being levelled against the banks and other financial institutions by a certain section of the community. It is generally recognised that the plank of

nationalisation of banking was not a popular one at the last election; but there are still people with socialistic tendencies who consider that institutions controlling credit deliberately engineered the depression. This is surely a fallacy; and it may be said, and safely, that the late causes of our troubles are not altogether local but rather due to external economic disturbances more or less beyond our control, and have nothing whatever to do with the monetary system of this country.

There we have the chairman of the Commercial Bank proclaiming something which I presume would, generally speaking, be agreed to by the banking fraternity. Yet the member for Claremont, by interjection, proclaims that he is quite prepared to allow the private banking institutions to continue on the principles forming the basis of their establishment. During the Federal election campaign the people gained a certain amount of information. Persons who today are desirous of obtaining information regarding the economic system and its application to the economic structure are persons who mostly voted against Labour's policy on that occasion. In view of certain posters which were exhibited during the election, it is no wonder that people voted against Labour's policy. The question is purely one of education. The Royal Commission which was appointed as the result of pressure exercised and which represents the fulcrum, so to speak, of the movement for monetary reform, is entitled to assistance from this Parliament on the lines I have indicated. The member for Claremont has been one of the spearheads of the movement. One can easily imagine that a committee appointed by this Parliament or by the present Government to place before the Royal Commission facts relating to monetary matters coming within the purview might advance proposals not generally subscribed to by the people of Western Australia.

Mr. North: That is the point.

Mr. MOLONEY: Included among those no doubt would be the hon. member interjecting. Let us take the principles of Social Credit. Here is a golden opportunity for adherents of those principles to select a Western Australian advocate of them, to place them before the Commission. But probably they would be up against the other official appointed under the motion. It is quite open to the Royal Commission to ask of the State Government to make available the services of the Under-Treasurer or any other officer able to throw light upon the financial ramifications of Western Australia. But there is this consideration: unquestionably the members of the Royal Commission are cognisant of that fact. They are also cognisant that, as shown by the member for Guildford-Midland, it is not a question to-day of our spending all we can lay our hands on, but a question of certain moneys being allowed to the State. The whole financial structure has to be readjusted accordingly. The analogy between road-making and the machine and enforced leisure is a natural corollary to the principles for which Labour at all times has stood. As already pointed out, monetary reform and employment are naturally coherent. Without monetary reform it is an utter impossibility to remove the ulcer of unemployment. Notwithstanding the zeal with which the motion has been brought forward, I think even the mover realises thot the Government will not be lacking in respect of witnesses to give evidence concerning anything that may be done to effect improvement. No doubt the Commission will travel the various States and solicit evidence there. I do not say it is incumbent upon the Commissioners to do so, but to my mind it is probable they will do so. Further, there is the moral feature that as an earnest of the desire of Conservative Governments, which as a result of the depression have become ashamed of the name "Conservative" and are now becoming devoted to monetary reform——

Mr. North: "Conservative" means to save, you know, as to save a situation.

Mr. MOLONEY: There is to-day no monopoly of saving. Under the present system, which has operated practically from the dawn of time, no great benefit has resulted from saving, as proved by the depression. Many men who were thrifty have suffered corresponding losses. On the other hand, the man who had nothing put by for a rainy day, who spent everything he could lay his hands on, was the man who received aid first. As a natural consequence we must provide for the most indigent. When it comes to a question of Conservatives being thrifty——

Mr. North: I did not mean that.

Mr. MOLONEY: Conservative Governments have been mentioned as having become extremely desirous of implementing a new monetary policy in favour of the

workers. Members of Conservative Governments, however, occupy exalted positions where at no time has want made its appearance. To my mind, the arguments of the member for Claremont——

Mr. North: You misunderstood my interjection.

Mr. MOLONEY: Apparently I did.

Mr. North: I made the point that Conservatives seek to save the situation.

Mr. MOLONEY: If that is the case, the hon. member is proclaiming something which at all times has been heard from the hustings. If the Conservatives are there to save the situation——

Mr. North: That is the point.

Mr. MOLONEY: Prior to the advent of the present Government of Western Australia, the people were told that salvation depended upon the return of a Conservative Government or a National Government. Apparently the people did not believe that assertion, which is now repeated by the member for Claremont. I oppose the motion on the ground that no good purpose will be served by giving effect to it, that it is entirely superfluous, and that by carrying it we shall be interfering in something with which we have no right to interfere. It is quite open to the Royal Commission to demand that certain persons shall give evidence, but those persons will not be able to give evidence as representatives of Western Australia. The committee will require to take evidence from many sources, and will listen to the panaceas that will be put forward whether they be for socialisation of industry, nationalisation of banking, the Douglas Credit social reform, or perhaps some Chinese method for the improvement of conditions as practised in China. It will be competent for the committee to ask for the views of all to be placed before it, so that those views might be submitted to the commission. It will also be equally competent for the commission to request the attendance of any person who, in their opinion, may be able to enlighten them in the way of hastening monetary reform.

MR. J. H. SMITH (Nelson) [5.47]: It is my intention to support the motion. I cannot understand the opposition to it that has come from the members for Guildford-Midland and Subiaco. I believe that the appointment of the Commission by the Federal Government was the direct result of a motion carried in this House last year at the instance of the member for Claremont (Mr. North), and forwarded subsequently to the Federal Government. The effect of that motion was that the Federal Government should be requested to conduct a full investigation into the banking system of Australia. Now, to move a step forward, the member for Avon has submitted the motion we are discussing, suggesting that a committee should be appointed to prepare evidence to submit to the commission. Surely our friends who have spoken against the motion will not expect us to believe that the opinions they have expressed are supreme and that everyone in the State should not have representation on the commission!

Mr. Moloney: No one said that.

Mr. J. H. SMITH: My friend from Subiaco seems to be obsessed with the nationalisation of banking, and because of that he ridicules any motion suggesting investigation of the system of banking generally. The nationalisation of banking will not get us over our difficulties. That is only a question of policy. The bugbear is the interest burden under which we are suffering. The yoke is around our necks, and will remain there for generations to come, even if we do get that panacea for all ills to which the member for Subiaco referred —the nationalisation of banking. Until we revert to the old laws we are not going to get away from the problem confronting us to-day. There is not a hope in life for our children or for our children's children. Take the wars we have had in the past, all of which have resulted in the squandering of money on munitions. To-day every nation is borrowing money at high interest rates, and this is going on for all time. Will the members for Subiaco and Guildford-Midland say that what is taking place now is going to be reproductive, and that the generations of the future will pay the interest?

Mr. Moloney: What are you going to do about it?

Mr. J. H. SMITH: Go back to the old and sane laws. We could revert to the Statute of Limitations and so not hand down our debts from generation to generation, but declare that after a period of six years had expired no further interest should be paid. For many years I have been a close student of economics, and I suppose I have read as many books on the subject as any other member of this House. Consequently in the last three or four years I have had reason to alter my views definitely. I can now

see the writing on the wall. Nationalisation of banking is not going to get us out of our trials and tribulations. Earlier in the day I committed my views on this important question to paper, and if members will listen for a few minutes, they will agree that what I have written is not too bad. There are few thinking men in the world to-day who will not definitely assert that the present economic system has reached not only the end of its usefulness, but has become a drag on the progress of the world, and has created a burden of taxation that the peoples of all nations are almost incapable of bearing. Some rich may become richer, but more poor are becoming poorer. No one will deny that. What is the cause? It is undoubtedly debt and interest. The wealth of the world consists of the annual production of the primary products of the earth, be they animal, vegetable or mineral. The production of these commodities is in excess of requirements, and has been accentuated by the advent of mass production in all its forms. This has displaced many men from their natural avenues of work. It has caused unemployment and made it necessary for the other workers to be taxed in order to meet the money requirements to pay the doles to the workless. It is evident that there must be a more equitable distribution of work, a more equitable distribution of play, and a more equitable distribution of the necessaries of life. We cannot, however, disguise the fact that it does not pay to harvest the national wealth, that nearly all commodities are being produced at a loss to the workers on primary production, and by the inequitable distribution of what is termed "money." Only those who command this latter commodity are able to use their powers over that money to buy and sell at their own discretion and price, and so the hundreds and thousands of people in this country cannot afford to buy the natural increase of the earth, the gift of divine Providence, although the supply is greater than the demand. These are mere commonplaces; they are quite evident to any thinking man. Now, if it does not pay to harvest this national wealth, if this food and clothing and other necessities, or the materials for making them, are gathered at a loss to the harvesters of this national wealth—and it is from this harvest that the interest on the debts of the country must be met—how much longer will those workers on primary production continue at a loss? I wonder how long! As a student of economics for the past 30 years, the last four or five years have altered my views completely on the solution of the economic problem. The basis of the old theme is the law relating to debt and usury. This law is stated quite clearly in the first few verses of the 15th chapter of Deuteronomy. It is distinctly stated there that all debts must be cancelled at the end of every seven years. That is where we get our Statute of Limitations, and the stated intention of this law was so that there should be no poor in the world. If members care to read the Book of the Law, they will find that every provision is made for all the abuses of the present economic system, and it distinctly states that all these laws must be kept. Everyone must admit that Major Douglas, by drawing the attention of people over the last few years to the present rotten economic system, has done a remarkably great deed, and he almost advocates the very laws which neither Church nor State has bothered about. Parliaments are discussing the making of laws to meet a situation that has already gone beyond the power of human government to readjust, and make this world fit to live in. The world is at war physically, and will remain at war until the nations conform to the only system of laws which were given to man for his benefit. Reverting now to the motion submitted by the member for Avon, I cannot understand its having opposition in the House. We are all democratic in our views, and all must be unanimous in an expression of regret that in the midst of plenty there should be so much starvation. We have not forgotten that the motion originally submitted by the member for Claremont advocating the appointment of a Royal Commission to investigate the banking system was carried unanimously in this House. I cannot understand, therefore, why there should be any exception taken to the motion we are now discussing, which merely sets out that evidence shall be prepared by a committee to submit to the commission. All the member for Avon is trying to do is to implement the original motion moved by the member for Claremont (Mr. North) which was supported in such glowing language by the member for Northam and the member for North-East Fremantle. Surely the Government have no wish to take on their shoulders the whole

of the responsibility of preparing a case to submit to the commission. We know that Cabinet Ministers are very busy men, and have no desire that this responsibility should be thrust on them. Consequently they should be prepared to accept the motion and agree to appoint a committee to prepare the evidence. We are all aware of the suffering that is going on in the world, and it should be the desire of everyone to try and break that down, and make the world a better place to live in.

MR. MARSHALL (Murchison) [6.0]: I should like to be in a position to support the motion, but for reasons I shall set out I am reluctantly compelled to oppose it. A lot has been said for and against the motion, and a good deal of what has been said, I submit, has been irrelevant.

Mr. Thorn: It looks as if the whip was cracking.

Mr. MARSHALL: I do not know about the whip cracking. I have a very open mind on the subject. The motion calls for the formation by the Chamber of a special committee to collate evidence for submission to the Royal Commission appointed by the Federal Government to inquire into and report upon the present monetary system prevailing within the Commonwealth. Let me suggest that I am supporting the motion, that it will be carried, and that the committee will be appointed. Let me also assume that the committee will get together all kinds of facts and figures and submit them to the Royal Commission. When the Commission reaches Perth what are its members going to do? Are we going to ask the State Government to inform them that we have already got together all the evidence necessary for them, and say to the Commission, "Here are all the facts of the case for Western Australia; you require nothing more; take them away and consider them." Does the mover of the motion expect us to do that? If he does not he must agree that the alternative is that the Royal Commission should be left to make its own investigations. There is no doubt we shall be cut very short if we attempt to interfere with the Commonwealth body.

Mr. North: If the ground is covered no harm will be done.

Mr. MARSHALL: If we had the ground covered we should be implying that we doubted the intelligence and capacity of the commissioners to elicit the necessary information. Is that the hon. member's intention?

