

# Legislative Council,

Thursday, 21st November, 1938.

	PAGE
Questions: Pensioners, totals paid, domiciles .....	2410
Agriculture, rural relief, Federal excise on wheat .....	2410
Motion: Native Administration Act, to disallow regulations .....	2410
Bills: Workers' Homes Act Amendment, 3R. ....	2419
Jury Act Amendment, report .....	2419
Bureau of Industry and Economic Research, 2R., defeated .....	2419
Lotteries (Control) Act Amendment, 2R. ....	2425
Inspection of Scaffolding Act Amendment, Com. ....	2433
Companies Act Amendment, 2R. ....	2434
Qualification of Electors (Legislative Council), 2R. ....	2435

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

## QUESTION—PENSIONERS.

*Totals Paid, Domiciles.*

Hon. A. THOMSON asked the Chief Secretary: 1, How many persons are receiving pensions from the State? 2, What is the total amount of pensions paid to such persons per year? 3, How many of the pensioners are domiciled in Western Australia? 4, What is the total amount paid by way of pension to persons residing outside the State?

The CHIEF SECRETARY replied: 1, 529. 2, £122,600. 3, 483. 4, £9,684.

## QUESTION—AGRICULTURE.

*Rural Relief, Federal Excise on Wheat.*

Hon. J. NICHOLSON asked the Chief Secretary: 1, What amount is estimated to be collected in Western Australia in 1938-39 under the Federal excise on wheat? 2, What are the amounts estimated to be distributed in Western Australia—(a) on a hushelage basis; (b) to assist drought affected farmers?

The CHIEF SECRETARY replied: 1, £257,000. 2, (a) and (b) £918,000, including £100,000 for drought relief.

## MOTION—NATIVE ADMINISTRATION ACT.

*To Disallow Regulations.*

Debate resumed from the previous day on the following motion by Hon. H. Seddon (North-East):—

That regulations Nos