Mr. North: I do not want to be disorderly.

Mr. MARSHALL: How is the committee to be efficient and yet refrain from being offensive to the Royal Commission? If we appoint a committee to get together facts and figures we must say to those who comprise it, "You have full power to operate on behalf of the State and to ask the Royal Commission to accept your facts and figures"; or we have to keep out of the picture altogether and allow the Federal Commission to do its own work. By interfering in the way proposed we can easily offend. I would support the motion if I thought we were not behaving in a fashion that might be regarded as offensive. It is plain that the committee would be able to elicit information that would be of the greatest value to the Royal Commission. Would the same avenues from which such information was derived be closed to the Federal Commission? The member for Avon has been connected with numerous inquiries by Royal Commissions and select committees. There is no doubt he would prefer personally to examine witnesses than to have evidence collated for him by a separate organisation and placed in front of him for his consideration. The members of the Federal Commission will wonder whether we consider they are intelligent enough to examine their own witnesses, if we say to them, "We have already presented our case for Western Australia, either wholly or in part." Everyone desires a change in the monetary system, but I do not want to interfere with the efficiency of the Commission. If the Commission's report is not favourable to our views I do not want it to be said that it is based practically on evidence submitted by a special committee appointed by us. It could be said in such circumstances, "It is due to your interference that we framed our report on these lines." We should be linking ourselves up with whatever decision might be arrived at, and doing so without any justification. What avenues would be open to the State committee that could not be explored by the Federal people? I doubt whether any Minister would give evidence, but every Minister has departmental heads who know all about the ramifications of State expenditure. No avenue would be closed to the Royal Commission. When the commissioners arrive in Perth every avenue they desire to explore

will be open to them. If we do not support the motion we shall not be bound by the report. If we are going to take the responsibility of providing the bulk of the evidence, in some degree we shall be linking ourselves up with whatever may be set forth in the report. It would be unwise for us to interfere. When the secessionists put up their case they based practically the whole of it on the financial position of Western Australia, bearing in mind our relationship with the other States. It would be better if we allowed the Royal Commission to visit Western Australia and have a free hand. It is made up of intelligent men, many of whom are schooled in the science of finance. They know what avenues they desire to explore. It would be better to let them proceed with their investigations unmolested and untrammelled by us. If the report be unsatisfactory we shall be free to act for ourselves, because we shall have played no part in furnishing the evidence. I am pleased that the investigation is being made. I trust the outcome will be of material assistance to this country. I have no desire to bind myself so that if the subsequent relief that is coming as a result of the report is inadequate, I shall not find either my hands or my tongue tied and be prevented from taking other action, moving along other avenues, and exploiting other channels to secure the necessary relief for my fellow men. I am sorry I have to oppose the motion, because I am in sympathy with the sentiments expressed by the member for Avon. If I supported it I feel I would be bound to accept the report of the Royal Commission, and leave myself shackled in respect to any future action I might desire to take. If the report is not favourable I want to be free to fight for the attainment of our desires.

On motion by Mr. Watts, debate adjourned.

BILL—HEALTH ACT AMENDMENT.

Returned from the Council without amendment.

Sitting suspended from 6.15 to 7.30 p.m.

BILL—BETTING CONTROL.

Second Reading—Defeated.

MR. MARSHALL (Murchison) [7.30] in moving the second reading said: It does not afford me any great pleasure to introduce the measure, and I would certainly hesitate to take such action if I were convinced, from observation, of the immoral aspect of the matter. What appeals to me to-day is that what we recognise is going on enables us to appreciate the evil. If they have observed what happens on race days throughout this State, members must realise that some action is urgent and necessary. There is a school of thought that contends that when Parliament gives sanction to legislation for the control of betting, by that very act, it condones betting. While I agree that such people are entitled to their opinion, I disagree with their contention. If we agree that because Parliament sanctions a measure to control what we all recognise as illegal betting on horse racing, it thereby condones betting, then we must also agree that by passing legislation that enables hotel premises to be licensed for the sale of liquor, Parliament condones the consumption of alcoholic beverages. I do not think that Parliament does. What Parliament has done in connection with the liquor trade I propose, in the Bill I am presenting to the House, to do regarding the evil of illegal betting as it prevails to-day. It must be recognised by members that no law that has not the support of the populace can be put into operation effectively. In other words, when a law is unpopular, the people will, of their own volition, flout it. That can be applied particularly to the condition of affairs regarding the laws dealing with gaming or betting. I suggest that probably we, as a Parliament, have been neglectful of our duty regarding the control of all forms of what may be considered evils in their effects. I am not suggesting that because a person makes a wager on a race, it is an immoral action, but such actions can be carried to the stage of immorality if indulged in to extremes. That can be said of almost every action in the life of an individual. For instance, some people overeat: some over-drink and there are a few who over-bet.

Mr. Sampson: And some over-talk.

Mr. MARSHALL: That, too, is a fault. The point I am making is that we cannot say, because there are a few individuals in our midst who may be gamblers in the extreme sense and thereby do themselves and their families an injury, that every indivi-

dual who wagers on a horse race is doing something that is evil in itself. For centuries past most civilised countries have endeavoured, from year to year, to suppress betting, but invariably such efforts have resulted in failure. I shall try to show that the Mother Country has attempted for centuries past to suppress what we call illegal betting. With every such attempt, the law was altered to make penalties more severe and the measures more comprehensive, but always the same result followed, namely, failure. There is an idea abroad, more particularly among those of my own generation, that many things are done to-day that we would not have dreamt of doing when we were young. We must remember that times change, and with them the ideas of the people. To-day we see things done commonly that we would have hesitated to do in our youth. Therefore I suggest that while it may have been considered quite illegal to wager on a horse race many years ago, we must admit that to-day people, speaking generally, do not accept that version. If I may say so without being offensive, we, as a Parliament, are always inclined to legislate for our grandfathers rather than for our grandchildren. We do not look ahead and legislate for those who will come after us. Rather do we look back and search for something as a guide upon which to base legislative enactments. We certainly hesitate to legislate ahead or even to keep up with modern requirements. With regard to the Bill I am submitting to the House, I suggest we have been belated with legislation of this description. I state definitely that if we desire our people to refrain from betting or from drinking, we should accept it as our responsibility to do something to educate them along those lines.

Mr. Stubbs: America tried it and failed.

Mr. MARSHALL: The hon. member has not grasped my point. It is true that America took certain steps and experienced the same result that followed attempts to suppress betting in centuries past. Decidedly they failed in America. If I may digress for a moment, I would suggest that if the Government believe that wagering on horse racing is wrong and that over-indulgence in alcoholic liquor is an evil, then long since should they have taken action through our State schools. The teachers should have been placed under an obligation to spend at least 15 minutes of each day in teaching the children regarding the evil effects of both betting and drinking. We have never attempted anything of the sort. We place before the kiddies nice little stories about fairies, horses, dogs, birds——

Mr. Sampson: And wildflowers.

Mr. MARSHALL: But we never attempt to educate them seriously respecting more important matters or to inculcate into their little minds a knowledge of the evils that result from over-indulgence in gambling or drinking.

Mr. Tonkin: That is not strictly accurate.

Mr. MARSHALL: No, but in the main it is true. What I am suggesting is that between the ages of 12 and 14, the latter being the school leaving age to-day, tuition regarding the evils of over-indulgence in both betting and drinking should be made part of the education of the children who attend our schools.

Hon. P. D. Ferguson: Are they evils unless indulged in to excess?

Mr. MARSHALL: No, I do not suggest they are. A section of the people contend that betting and drinking are evil. If the nation is to be guided along such lines, then it is the duty of the Government to see that the children are educated accordingly and to encourage them to refrain from anything that may be detrimental to the wholesome welfare of the nation.

Hon. P. D. Ferguson: If you remove all temptation, you lower the moral fibre of the community.

Mr. MARSHALL: I do not suggest that we remove all temptation but that we should bring before the notice of children of the ages I have indicated the evil character of excessive gambling or drinking. As it is, those children after leaving school embark upon life without any knowledge that will be a safeguard to assist them in withstanding the evil consequences of over-indulgence in either betting or gambling.

Hon. P. D. Ferguson: The State considers that to be the responsibility of the parent.

Mr. MARSHALL: I will not answer these little interjections that do not carry any substantial weight with regard to the point I raise. Many of our children have not been equipped with the knowledge that will fortify them to withstand the evils of drinking and gambling. If they had that knowledge, many might not indulge in either. I believe the churches do the best they can along these lines in the Sunday schools, but we have to remember that in

these days a very limited proportion of the people attend church or Sunday school. I acknowledge that we can see the effects of their work in that usually those they have taught do not indulge in either practice. So I suggest that if we consider this an evil we should take opportunity to teach all children who are compelled to go to school, and educate them on those lines, so that when they leave school they will not be tempted into an environment which may ruin them, without their having been fortified against the temptations of gambling and drinking. I do not propose to quote very much in support of that principle, but I have here the report of the Royal Commission on Betting which was appointed in South Australia. It is a very edifying report and, as I say, it was drawn up by the Commission appointed to inquire into the prevalence of illegal betting in South Australia and to make representations to the Parliament of that State. That Commission decided to circularise all churches with a view to getting an expression of opinion from the various denominations, so that they might be guided as to the report they would submit to Parliament.

Mr. Doney: What is the date of that report?

Mr. MARSHALL: It is dated 1933. It is the last of the reports of which the decision to legalise betting in South Australia was the outcome. One of the church dignitaries over there expressed his opinion in regard to the matter very fully. Let me quote him from Clause 16 of page 4 of the Commission's report as follows:—

> Much controversy has raged over this question since we started our investigations. Those churches and societies represented by the Council of Churches regard betting as immoral in itself and a sin—an offence against the laws of God—which the State ought to suppress or attempt to suppress by every means in its power. When the Church of England was invited to give evidence, the Lord Bishop of Adelaide replied that he did not desire to do so, but in an address to the Rotary Club on 9th March, 1933, on "The Ethics of Gambling" he expressed his views on this subject as follows:—After dealing with the moral, social, and economic evils of gambling, he said that legislation directed to its total suppression would do more harm than good, because it would not have the bulk of public opinion behind it, that State control of betting did not go to the root of the evil, and that the most urgent need was the creation of a right public opinion.

In that I agree. And the way to get that right public opinion is to create it in the minds of our children before they leave school. Then quite a lot of the apparent evil would be overcome. Instead of that, we allow the children to go out into a world which is full of these evils, and the children are not equipped with a knowledge to combat them. So they go out into the environment and become victims of it. We wait until they become victims to the environment and then we attempt to suppress the evils by legislation. The history of the attempts to do that in England is very edifying. I have to admit that they have failed dismally, and have reached the point where they have had to consider the advisability of legalising betting, as has been done in some of the States of the Commonwealth. When the member for Victoria Park (Mr. Raphael) was speaking on the Address-in-reply, he referred to the deplorable state of affairs prevalent in his electorate in point of illegal betting. The Premier, interjecting, stated that one could not get a bet anywhere in Victoria. I doubted whether that could be possible. I could never see that the border lines between South Australia and Victoria, or between Victoria and New South Wales, would be the starting and stopping point of illegal betting according to the direction in which one was travelling. It seemed almost impossible, and if the Victorian law could be so successful in its suppression of illegal betting, it would seem that the troubles we are experiencing in this State could be overcome without much difficulty. All that we would have to do would be to copy the Victorian law, put it into operation and our troubles would be over. When the Premier makes a statement it is generally accepted as being authentic, reliable and truthful. In other words, the Premier when he speaks carries all due weight and confidence. So I thought it my duty before introducing this measure to take up the remark he had made, as will be found on page 964 of "Hansard" of the present session. As I say, the member for Victoria Park was speaking, and the Premier interjected, "You cannot get a bet in a shop, a hotel or anywhere in Melbourne." I interjected "Nonsense!" and the Premier replied, "There is no nonsense about it." I reflected that the Premier's remark might give the Chamber a convincing lead as to the position in Victoria. So I wrote across to three persons whose words I thought the Chamber could well accept,

and whose opinions would be valued as a guide to members regarding the true state of affairs in Victoria. I wrote to the Commissioner of Police, to the Leader of the Victorian Assembly and to Mr. Tunnecliffe, the Leader of the Labour Party in Victoria. These are the replies I received—

Police Department, Chief Commissioner's Office, Melbourne, 11th October, 1935. Dear Sir, with reference to your letter of the 2nd instant I have to state that although provision is made in the Police Offences Act for severe penalties against persons convicted of illegal gaming, a large volume of illegal betting is carried on in Victoria off the racecourse, and thousands of pounds are collected every year from fines for these offences.

That is signed by Mr. Blamey, the Chief Commissioner of Police. I wrote also to the Leader of the Opposition in Melbourne, and I received a reply from the Acting Leader of the Opposition, Mr. W. S. Kent Hughes, as follows:—

With reference to your request of the 2nd October, it is impossible to obtain any accurate information as to how much betting takes place outside the racecourse. Undoubtedly a very great deal goes on and people are continually being caught and fined for being starting-price bookmakers. I do not think that any further legislation would be any more effective than the prohibition laws in America.

Then under 10th October, 1935, Mr. Tunnecliffe wrote me as follows:—

Yours of the 2nd instant to hand re the efficiency of betting legislation in Victoria. Betting outside a racecourse is illegal—street betting and starting price betting are widespread and general. It is safe to say that anybody who desires to put any sum from 1s. to £1,000 on horses will find no difficulty whatever in being accommodated. Every public building has somebody who is prepared to accept a commission, and even in the public offices betting takes place. Prosecutions are frequent and the fines are heavy.

I think those three letters convey an answer to the Premier's statement that one cannot bet in a hotel, shop or anywhere else in Melbourne. I have no more to say on that point. Personally, I derive no pleasure from introducing this Bill for I know it will be unpopular with many, but if every racecourse were to be subdivided for more useful purposes, and if every racehorse were backed into a sulky, and if everyone who derives a living from horse racing in Western Australia were to be put to some more useful occupation, I would sleep the more soundly at night. Thousands of people in Western Australia do not derive benefit from betting on horse races. But while it is a pastime and a pleasure to them, we have to bear in mind the experiences in this State and other States of the Commonwealth and the experiences of the Old Country in regard to suppressive laws. I do not know that we should not reconsider the position with a view to legalising betting for the purpose of taking control of it and regulating it, and thus minimising the evils which are apparent in illegal betting to-day.

Mr. Moloney: Would you suppress betting on racecourses, too?

Mr. MARSHALL: The Bill contains the necessary clause to legalise betting both on and off the racecourse in Western Australia, just as in the South Australian and Tasmanian Acts. I wish first to support the measure by advancing reasons, as I have been doing, before I outline in general the contents of the Bill. Members will observe that there is a big difference between the measure I am now sponsoring and those in South Australia and Tasmania. Tasmania made a blunder and is now amending her legislation to bring it up to the same standard and along the same lines as the South Australian Act. But I wish to support this measure in two ways, first by quoting reasons why the Bill should be passed and, secondly, by outlining the general contents of the Bill. Of all countries that have experienced difficulty in regard to gaming and betting, the Motherland is probably pre-eminent. For hundreds of years attempts have been made to stamp out the evil, but unsuccessfully. Try as the authorities did, every possible effort seemed to be attended with fresh evils. No sooner would one difficulty be overcome than another would arise, and finally it was decided that the only course to adopt would be to legalise betting. I have a book entitled "The Law of Gaming and Betting," by C. F. Shoolbred, to which one of the judges of England contributed a preface. If anyone should be acquainted with what was taking place in England and what remedy should be applied, surely it would be one of the judges who had to handle cases of that alleged crime. The position in England to-day is very different from that of years ago. I intend to quote from a report of a Royal Commission on Lotteries and Betting which was appointed in 1933 to report on the prevalence of the evil and make suggestions to the Government as to what should be done.

From time to time select committees and Royal Commissions have been appointed, all of which have submitted recommendations. The reports were given effect to by way of legislation, but the legislation invariably proved ineffective. There was a time in England when betting was not considered to be an evil. From the history contained in the reports, it appears that even in modern times betting on horse racing under restrictions has been permissible. There are some people who regard the Australian as an inveterate gambler and bettor. They say, "You cannot prevent an Australian from betting; it is inherent in him." After consulting the history of other countries I doubt whether the Australian can equal other people in the weakness for betting. In England betting is now permitted on football matches, and greyhound racing, as well as on horse racing. It was not regarded as any great evil, but it became so prevalent as to cause a nuisance, and restrictions were applied. Ultimately the authorities considered it necessary to legalise, control and regulate betting, thus eliminating the objectionable features associated with it. Mr. Justice McCardie, on page 6 of the preface to the work mentioned, wrote—

> It seems clear that the instinct for gaming and betting is rooted as deeply in the British as in any other nation. That instinct has never been eradicated in the past, and it can never, I assume, be eradicated in the future Frankness on this subject is plainly desirable. It may, on the whole, be better, in the general interest, that a legalised and reasonable indulgence should be allowed in respect of several things now prohibited, rather than that the present state of affairs should continue. We must take human nature as it is. The whole matter is ripe for full and unreserved discussion by the public, the Press, and Parliament.

There can be no doubt of that. Could we have anything more vicious than the conditions prevailing in Western Australia, and what applies here applies equally in other places where betting is not legalised. Only a few weeks ago deputations waited on the Premiers of Queensland and New South Wales on this question, but the motive there was to assist horseracing by attempting to suppress betting off the course. I am actuated by no such motive. I wish to prevent young people and men partly or wholly intoxicated from making bets.

Mr. Sleeman interjected.

Mr. MARSHALL: I have been to South Australia where I spent three betting days in registered premises, and I say unhesitatingly that what has been achieved there is a credit to the State, particularly when compared with the conditions that prevail in Western Australia. There was no sign of a person under the influenc of liquor or of juveniles near the registered premises. As a matter of fact, unless one were told, he would not know what business was carried on in those premises.

Hon. P. D. Ferguson: Has betting been reduced as a result of legalising it there?

Mr. MARSHALL: There are no authentic figures to enable anyone to say definitely and distinctly that betting has increased or decreased in South Australia as a result of its legalisation. No more could the volume of illegal betting be assessed there than here.

Hon. P. D. Ferguson: The police would have a good idea.

Mr. MARSHALL: I intend to quote the South Australian records. When the Royal Commission sat here, the best evidence that could be obtained concerned the particular places and persons actually known to the police. Certainly they did not secure 100 per cent. Let me point out that betting in South Australia assumed more objectionable features than it has done in this State. The people of South Australia are possessed of no less intelligence than are the people of Western Australia, and they did not jump haphazardly at the idea of legalising betting. They recognised that the existing condition of affairs had become intolerable. Let me mention one case known to the police. In no fewer than 29 private homes connected with the telephone, betting was conducted on every race day, and the children were sent into the street, ostensibly to play, but really to watch for the police. What a fine education for children! What an environment in which to rear children! I would not say that we have no private homes in which betting is conducted. I do not know, but I would not wager that there are none. As to the tactics adopted in South Australia let me give an instance. There were known to the police in South Australia no fewer than 600 pimps who kept nit for the approach of the police. That number did not include the pimps employed by the police to watch the bookmakers. Hence in South Australia there was practically a regiment of young men, each trying to catch the other, and I

doubt whether either section had much respect for the law. Thus young people were being trained to defy the law, and naturally their defiance of the law would extend in any direction that suited their purpose.

The Minister for Justice: It should have settled the unemployment problem.

Mr. MARSHALL: Notwithstanding the severity of the South Australian law, that is the kind of unseemly occurrence that was happening. The bookmaker used to evade the worst feature of the penalty by employing agents. I know that agents are similarly employed in Western Australia, and although the fine is particularly heavy and imprisonment may be included in the penalty, the bookmaker never appears in the case. The agent is the man who is caught, and he is the man who goes to gaol. While he is in gaol the bookmaker would pay so much a week to his family. When he came out of gaol he was not despised, as people had no respect for the law. He was well paid while he was in gaol, and the bookmaker thus paid a very small price for the right to bet. I do not think that our people respect the gaming laws any more than did those in South Australia. If we wish to reach the stage reached by South Australia, we have only to tighten up the law a little more and increase its severity, and then the same objectionable features will ensue. Let me quote what happened in England. I ask members to follow this passage closely, because it affords a good example. We have a good example at our very door, if we choose to follow it. I am in a position to refute any statement that may be made regarding injury to the sport or to the clubs as a result of legalising betting in South Australia. This is the final report of the British Royal Commission on Lotteries and Betting, 1932-33. I shall conduct hon. members along as quickly as I can. The following quotation begins on page 4 of the report:—

> Unlawful Games Act, 1541. The earliest English legislation as to gambling, namely Acts of 1388,1409, 1477, and 1541, prohibited the playing of certain games, and as a consequence prohibited gaming in the form of playing at those games for money. The motive behind these laws was the desire to promote archery and other military exercises by preventing men from wasting their time on games. Thus the Act of 1541 prohibited the keeping for gain of a house for playing at games such as bowls or tennis, or games of cards and dice. The Act made it an offence for anyone to play at those games in houses of this description, or for artificers, servants and others to play such games at all, except at Christmas time. Portions of this Act are still in force.
>
> In 1621 an Act of the Scottish Parliament prohibited in Scotland the playing of games of cards or dice in inns or (save where the master of the family played) in private houses, and imposed penalties on excessive gaming.

We can see the motive for the first attempt by an English Parliament of hundreds of years ago to prevent gaming, not because gaming was immoral, but because it was undesirable that the man of those days should direct his attention to games or gambling instead of preparing to repel invading armies. I now quote from page 9 of the report—

> By the middle of the nineteenth century much of the gaming legislation had ceased to be applicable to the conditions of the times. The Act of 1541 made unlawful sports which three centuries later were regarded as healthy forms of recreation, while the provisions against excessive gaming were sometimes employed by common informers acting from spiteful motives.

There were pimps in those days, evidently.

> As a result of this situation, select committees to inquire into the subject were appointed in 1844 by the House of Lords and the House of Commons. The Lords committee recommended that "the law should henceforth take no cognisance whatever of wagers; that all statutes making it penal should be repealed; and that debts so contracted should be recovered by such means only as the usages and customs of society can enforce for its own protection."

That law, though repealed at Home, remains in force here.

> The House of Commons committee, of which Lord Palmerston was chairman, made several important recommendations. The committee recommended that the "old and obsolete enactments which restrained persons of any degree from playing at certain games, many of which are conducive to health as well as to amusement," should be repealed. The political motive upon which "those enactments were founded has long ceased to exist, and even if these laws were expedient when they were passed, which may well be doubted, they ought no longer to remain in force." The committee also recommended the repeal of "those laws about gaming which are of the nature of sumptuary laws, and which prescribe the pecuniary amount which private individuals may win or lose by playing at or by betting upon any game."
>
> The committee, while recommending that "Wagering in general should be free, and subject to no penalty," were "also of opinion that wagers are not matters which ought to be brought for adjudication before courts of law." They recommended that in England, as was already the case in Scotland under the Common Law, "the courts of law should be entirely relieved from the obligation of taking cognisance of claims for money won by wagers of any kind."

That conforms with our law of to-day. Next I should like to quote from page 11 of the report because it is highly interesting to observe the gradual progress of the law spread over many years—

Until about the end of the eighteenth century, when the professional bookmaker is said to have made his appearance, betting was a private matter among individuals. It was subject to the various laws relating to gaming. Thus until 1845 excessive betting was a criminal offence, and one effect of the Gaming Act, 1845, was to remove betting entirely from the operation of the criminal law, though at the same time it made all betting contracts unenforceable in the courts.

It is clear from the evidence given before the Commons Select Committee of 1844 that bookmakers were common by that time; but as no mention is made in the evidence or report of betting houses for ready-money betting, it is to be presumed that they did not exist or at least were not at all numerous. Nevertheless by 1835 betting houses had become numerous in the larger towns, and the Betting Act of that year was passed for their suppression.

Thus we find that when one evil has been stamped out, another makes its appearance.

The rapid growth of ready-money betting shops between 1845 and 1853 is usually explained by reference to the provision in the Gaming Act, 1845, which rendered gaming transactions unenforceable. This is said to have led to the practice of requiring money to be paid in advance. Another factor appears to have been certain decisions of the courts in 1845 that sweepstakes were illegal. These lotteries had had a great vogue in public houses and elsewhere. The stake was paid in cash in advance, and when sweepstakes were declared illegal, bookmakers, and no doubt former promoters of sweepstakes, developed betting businesses on the same basis.

The manner in which these betting houses were conducted was as follows:—"A list of races about to take place and the current odds against each horse were placarded, and the proprietor (who either by himself or by another conducted the business) received deposits from all sorts of persons, to abide the event of races on which they were willing and anxious to bet, and they in return for their deposits usually had a ticket handed to them which enabled them, when the race was over, to receive the money from the office if they won; and if they lost, the deposit was gone, and they had no further interest in the bet."

That applies to-day.

In moving leave to bring in a Bill for the Suppression of Betting Houses (the Betting Act, 1853) the Attorney General (Sir Alexander Cockburn) said that the evils which had arisen from the introduction of these establishments was perfectly notorious and acknowledged upon all hands. The difficulty lay in the fact that it was not desired to interfere with the description of betting which had prevailed at such places as Tattersalls, where individuals betted with each other. The object of the Bill was to suppress the opening of houses, shops, or booths, for the purpose of betting, the owner of which held himself forth to bet with all comers. It had been suggested that the more effectual course would be the licensing of these houses, but for his part he believed that would be discreditable to the Government, and would only tend to increase the mischief instead of preventing it. The Act prohibited betting houses and declared them to be common nuisances; it imposed penalties on those who kept such places and on those who advertised them; and it also provided that places suspected of being betting houses might be broken into, the persons in them arrested, and all documents found therein relating to racing or betting seized.

The Betting Act, 1853, applied to England and Ireland, but not to Scotland. Betting businesses located in Scotland, the Channel Islands, and neighbouring foreign countries, did a considerable amount of ready-money betting with persons living in England, and advertised extensively in certain English papers. Advertisements of such businesses, since they did not relate to an illegal betting house under the Act of 1853, were not illegal. In consequence of this and of a movement in Scotland for the suppression of betting houses, the Betting Act, 1874, was passed, which extended the Betting Act, 1853 to Scotland, and prohibited the advertisement in the United Kingdom of a betting business, as defined by the Act of 1853, whether situated in this country or elsewhere.

Now, of that legislation this was the result—

In the sixties and seventies of the last century there was a considerable development of street betting. The enforcement of the provisions of the Betting Act, 1853, made it impossible for a bookmaker to keep a house or shop for ready-money betting, and he went into the streets in search of business.

That is very similar to what has occurred in South Australia.

When street betting became a nuisance, local authorities took powers to deal with it. Where actual obstruction was caused, existing powers could be employed: but street betting was found to be a nuisance without causing actual obstruction. At first local authorities secured local Acts or made by-laws to the effect that persons assembling together for betting should be deemed to be obstructing the street. Later, local authorities made by-laws directly penalising the frequenting and use of streets for bookmaking or betting.

Not only did the British Parliament attempt to suppress betting, but they got the shire councils to assist, meeting, however, with very little success. I now quote from page 13 of the report—

Mainly in connection with the problem of street betting, the House of Lords in 1901, and again in 1902, appointed a select committee of which the Earl of Durham was chairman, "to inquire into the increase of public betting amongst all classes, and whether any legislative

measures are possible and expedient for checking the abuses occasioned thereby." The committee found that betting was generally prevalent in the United Kingdom and had increased considerably of late years, especially among the working classes. It was not confined to horseracing, but was also prevalent at athletic meetings and football matches. In their view the increased prevalence of betting was largely due to the greater facilities afforded by the Press (especially the publication of starting price odds) and to the inducements by means of bookmakers' circulars and tipsters' advertisements.

The committee's main conclusion was that it was impossible altogether to suppress betting, but that the best method of reducing it was to localise it as far as possible on racecourses and other places where sport was carried on. They considered various means of effecting this object. The proposal that bookmakers should be licensed was negatived on the grounds that it was not desirable to legalise betting in this manner and that the establishment of such a system would increase rather than lessen the amount of betting. The committee likewise negatived the establishment of pari-mutuel or totalisator betting on the ground that the encouragement of the gambling instinct would far outweigh any gain that might accrue.

The main recommendation made by the committee was that a general statute should be passed prohibiting betting in streets and public places, and providing heavier penalties than could be imposed under local by-laws. The committee further recommended that a bookmaker who engaged in betting transactions at a sports ground where the management did not desire betting to take place, should be liable to summary arrest and a fine.

The committee also recommended that the provisions of the Betting Act, 1853, should be extended to cover offices for credit betting by correspondence, and that betting advertisements and circulars and tipsters' advertisements should be prohibited. The committee did not, however, recommend the prohibition of the practice of publishing starting price odds.

That is what was done in England.

The Street Betting Act, 1906, gave effect to the recommendations of the select committee of 1902 set out in paragraph 46. The provisions of this Act are given in paragraphs 67 and 68.

So we find that notwithstanding the law that it has extended and that not only has betting become more prevalent on horse racing, but that it has extended also to football matches and other forms of sport. On page 103 of the same report we get the following:—

> The registration of bookmakers is of special importance in connection with bookmakers who carry on cash betting businesses, in order to ensure compliance with the law. We think, however, that all persons who carry on business as bookmakers should be registered. A comprehensive registration of each man as a condition of his practising as a bookmaker, whether on or off the course, will broaden the hold upon the bookmaker since, if he offends in any one branch of the business, he may find himself debarred from every branch of it.

[*The Deputy Speaker took the Chair.*]

They get to the point where they recommend the registration of bookmakers and finally on page 106 we have this—

> In our view the scheme outlined above allows sufficient legal facilities for off-the-course betting. The provision of organised betting facilities, other than those expressly authorised, should be prohibited. Special penalties will no doubt be necessary to enforce the prohibition of carrying on betting businesses in streets, public places, or places licensed for the sale of intoxicating liquors. These measures, taken with the system of registration proposed, should make it possible to ensure general compliance with the law.

So that in the period from 1388 to 1932 every effort was made to introduce suppressive legislation, but all failed dismally. It only aggravated the position, and it was finally recommended in the Old Land that betting on horse racing should be legalised. Analysing the reports of the various Royal Commissions and select committees that investigated the subject one might almost imagine that I had been reading from the report of some Commission that had inquired into the prevalence of betting in Western Australia. But that is not so. I have quoted from the English report and it concludes by saying that after all their efforts, nothing but corruption and immorality had resulted from the introduction of suppressive laws to which the people gave no cognisance. Before I left for South Australia to conduct my investigations I gave an interview to the "Daily News" and a member of the Government thought fit to reply. The reply was headed "South Australia's Experience." and it went on to say—

> The Government claims to be in possession of information with regard to the working of the South Australian scheme, and it shows that thousands of persons go to gambling who never bothered about it before.

I will reply to that. There is no human being in South Australia or out of it that can yet gauge whether betting, by virtue of its being legalised, has increased or decreased. Who can say to what extent illegal betting was prevalent in South Australia before it was legalised? In an interview with the South Australian board I was informed that the Act had not been long enough in existence to enable them to say

whether there had been any increase in the volume of betting. I was told definitely that there were no figures to guide them. The board had been running only 18 months and when betting was legalised in that State, betting was not permitted either on horses or anywhere else. This however, did hap pen, that on the occasion of a big race meeting held in Adelaide after betting had been legalised, there was a bigger attendance, and quite naturally too, because the novelty of bookmakers operating on the racecourse was, I suppose, an attraction. I should like to know who the man is from whom the Minister, who gave the interview to the "Daily News," got his figures which he said would show that in South Australia betting had increased enormously as a result of its being legalised. As a matter of fact, it will not be possible to say anything at all about that aspect until the end of the year. Therefore it is wrong for anyone to imagine that the legalising of betting in South Australia has increased the volume of the business when there are no facts to support the assertion. The Minister in his interview went on to say that instead of controlling betting it opened the door to it. In the first place I should like to ask where the doors are closed in Western Australia. One would really suppose it was not possible to make a bet in Western Australia and that the effect of my Bill would be to open the doors to betting as in South Australia. There were no doors closed; anyone could get a bet in any part of South Australia, in the shops and on the streets, and now I am told that the legislation would open the doors to betting. Of course there is a certain section of the community who would not bet, not because they did not want to bet, but because they had some dignity and pride and did not like to bet for fear of being caught and subsequently having to figure in the courts. I suppose the small percentage of people in South Australia who did not bet are now giving vent to their feelings by exercising the privilege that is given to them to bet openly. Before betting was legalised in South Australia it was possible to make a bet almost anywhere. It will be interesting to read the first report of the board in South Australia after betting operations have been carried on legally for about six months. I want to show just exactly what happened and I do not wish members to lose sight of the fact that the only basis on which they could work in South Australia was the figures and facts submitted by the Police Department as being known to the police. Of course we must assume that there were a lot of places in South Australia where betting was carried on and which were not known to the police. I have the first report of the Betting Control Board dated the 2nd August, 1934, and from this I should like to read one or two extracts—

A Royal Commission was appointed on 7th December, 1932, to inquire into and report on the prevalence of illegal betting, etc. The report, which is an excellent one, is comprehensive and thorough, no detail having been overlooked. Evidence submitted to that body went to show that illegal betting was rampant, that it flourished in hotels, hairdressers' shops, billiard saloons, and many other shops, private houses and places. The ramifications of the illegal business was State-wide, those known to participate numbering over 50,000. It was said that large funds were at its command, and it was known that amongst the uses to which these funds were employed were attempts to bribe the police.

It cannot be denied that thousands of youths were betting in an atmosphere which could not fail to breed a type having no respect for law, thus constituting a menace to the community. One of the most dangerous aspects in regard to illegal betting was its association with drinking, this especially so in regard to youths. Illegal betting gave birth to the "nitkeeper" and "briber," it bristled with objectionable features, and was devoid of good ones.

During the inquiry by the Royal Commission on betting, evidence was submitted by police officers regarding their respective districts as to the number of habitual bettors who were suspected of wagering with illegal bookmakers, the total being 54,036. The police officers' estimates also showed that there were 643 bookmakers operating in 426 hotels, 69 billiard saloons, 59 hairdressers and tobacconists' shops, 29 in private homes, 24 in streets, and 36 in other places.

These figures represent only the premises and places actually known to the police at which illegal betting was conducted. The estimate further points out that "nitkeepers" to the number of 590 were employed by illegal bookmakers. The board has these figures as a guide in respect of the requirements of betting premises, and as the duty was placed on its shoulders of making provision for these folk to do legally in registered premises that which they have previously done in the above-mentioned premises and places, it became a problem not materially different from providing sufficient accommodation for persons in any lawful business.

As to the provision made for betting legally, the board has registered 370 bookmakers and 60 agents—a total of 430 compared with 643 before the board's appointment. This shows a reduction of 33 per cent. In respect of premises the figures are 244 registered as against 528 knowingly used illegally prior to the passing of the Act—a reduction of 53 per cent.

So it will be seen that it has not opened the door to betting. The only reply that I could get was that on principle the legalisation of betting was opposed, but they had to admit that since the shops had been registered and regulated by law, there had been a vast improvement on what had taken place before the law was passed. The interview with the Minister went on to say—

That it has introduced thousands of persons to gambling who never bothered about it before.

No one outside the members of the board could possibly have formed that opinion with accuracy. I do not know where the information came from, or who supplied it to the party who gave the interview. The persons concerned were badly informed, and are attempting to misinform this Chamber on the subject. It is not possible for anyone to know better than the board, which in turn say that it is too early to judge. The Minister in his interview continued—

That it is killing racing as a sport, and if the drift is not stopped horse racing will become a dead letter.

When do racing clubs offer the most attractive stakes? When the revenue is declining or when it is increasing? No racing club could afford to increase the stakes if its income was declining. The seven metropolitan courses in South Australia have increased their stakes over a period of 12 months to the amount of £8,000, that is to say, during the period when the bookmakers have been legalised. From the point of view of the clubs, racing is flourishing in South Australia.

Mr. F. C. L. Smith: Do they get fees from the bookmakers?

Mr. MARSHALL: They receive a percentage, the Government get a percentage, and the bookmakers retain the balance. I wish to quote from the "Referee" a sporting paper which is very careful before it makes any comments. It is a reliable journal. That paper has something to say on the subject, after eliciting a great deal of information, and after the board had been in operation for a short period. The "Referee" contains the following:—

The effect, so far as concerns the clubs, has been profitable to date. At least it can be said that almost every club is making a profit, and increasing stakes. For the first six months admissions increased enormously, no doubt because of the novelty of the betting ring, and then the time it took to get the shops smoothly working "in town."

Last Jubilee day (last month) at Morphetville, the S.A.J.C. reported the biggest attendance for seven years. In addition, the betting shops away from the course were strongly patronised. Thus, it can be taken that the shops are not keeping people from patronising the meetings. But, of course, even when they stop away and bet in town, the clubs get a share of the turnover from their wagers. One thing the board are pleased about is that the licensing of the shops and books results in a better moral influence. In the old days there was as much betting, but no control. The State was breeding up a generation of law breakers eager to bet against the law. Putting it on a legal basis must have a good moral effect. No one under 21 is allowed to bet. There have been prosecutions for this line of the code, but a number were due to understandable misapprehensions about the age of the bettor.

Undoubtedly the clubs in South Australia are flourishing, compared with the state of poverty and struggle of years gone by. That is a sufficient reply to the statement. I have here some information I would like to give to members to show the enormous amount of betting that takes place. Western Australia compares with South Australia. The population is about the same, and the people in this State like to indulge in a little risk just as do the people in South Australia. This information is contained on page 2 of the report—

Bets laid—			
Local:			
On course	..	1,421,665	
Premises	..	5,763,757	
			7,185,422
Interstate:			
On course	..	242,188	
Premises	..	7,680,103	
			7,922,291
Total number of bets laid	..		15,107,713

This total approximates a monthly average of 1,259,000 bets laid. The number of bets laid on local races is approximately 47.56 per cent. of the total. The number of bets laid on interstate races is approximately 52.44 per cent. of the total. 19.79 per cent. of the bets laid on local races is laid on the course; 80.21 per cent. of the bets laid on local courses is laid in premises; 3.06 per cent. of the bets laid on interstate races is laid on the course; 96.94 per cent. of the bets laid on interstate races is laid in premises.

A comparison of these percentages with those prepared as at the end of last July shows that the betting on the course on local races has decreased by 4.42 per cent., and the betting in premises has increased by that percentage, whilst the betting on the course and in premises on interstate meetings is practically unaltered—there being an increase in bets laid in premises of only .11 per cent. and a like decrease in the course betting.

Many people imagined that there would be a rush from the racecourses to the S.P.

shops if they were legalised. For a considerable time the board of South Australia could not cope with the situation. In consequence, many people who had used S.P. shops went to the racecourses because they could bet there. It was anticipated they would drift back to the avenues they had employed originally, when the premises became suitable and convenient. Again, people have argued that if betting were legalised there would be betting beyond the means of the persons concerned. On this point I would like to quote from page 3 of the report, which gives the actual value of the bets and the numbers of bets made.

Taking the number of bets laid as a whole, it is seen that out of the total of 15,107,713 bets laid, 1,663,853 were laid on the course and 13,443,860 were laid in registered betting premises. The respective percentages of these are —11.01 per cent. of all bets are laid on the course; 88.99 per cent. of all bets are laid in registered premises. The average amount of each bet, taking the number of bets and the turnover as a whole, was 4s. 7d. The average bet on local races on the course was 11s 6d., in premises 3s. 8d.; interstate races on the course 8s. and in premises 3s. 11d. The bets laid were made up as follows:—Bets 10s. and under, 14,321,421, equal to 94.79 per cent.; bets over 10s., 786,292, equal to 5.21 per cent. The estimated revenue received by the Treasury for betting tickets is £67,223 7s., to which must be added the charge for printing of 5s. per thousand. This sum is approximately £3,777, so that the amount received by the Government from the sale of tickets and the printing of same is £71,000 7s. This estimate is based on the assumption that all tickets used in December for bets of 10s. and under were those bearing a half-penny tax. This amount added to that of £46,238 1s 7d. received by the Treasury for turnover tax, shows that the Government received approximately £117,238 8s. 7d. from the operations of bookmakers for the period. This figure represents 3.38 per cent on turnover. Results to bookmakers (collectively)—

Results to Bookmakers (collectively)—	£ s. d.	£ s. d.
Total turnover		3,469,775 12 3
Winnings paid to betors	3,123,967 17 0	
Two per cent turnover commission ...	69,402 9 6	
Ticket Tax, etc. ...	71,000 7 0	
		3,264,370 13 6
Total		£205,404 18 9

This gain to bookmakers is equal to 5.92 per cent on turnover. The estimated total amount paid by bookmakers for taxation (*i.e.*, turnover and ticket tax) was £140,402 16s. 6d. This sum has been distributed as follows:—Treasury, £117,238 8s. 7d.; racing clubs, £21,447 18s 5d.; retained by board, £1,716 9s. 6d.; total, £140,402 16s 6d. On a percentage basis this means the Treasury received 83.50 per cent., racing clubs 15.28 per cent., and the board retained 1.22 per cent.

Members will thus see what has happened in South Australia, the Government of which State are altogether too greedy. The figures show that, even with legalised premises, people are not betting beyond their means. If we take the number of large bettors who wager on big commissions, we can see that the small man must bet in remarkably small terms. The Bill I have submitted follows the South Australian Act with regard to the creation of a board. It provides for a board in the same way as does the South Australian measure. It sets out that the metropolitan racing clubs, including the trotting association, can be represented by one person, and the country clubs can be represented by another. The Government make one appointment, and the Commissioner of Police constitutes another. In South Australia the Commissioner of Police acts on the board. His opinion of the South Australian Act is very eulogistic. He would not think of reverting to the old system. I do not want to say there is any corruption in this State so far as the police are concerned, as things are to-day. It would be unfair to say such a thing and I do not think I could prove it. Members will admit, however, that, as things are to-day, the temptation prevails. It may be said that if betting is legalised, as it is in South Australia and Tasmania, there is no temptation, and that any possibility of anything being corrupt or wrong would be obviated by legalising S.P. betting as we know it to-day. The Bill in that regard gives the board power along the lines I have outlined. The functions of the board are comprehensive in the extreme. They can register premises that they think suitable. Naturally they must take into consideration certain requirements such as the suitability of premises and so forth. They can license bookmakers, each with one agent and a clerk. Members have seen what has happened in South Australia with reference to the activities of the board, and the board proposed in the Bill will be along similar lines. The board will have power to regulate and control and also to prevent advertising. In South Australia they attempted to get the leading newspapers to assist them by not advertising or publishing full particulars regarding training operations daily. That included also the columns of information about horses and horseracing that were placed daily before the public. There is

no doubt that that particular form of advertising encouraged people to take an interest in racing who otherwise would not have bothered about it. Then again there is advertising by broadcasting. The establishment of wireless has increased materially the opportunity presented to people to develop a liking for betting on horse-racing. That has been amply demonstrated in South Australia. Formerly wireless was used in betting premises, but immediately the board attempted to eradicate that objectionable feature, another arose inasmuch as people would go to the shops to bet and then retire to hotels where they could listen to a broadcast of the race in running. Thus, instead of separating the two evils, if I may refer to them as such, the action of the board tended to bring them together. The result was that streets became congested and the people took exception to the conditions that followed. Consequently the board agreed to allow registered premises to possess wireless, and that overcame the difficulty in that regard. Because of the South Australian experience, I have not included a similar provision in the Bill. In South Australia formerly no betting was allowed on the racecourse or off it, so in legalising betting in this State I have included operations both on and off the course. Although the Bill contains a provision to that effect, it must be understood that no interference is suggested with the control or jurisdiction of the race clubs, any more than bookmakers may become registered by any particular club or by the W.A.T.C. There will be no interference with them so long as they conform to the law and to the requirements of the board. The bookmaker must furnish returns to the board within a week after a betting day either on or off the course. He has to comply with the law in every way. The Bill also provides that the members of the board can enter upon any course or premises of the club controlling the course. That is essential so that the board members may control betting operations properly. The Bill does not interfere with the operations of clubs. In South Australia there is one club only that stands out. I refer to the Adelaide Jockey Club. Members of that body do not criticise the South Australian board to any extent, but they seem to be sulking because they did not secure full control over bookmakers and betting in general. The club wanted to attain the position in South Australia that the W.A.T.C. has in Western Australia. There is a clause in the Bill empowering a club, should they desire to register their premises, to do so, and they can have as many men operating on the club premises as they deem fit or wise. Thus Tattersalls Club will not be interfered with in any way. I, as a private member, cannot introduce a Bill that will impose taxation, and, in the circumstances, I have not been able to do what has been done in South Australia. Nevertheless the Bill does make it possible for the Government, if they so desire, to require bookmakers to comply with the Stamp Act. The Government may impose that form of taxation if they so desire, but the Bill itself does not include any tax at all. All it suggests is that a fee shall be paid by those who are registered, and the fees from that source will represent all the money with which the board is to be financed and operated. In South Australia the board operated at a very small cost, and I think it amounted to £1,726 last year. If the receipts should prove more than adequate for all expenses, the board will have power to reduce fees or to make a pro rata repayment to those who have been licensed. On the other hand, should the returns prove inadequate, power is reserved to enable the board to charge a slightly higher fee. Apart from that, no suggestion of a tax is embodied in the Bill. All bookmakers will be required to furnish weekly returns to the board, without which the board could not check their operations and control betting, nor would they be able to supply any statistics that would be a guide to the Government if the latter desired to impose some form of taxation. The board are required to keep accounts regarding registered premises and registered persons, and will be required to submit audited accounts to the Government every year. A bookmaker registered or licensed under the measure cannot operate unless he uses tickets as prescribed by the board, and which, no doubt, will be taken from the Stamp Office, as is the practice today. Fairly heavy penalties are provided for breaches of the legislation. There are two great features of the Bill. In the first place, under no circumstances will any individual under the age of 21 years be admitted to

betting premises. If he is found on such premises, the bookmaker concerned becomes liable to a penalty, unless he can justify the youth's presence. The second great point is that no one with any sign of liquor on him will be allowed to make a bet. Should a bookmaker be caught in the act of making a bet with anyone showing any signs of liquor, he will be liable to a very heavy penalty, and may lose his license as well. They are the two great points that induce me to ask the House to agree to a Bill to register bookmakers. It is awful to contemplate what is happening in the State to-day. Under existing conditions a man rushes into a shop to make a bet and rushes out straightaway for fear that the police should raid the premises. Then he goes to an hotel and listens to the description of the race in running. While there he probably has a few drinks and becomes semi-normal, finally returning to the premises to register other bets. We know the bad language that is heard about these premises to-day, the congestion in the streets, and the unseemly conduct that goes on. That will not be possible if the Bill be agreed to. No one who is under the influence of drink will be able to bet at all. In those circumstances, he cannot go round causing trouble, because he will not be allowed on licensed premises. The Bill provides for the cancellation of bookmakers' licenses should they be guilty of a breach of its provisions. As in South Australia, the Bill seeks to prevent advertising by men who hawk tips and information of that description. The measure will also prevent advertisements such as we often see when bookmakers advertise great blocks of figures showing concession doubles, and so forth. That sort of thing has been prohibited in South Australia too.

Mr. J. H. Smith: But that is illegal to-day.

Mr. MARSHALL: Nevertheless it is prevalent. There are three factors that have caused many people to become interested in racing to-day. If members look at the "West Australian" each morning they will find that practically one page is devoted to information regarding horseracing.

Mr. Moloney: They give the people what they want.

Mr. MARSHALL: I suppose so, but the three great factors that have encouraged interest in horseracing and betting are the advertisements and news in newspapers, telephones and broadcasting.

Mr. J. H. Smith: "The Worker" newspaper is full of these advertisements.

Mr. MARSHALL: I do not doubt of that. If the Bill be agreed to, those advertisements will not be allowed. No individual will be allowed to sell information or advice for a fee. Already that is an offence under the Police Act. Another provision in the Bill empowers members of the police force to deal with breaches of the Act and they may seize documents or other evidence necessary to secure convictions. The board has access to all premises and racecourses. That, as I pointed out before, is necessary if their control over betting is to be efficient. They are about all the main points in the Bill. I sincerely hope that if the measure becomes law and the bookmakers are legalised, the Government will not contemplate doing what was done in South Australia, where the bookmakers have not been given any chance at all, for even under their rates of taxation the authorities took £117,000 from them last year. Members have all the information necessary for the support of the measure from a general standpoint, and in Committee I shall be able to furnish them with all facts and figures and advance arguments for each clause in the Bill. In conclusion I may say I have been obliged to introduce the measure because, as the position is to-day, there is no person of normal mind who can look upon betting without seeing that there are a great many objectionable features in the practice of illegal betting. Under the Bill the premises will be wholesome and the conduct of the person making the bet will be properly regulated and controlled. So to a large degree everybody interested will be able to have what little pleasure they may find in betting, and in consequence a much better state of affairs will prevail. I am satisfied that the most drastic legislation will not catch the bookmaker, but will catch merely his agent, and so we would have, as in South Australia, an army of young people eager to flout the law. I advise the Government to see that our school children are furnished with the necessary information before they leave school, so as to be warned against the evils of the environment instead of allowing them to become victims of that environment and then seeking to remedy the position by drastic laws. I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

MR. J. H. SMITH (Nelson) [9.18]: I move—

That the debate be adjourned.

Motion put and negatived.

Question (that the Bill be read a second time) put and negatived; Bill defeated.

BILL—RURAL RELIEF FUND.

Council's Message.

Message from the Council received and read notifying that it did not insist on its amendment No. 1, disagreed to by the Assembly.

BILL—TRAFFIC ACT AMENDMENT.

Council's Message.

Message from the Council received and read notifying that it had agreed to the further amendment made by the Assembly to the Council's amendment No. 5, and that it insisted on its amendments Nos. 2 and 3, to which the Assembly had disagreed.

PAPERS—CROWN LAND OCCUPATION.

Prosecutions at Reedys.

Debate resumed from the 16th October on the following motion moved by Mr. Marshall (Murchison):—

That all files, papers, documents, etc., appertaining to the prosecution of twenty-nine residents of Reedys, in the month of March last, for unauthorised occupation of Crown lands, be laid upon the Table of the House.

THE MINISTER FOR LANDS (Hon. M. F. Troy—Mt. Magnet) [9.20]: In connection with the survey of residential allotments at Reedys, my administration of the Lands Department has been criticised by the member for Murchison. I propose briefly to discuss the facts, because not only was the criticism unjustified, but there is entirely no foundation for any of the statements made by Mr. Marshall. First of all I propose to discuss his statement that "in a place like Reedys, the Minister for Lands and the Minister for Mines had failed to make the necessary provision for residents." He stated that "the Mines Department or the Lands Department should have had the foresight to have lots surveyed for residents, but nothing of the kind was done." The Lands Department was accused of "surveying only business blocks and forgetting all about residential blocks until the department had dealt with what is known as the business area." He also said "I think I can justly accuse the Lands Department of being more desirous of surveying the business blocks so that they might make huge profits out of them, than they were desirous of studying the convenience of the people." And in the next breath he stated, "I do not think the Lands Department was obliged to take the initiative in providing residential blocks. It was more a job for the Mines Department." If that is his opinion, why did he drag the administration of the Lands Department into the subject at all; and further, why did he not acquaint himself with the facts before attacking the administration in this Chamber? It is not the responsibility of the Minister for Lands to foresee the development in every portion of the State in order to make provision for townsite and residential areas. The Minister frequently does not possess the knowledge of these developments unless representations are made to him personally. If he is to be personally responsible for every function of the department then ministerial office would be absolutely impossible, and no one but a superman could administer in such circumstances. When a survey of a township is desired representations are made to the Under Secretary for Lands and the matter is passed on to the Surveyor General for inquiry and report. The Minister may not hear anything about the matter until long after the representation has been made. Adopting this procedure, the secretary of the Cue Road Board communicated with the Under Secretary for Lands on the 21st October, 1933, asking that an officer be sent up to survey a townsite for the Reedys mine. The Surveyor General reported that he understood from the Mines Department it was too early to do anything in the way of laying out a township, and recommended that no action be taken. The Cue Road Board repeated its application on the 17th November, 1933, and the Surveyor General wrote the chief draftsman of the Mines Department as follows:—"Have you any information in your office to enable me to deal with this application?" The chief draftsman of the Mines Department replied on the 30th November, "that up to the present there had been only one

application for a business area and that the matter was really one for the warden to advise the department whether a section or two of business and residential lots were necessary." On the same date the Surveyor General suggested to the Under Secretary for Lands that the warden be asked to advise as to the necessity for a townsite as early as possible, stating that if there were a number of people in the vicinity something would be necessary to ensure an orderly arrangment of habitation, and that could only be effected by the survey of town lots. He further stated that if there were likely to be any delay in getting the warden's report he could despatch Mr. Minchin, a contract surveyor of Geraldton to inspect and advise. The warden was immediately communicated with, and he replied on the 8th December, 1933, recommending the survey of a townsite. In the meantime a deputation comprising Messrs. Vail, Mathers, and Gilbert, waited upon me on the 8th December, 1933, and asked for a survey of a townsite, but more particularly the making available of a reservation of 50 acres on which the company proposed to erect buildings to house the workers. The company proposed to make no profit out of the leasing of the buildings, their purpose being to provide accommodation for the workers whom they employed. I immediately agreed to this request, and instructed the Under Secretary for Lands to expedite the matter and have the area surveyed as soon as possible. The Surveyor General forthwith wired Surveyor Minchin asking him to proceed to Reedys immediately to lay out the townsite. In granting the company's request for 50 acres, with which to provide accommodation for the workers employed on the mine, provision was made by the department to meet the needs of the workers, and this was done before the survey of the townsite was decided upon. If the file is desired it will show that the matter was expedited. The Mines Department was asked for the country necessary for townsite purposes and their consent was secured. A surveyor was despatched to Reedys and the warden notified on the 14th December, 1933, that approval had been given for the laying out of a townsite. If the townsite was surveyed before the residential blocks, it was because the Surveyor General took it that the warden regarded the survey of the townsite as urgent. He knew also of the company's request for 50 acres to provide accommodation for the workers employed on the mine. So far as the Lands Department were concerned, ample provision had been made at Reedys for all requirements. On the 15th December Surveyor Minchin was instructed to carry out the work. Surveyor Minchin was a contract surveyor and did not linger on the job more than was necessary. He commenced the work early in January and completed the survey on the 13th February, 1934. So the warden recommended it in December and the survey was completed on the 13th February—six weeks, which was not very long. In addition, the 50 acres had been surveyed for the company on which to erect houses for their employees. It is true that when the townsite was surveyed, most of the lots were business allotments, but no request whatever had been made for lots for residential purposes, excepting the request for 50 acres by the mining company, which was promptly agreed to. At the same time, in the township, provision was made for parks, recreation ground, public buildings, school site and sanitary site. On the 19th March the warden notified the Under Secretary for Lands that inquiries were being made for residential allotments, and the Under Secretary on the 27th of that month, approved of 24 lots being made available for residential purposes. Those blocks were sold on the 21st April. They were sold a month before the prosecutions took place. I admit that the member for Murchison did take exception to the price. The price fixed per lot was £25. On the 15th May the hon. member wrote me personally asking that the value of the upset prices be reduced. He pointed out the inability of the miners and workers to pay the prices fixed. I did not hear the hon. member's speech but I read it in "Hansard." He accused me of apathy. My apathy was such that when he wrote to me on the 15th May complaining of the price of the blocks, I replied to him on the same day and informed him that the price had been reviewed and had been reduced 50 per cent. If giving a man a satisfactory reply on the day he makes a request is apathy, what is expedition?

Mr. Marshall: I will answer that very quickly. I will show you where your apathy came in. You might misrepresent it now, but I will show you.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: The hon. member need not get excited.

Mr. Marshall: Well, do not misrepresent the case.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I must ask the hon. member to keep order.

Mr. Marshall: Well, I do not like to be misrepresented.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: The hon. member suggests that I misrepresented him.

Mr. Marshall: Very much so, too.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: He wrote me on the 15th May from Parliament House asking for a review of the land values. On the very same day I replied and told him I would reduce them 50 per cent.

Mr. Marshall: That is not where I said you were apathetic. It was when I was reading the letter.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: I will come to that, and the hon. member will find he has not much of a case there, either.

Mr. Marshall: You are putting up a splendid case!

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: I am not going to attack the hon. member.

Mr. Marshall: You are not going to misrepresent me.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: I will not misrepresent the hon. member in any way.

Mr. Marshall: You did so there.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: I intend to give day and date. The hon. member had no need to drag me into this discussion at all. If he had seen me personally, he would have received a hearing and been given the facts.

Mr. Marshall: I was not down here for five months.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: The hon. member could have written me.

Mr. Marshall: I did.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: Or he could have telephoned me. He has always received courtesy from me and his requests have always been given attention. He will find himself entirely mistaken in this instance. I am prepared to let the House judge. There is no need for him to get angry. I do not propose to be provocative at all. Let us discuss the matter on its merits.

Hon. C. G. Latham: That is something unusual, too.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: On the very same day that the hon. member wrote to me and I replied to him, I instructed the Under Secretary to reduce the values of the residential lots by 50 per cent.

Mr. Marshall: You did not appear in this case and I did not expect you to, either.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: There is no reason why my name should have been dragged into it at all. The hon. member stated that the department had placed high prices on the blocks in order to exploit the workers. The Under Secretary did not know that the lots were for residential purposes; he regarded them as business sites. The department do not make huge profits out of such blocks. In one instance the department surveyed an area of residential blocks, and the payments to be received for two years would not cover the cost of the survey. The department expect to make a little out of business areas, but not out of residential areas. Even if a worker at Reedys or elsewhere had purchased a block at the auction sale, the purchaser had the option of paying the capital value or taking the block on leasehold conditions. If the upset price were £25, which the hon. member regarded as excessive, the purchaser would be asked to pay only £1 per annum under leasehold. When the price was reduced to £12 10s., he would have to pay a rental of only 10s. per annum. I assure the House that the department have not been recouped for the cost of some of the surveys made. One instance particularly was at Norseman where residential blocks were surveyed and the department will not be recouped for the survey costs for two or three years. Hence the department are not making huge profits out of the surveys. I wish to assure the House that never at any time was I aware of the prosecution of persons for squatting on Crown lands until the prosecutions had taken place. The Minister for Agriculture and the member for Kimberley are aware of that, I think, for both of them made some inquiries regarding the prosecutions. Further, I was not acquainted, even by the member for Murchison himself——

Mr. Marshall: You are not interested. I do not accept you as being in the matter at all.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: I was in the discussion, and so I propose to make my

position clear, especially as I have read in the Press that the Minister for Mines sent me a certain letter and that I treated the letter with indifference. The letter which the member for Murchison assumes the Minister for Mines sent me was a letter that Minister passed on to me, dealing with prosecutions.

Mr. Marshall: I naturally assumed that.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: I am sure that on the Murchison, at all events, the statement that I treated the letter with indifference got abroad; and so, as far as possible, I must catch it up. I assure the House that I was not aware of the prosecutions, and that they were never brought to my notice, either by the member for Murchison himself or by the persons concerned. On looking through the file, however, I find that on the 3rd August of last year, 1934, the acting Superintendent of the Triton Gold Mines wrote to the Under Secretary for Lands complaining that a number of people were squatting on Crown lands east of his company's workings, and he stated it appeared to him that the necessary sanitary operations were not being observed. Further, as the occupation of those Crown lands under existing conditions might be the cause of disease during the summer months, he suggested that the department take the necessary steps to compel the people to erect premises at Reedy's townsite, where residential blocks were available. I want the House to bear in mind that the residential areas were made available in June of 1934 at an upset price of £12 10s. each, or an annual lease rent of 10s. That letter was written not to me but to the Under Secretary for Lands, and never came under my notice. Hon. members are aware that letters written to an Under Secretary may not come under the notice of the Minister, not being sent to him. The Under Secretary notified the acting superintendent of the Triton Gold Mines that it was not a matter for the Lands Department at all, but a matter for the Mines Department. I find a further reference on the file from the mining registrar at Cue to the Under Secretary for Lands that a number of persons occupying Crown lands at Reedy's had been given notice to remove, and that it appeared that approximately 20 or 30 residential blocks would be required. On the Mines Department file I find a minute addressed to me by the Minister for Mines on the 27th August, 1934, stating that it had been brought under his notice by the Cue Road Board, and also by representatives of the Triton Gold Mines, that there were considerable numbers of people squatting on Crown lands in close proximity to the mines, and that the board had complained that those people were not in a satisfactory position to be properly catered for from a sanitary point of view, and it was feared that during the summer months disease might become prevalent. Mr. Munsie thought that the Lands Department had power to prevent people from squatting on Crown lands when there were residential lease areas available. The Under Secretary for Lands reported that the squatting in question was on the mining leases, and that the matter was one for the Mines Department to deal with. I minuted the file on the 31st August informing the Minister for Mines that the matter was one for his department to deal with. On the 28th November, 1934, the member for Murchison wrote to me enclosing a letter from Mr. W. J. Forslun, of Reedy's, suggesting that a simpler and cheaper method should be adopted for the supply of residential lots to prospective settlers in mining areas. I was at that date attending a conference at Canberra; but the Under Secretary for Lands acknowledged the letter in my absence, and in December a further 55 residential lots were auctioned at Reedy's. The member for Murchison was notified of the sale, and also was notified that the blocks would be available under leasehold conditions. The purchasers were entitled to a 99-years lease at a rental of 10s. per annum, the leases being reappraised every ten years. A provision was inserted in the leases that buildings must be erected within six months. This provision was inserted in order to meet the complaints of dummying made by the member for Murchison. There was also a provision that buildings must be erected within six months, because on the goldfields people have taken up these blocks and held them for some other person to purchase. The building clause provides against that. The member for Murchison quoted a long letter which he wrote on the 17th March last, and in which he requested the Minister for Mines to withdraw the action taken against 29 residents at Reedy's under the Mining Act for unauthorised occupation. Hon members who were present during the discussion here,

will remember the contents of the letter. It is printed in "Hansard," and so I have been able to read it there; but what I deem I am entitled to take exception to is the inference that Mr. Marshall wrote me on the same subject at the same time, for he stated that when he wrote to the Minister for Mines asking him to withdraw the prosecutions, he also wrote to me. It is true the hon. member wrote me a letter on the 17th March, but it was on an entirely different subject. In the course of his letter to me he did make a brief mention of the fact that the Government had started to take action against all those persons, both married and single, blind and aged, who were in unauthorised occupation of Crown lands; but his letter was an application for a camping area. He recklessly assumes from a letter he received from the Minister for Mines that that Minister had passed the letter written by Mr. Marshall on to me, and, to use Mr. Marshall's own words, "I treated it with utter indifference." I need hardly say that Mr. Munsie did not pass Mr. Marshall's letter on to me, and that I had never seen the letter until I read it in "Hansard" last week. Hon. members who were here during the discussion will remember the contents well. Other hon. members can read the letter in "Hansard," where it is printed. What I am entitled to take exception to is the inference that Mr. Marshall wrote me on the same subject.

Mr. Marshall: Nothing of the kind. You were not implicated in the matter at all.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: It may not have been the hon. member's intention, but if he will read "Hansard" he will find that suggestion. I do not say that such was his intention, but that is the inference from the "Hansard" report.

Mr. Marshall: No, it is not.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: It is true that the member for Murchison wrote me on the same day, the 17th March, as he wrote to the Minister for Mines. But he wrote me on an entirely different subject—the necessity for camping areas. He has assumed to-night, quite recklessly, that the letter he wrote to the Minister for Mines was passed on to me by that Minister. That is the letter the hon. member accused me of treating with utter indifference. That letter asking for a camping area was not treated with indifference.

Mr. Marshall: Don't mix the thing up like that!

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: The hon. member wrote to me, from Meekatharra on the 17th March, asking for a camping area at Reedys. I replied to him on the 23rd March. On the 22nd March the camping ground at Reedys was approved by Executive Council—five days after the hon. member made application to me.

Mr. Marshall: That is ridiculous.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: If the hon. member will read the speech, he will find that he accused me of apathy and indifference.

Mr. Marshall: Oh no!

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: The hon. member was treated not with indifference but with courtesy and consideration. What happened was this: The hon. member considered he had a good case but his premises were wrong. He has been labouring under the impression all along that the letter he wrote to the Minister for Mines regarding the prosecutions had been passed on to me by the Minister.

Mr. Marshall: No.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: Then the matter is more serious than ever. What is his accusation?

Mr. Marshall: Nothing against you.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: Very well. Of course, there is nothing against me.

Mr. Marshall: I won't hesitate to tell you, old boy, where I got it.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: Then I must be acquitted of blame in this instance. Of course, there is nothing against me. The hon. member got every consideration from me.

Mr. Marshall: You are putting up a very bad case all the same. You are drawing red herrings across the trail.

Hon. C. G. Latham: That is nothing new.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: Every communication that the hon. member addressed to me was promptly attended to, except when I was at Canberra.

Mr. Marshall: Quite right.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: He wrote complaining about the capital value placed upon blocks and on the very day I received his communication I replied assuring him that the values would be reduced, and that very day I instructed that they were to be reduced. He wrote again asking that a camping area should be provided.

He dated his letter from Meekatharra, and five days later the camping area was gazetted and he was informed accordingly. I regard that as very great expedition on the part of the Lands Department. If every hon. member receives such consideration as the member for Murchison did, others who follow me will have something to live up to. I was asked to read the speech delivered by the member for Murchison in the House. I did not know he had made statements about myself, and I assure the House that I did not know of the prosecutions until they had taken place. No member asked me for a withdrawal of those prosecutions. I have not seen any such letter from the hon. member. Where he made his mistake was that he based his case on unsound premises that were quite wrong. He assumed that the Minister for Mines had passed his complaint on to me and that I had treated it with indifference. That cannot possibly be so because no such complaint ever reached me. That is all I need say. The Lands Department met every request in the promptest possible way, and was not in any sense responsible for the prosecutions.

MR. MARSHALL (Murchison—in reply) [9.54]: Of all the red herrings ever drawn across the trail during the 15 years I have been a member, I have never before known of so many as have been drawn by the Minister this evening. As a matter of fact, I do not know really what is wrong between the Minister for Mines and the Minister for Lands, but I imagine that between the two they hope to mislead the Chamber some way, some how.

Hon. C. G. Latham: Perfectly right.

Mr. MARSHALL: As a matter of fact, everything uttered by the Minister for Lands to-night has been a mere attempt to decoy members along the wrong road. He did not touch upon the vital matters concerned in my complaint. I tell the Minister for Lands that I was in the court on the day of the prosecution, and saw the source of the authority from which the proceedings had sprung. Later I made a statement in the Chamber and it appears to me that if the Minister for Lands had been genuine, he would have read the report of my speech in "Hansard" before he made his statement to-night. Had he done so, he would have seen that I made the position quite explicit, and he would have known that his department received no severe criticism from me regarding the prosecutions. I regarded the valuation placed upon the blocks as too high, and also said that the procedure adopted with reference to the sale of blocks was cumbersome and obsolete. He would have seen that as Minister for Lands he did not come into the picture at all. It would appear that he has deliberately attempted to mislead the Chamber into thinking that I accused him of being responsible for the prosecutions at Reedys. That was absolutely wrong. Let me read a letter I received from the Minister for Mines in reply to a letter I had sent him on the 17th March asking for a withdrawal of the prosecutions. In his letter, dated the 26th March, the Minister for Mines said—

> In reply to your letter of the 17th inst., relative to prosecutions at Cue against persons in unauthorised possession of Crown lands at Reedys, I understand that you addressed a letter to the Hon. Minister for Lands at the same time you wrote to me, and the Hon. Mr. Troy has now replied to you and explained the position in full.

That is in reply to my letter asking for a withdrawal of the prosecutions.

The Minister for Lands: Yes, but that is the Minister for Mines' letter, not mine.

Mr. MARSHALL: Why did you attempt to mislead the Chamber?

Personal Explanation.

The Minister for Lands: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I desire to make a personal explanation. The letter read by the member for Murchison would make it appear that the Minister for Mines had forwarded the communication to me, and that I had knowledge that the prosecutions had taken place. Really what took place can best be shown by the files, and I shall place the files on the Table so that members may know that no mistake has been made. I find that the Under Secretary for Mines spoke to the Under Secretary for Lands about this matter and apparently the Under Secretary for Mines told his Minister that I had written to Mr. Marshall about the prosecutions, although Mr. Marshall communicated with me about a different subject altogether.

Hon. C. G. Latham: Is this in order?

The Minister for Lands: Do you not want the truth?

Hon. C. G. Latham: Yes, but there is a proper way of getting the truth.

The Minister for Lands: Apparently the Under Secretary for Mines told the Minister for Mines that I had written but my

letter was about an entirely different subject. In point of fact, the member for Murchison's letter regarding the prosecutions did not come to me at all. The letter the hon. member has quoted from the Minister for Mines makes it appear that I was to reply to the hon. member's complaint, but my reply to him had reference to the camping reserve only. It will be seen that Mr. Munsie was misled. However, I shall place the Lands Department files on the Table to show that I am telling the truth about the matter.

Debate Resumed.

Mr. MARSHALL: I am not concerned about the Minister for Lands at all. All he says may have happened, but I will not allow him to come here and attempt to misrepresent me. I had no misgivings regarding the Minister for Mines replying to me. I want to know which of the two Ministers is attempting to evade his responsibility.

The Minister for Lands: I have told you the facts.

Mr. MARSHALL: Very well, that ends the matter. I suppose I should not get annoyed with the Minister for Lands, but my annoyance was caused because it appears to me that he and the Minister for Mines intend to shift the responsibility from one to the other until finally the matter dies out.

The Minister for Lands: That is not so.

[*The Speaker resumed the Chair.*]

Mr. MARSHALL: The Minister for Mines informed me that he could do nothing until he had seen his colleague, the Minister for Lands. I told him deliberately, as will be seen from the "Hansard" report, that I did not accuse the Minister for Lands of being in the picture at all.

The Minister for Lands: Why did you say I had treated the matter with indifference?

Mr. MARSHALL: Actually what happened was that I wrote those letters. The letter to the Minister for Mines was replied to by him telling me that the Minister for Lands had given me a reply to my application for a withdrawal of the prosecution. He informed me that the Minister for Lands would write to me in detail. When I read those letters to the House, including the reply of the Minister for Mines, I remarked that naturally it had nothing to do with the Minister for Lands. I did not accuse the Minister for Lands of being apathetic towards my application or the withdrawal of the prosecution. I did nothing of the kind.

The Minister for Lands: But it is in "Hansard."

Mr. MARSHALL: I read first my own letter to the Minister for Mines and the Minister's reply, and then I read the reply of the Minister for Lands to me. It was then I proffered the remark that, naturally, the Minister for Lands treated the application for the withdrawal of the prosecution with apathy, because he had nothing whatever to do with it, it being a matter for the Mines Department. But the Minister for Mines would not take the responsibility, declaring that it was a matter for the Lands Department and that he could not reply, Mines Department. But the Minister for Lands about it. I told him he had to take the responsibility, but he said no, he wanted first to see the Minister for Lands. I am entitled to ask, why this shuffling? It is true, as the Minister for Lands said tonight, that the sale on the reduced price list took place two days after the prosecution. That was the second sale at the reduced prices. On the 14th March the prosecutions took place, on the 16th March the land was being sold for the second time and on the 17th March I wrote my letter to the Minister for Mines; because the magistrate had agreed to reserve his decision until I had written the letter. In order to expedite this debate, I will tell the Minister for Lands the rest of that part of the story when discussing his Estimates. Although the Minister for Lands mentioned the action of the road board, he must admit that at the finish the road board wiped their hands clear of the matter

The Minister for Lands: I do not know the facts of it.

Mr. MARSHALL: Then the Minister had no right to mention it. The Minister admitted that on two occasions the board wrote to the Lands Department and the reply to the board was that it was too early, that there was no settlement yet. Then on the second occasion the request was referred to the Surveyor General and then to the warden for information, and finally it was decided to survey a business area.

The Minister for Lands: It was for residential purposes.

Mr. MARSHALL: If the Minister is not under a misapprehension, how can he be-

lieve that the road board at Cue was writing down for the purpose of surveying blocks for settlement? Why should they write to the Minister after the 50 acres he had granted and which were sufficient? What were writing for?

The Minister for Lands: For the townsite.

Mr. MARSHALL: Very well, if so, they took no part in the prosecution.

The Minister for Lands: I know nothing about that.

Mr. MARSHALL: The case the Minister put up this evening was purely one of defence and now I am replying. If the Minister does not know, he should not have attempted to use anything he was not familiar with.

The Minister for Lands: I told the facts as they appear on the departmental files.

Mr. MARSHALL: But you must stand up to what you quoted here to-night. Everyone can see how much time was lost in the refusal given to the road board. The road board then wiped their hands clean of it and said if you do not survey blocks in time for settlement to take place, we will not have anything to do with prosecuting people for being improperly on Crown lands. When I wrote on the 17th March asking for the withdrawal of those prosecutions, I tacked on to the letter a cutting from the local newspaper giving a reply to letters I had written in regard to the possibility of the prosecutions, and wherein the road board said that they would have nothing to do with it. I made mention of it in my letter, to show that the road board were finished with it. The truth came out to-night. In "Hansard" it will be seen that I made reference to the activities of the mine manager, whose great desire was to shift the two small boarding houses so as to get the business down into the mine mess. Everybody knew that the mine manager fired the final shot. So what they said at Reedys is true, namely that the Minister for Mines fell for the mine manager and took up the cudgels on behalf of the manager. My God! this Government are becoming terribly flexible in the hands of mine managers. The mine manager succeeded with his final shot, so the application went to the Minister for Mines and then went on to the Minister for Lands.

The Minister for Lands: We told them it was not our business.

Mr. MARSHALL: But the Minister has told the Chamber that the mine manager wrote and asked for the removal of those people from Crown lands because of the neglect of sanitary conveniences. The Minister for Lands passed it on to the Minister for Mines.

The Minister for Lands: I told the Under Secretary to tell him it was not our business.

Mr. MARSHALL: The Minister said he wrote back to the mine manager pointing out that it was a matter, not for his department, but for the Mines Department, and that his letter had been sent on.

The Minister for Lands: I did not write to the mine manager.

Mr. MARSHALL: The Minister said that the mine manager wrote to him.

The Minister for Lands: The mine manager wrote to the Under Secretary for Lands.

Mr. MARSHALL: I am not doubting that. That will do. I am not trying to drag the Minister in. I want to ascertain why those prosecutions were proceeded with.

The Minister for Lands: You have dragged me in.

Mr. MARSHALL: I do not desire to drag the Minister for Lands in, but I accuse him of trying to drag a red herring across the track.

The Minister for Lands: No, I am attending to the administration of my department. You said I was apathetic.

Mr. MARSHALL: I have explained that: I said it did not concern the Minister for Lands.

The Minister for Lands: Well, read your speech in "Hansard."

Mr. MARSHALL: It was very explicit. I have obtained sufficient information to satisfy me that the workers at Reedys were right. No wonder Ministers all run into their warrens out of the way and do not want to take any responsibility. They can see it was an unusual thing to do. I do not think those people at Reedys were any more likely to jeopardise the health of the other people than are those in unauthorised occupation at Mt. Magnet, Hannans or Boulder likely to jeopardise the health of thousands of people in those localities. There are hundreds of people in unauthorised occupation, and yet those unfortunate

people at Reedys, who were scrambling to get homes together, have been prosecuted, mainly because of the exorbitant price of £25 placed on the blocks in the first instance. I do not wish to argue the question of leaseholds. Whatever may be said to the contrary, 98 per cent. of the people have no conception that they can get blocks on leasehold.

The Minister for Lands: That is explained at the auction sale.

Mr. MARSHALL: Whether it is or not, the people do not understand it. After all, then, it was the mine manager at Reedys who incited the Minister for Mines to prosecute those people. I repeat that that was one of the greatest injustices that has ever been perpetrated on the goldfields. I was present at both sales. For five months I did not come to the city. Yet the Minister said I could write him or ring him up. I had no occasion to do so; he was not in the picture.

The Minister for Lands: But you dragged me in.

Mr. MARSHALL: I do not want to drag him in further than to hold him responsible for what he has said this evening, and I have no doubt he will stand up to that. He told us the mine manager was responsible for the prosecutions. That is what I wanted to know. I have seen the Minister's officers regarding the sale of blocks and have told the clerk that he should explain clearly to people the different titles on which land may be acquired. When the department say that a block has an upset price of £25, people think they have to pay a minimum of £25, even if it be taken on leasehold. I wish to know why Reedys has been singled out for this treatment. Had the Minister for Mines given consideration to my request, which reached him two days after the prosecutions. those people would have shifted. I wrote to the Minister and I say I was absolutely ignored by him. I take strong exception to the tyranny of singling out my electors for special treatment. If the Government want to prosecute people in unauthorised occupation, let them prosecute those at Hannans, Boulder and Kalgoorlie. Are not thousands of lives there being jeopardised by people who are in unauthorised possession?

Mr. Lambert: Efforts are being made to get them all off.

Mr. MARSHALL: Get them off! They have been trying to do that for 30 years. Why should Reedys be picked out for special treatment?

Mr. Lambert: I will give you an instance.

Mr. MARSHALL: I do not want Ministers to be so amenable to the wishes of mine managers. That is the sore point. Why did not the department write to me and give me a chance to explain the position? No, the mine manager writes to the department, and that is sufficient to get prosecutions instituted. Let the Government be consistent and prosecute everybody who is in unauthorised occupation. They are not going to single out my electors for special treatment without a protest on my part. There is too much of it in my electorate, for some reason or other. If those people at Reedys should have been prosecuted, so should thousands of others, though I would not agree to that course being adopted. Seemingly it is necessary to wait until a mine manager requests a prosecution, and then it is instituted. Had the department made a survey of the blocks in the first place——

The Minister for Lands: I told you that 50 acres had been surveyed for the company.

Mr. MARSHALL: They were purely the property of the company.

The Minister for Lands: Their assurance to the department——

Mr. MARSHALL: Their assurance is as good as the Wiluna company's assurance. Neither is being fulfilled, though I am satisfied with what they have done. When the Minister received the first request from the Cue Road Board, the survey of the blocks should have been carried out, and people then would have had no excuse for unauthorised occupation. The blocks were not surveyed, and when the people got there, it was too late. The business areas were surveyed first of all. One might have thought that I was attempting to make a mountain out of nothing, but it is now clear I was on the right track. So long as a mine manager asks for a prosecution, it shall be instituted. I am looking after the interests of my electors.

The Minister for Lands: All you can say is that the mine manager asked the Lands Department to do it, and the Lands Department said they would not do it.

Mr. MARSHALL: The Minister is wrong. I have seen the authority for the prosecu-

tion, and that emanated from the Mines Department.

The Minister for Lands: You do not know it for my part.

Mr. MARSHALL: I am not asking anything of the Minister. If he has read "Hansard" he can see what I have said.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! There are too many interjections.

Mr. MARSHALL: I know that the authority for the prosecution of the 29 people came from the Mines Department.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! The hon. member is repeating himself. I have heard him make the same remark at least five times.

Mr. MARSHALL: I will stop now. I wish, however, to make this final protest. If Ministers want to accept the dictates of mine managers let them do so in the case of the mine managers in their own electorates. Let the Government leave my electorate alone, and they will hear nothing more from me on this subject. Finally, I am prepared to withdraw the motion.

Hon. C. G. Latham: Let us see the papers now.

Question put and passed.

BILL—WORKERS' HOMES ACT AMENDMENT (No. 2).

In Committee.

Mr. Sleeman in the Chair; Hon. N. Keenan in charge of the Bill.

Clause 1—agreed to.

Clause 2—Amendment of Section 11 principal Act:

The MINISTER FOR JUSTICE: I move an amendment—

That the proviso be struck out and the following inserted in lieu:—"Provided also that the applicant may at any time pay off the whole of the moneys outstanding in respect of the capital cost of the dwelling and any accrued interest thereon and a sum equal to the last appraised value of the land on which such dwelling-house is erected, and he shall be thereupon entitled to acquire the freehold of the land."

The existing proviso gives the lessee the right to acquire land for a sum 25 times greater than the ground rental. The ground rental was fixed years ago at three per cent. This would give the people the right to obtain land at about 75 per cent. of its value. By my amendment it is proposed to allow the owner to acquire the land at the appraised value, which is a fair and generous arrangement.

Hon. N. Keenan: I have no objection to the amendment.

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

Title—agreed to.

Bill reported with an amendment.

House adjourned at 10.25 p.m.

Legislative Council,

Thursday, 31st October, 1935.

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

AUDITOR GENERAL'S REPORT.

The PRESIDENT: I have received from the Auditor General a copy of his report on the Treasurer's statement of the Public Accounts for the financial year ended 30th June, 1935. It will be laid on the Table of the House.

QUESTION—MINING, GREENSTONE AREAS.

Hon. C. G. ELLIOTT asked the Chief Secretary: Have all known greenstone areas been reserved for the Western Mining Corporation, from a point south of Norseman—including Norseman, Coolgardie, Kalgoorlie, Broad Arrow, Menzies, Ularring, Malcolm, Laverton, Leonora, Lawlers, and Wiluna—to a point north of Peak Hill?

The CHIEF SECRETARY replied: No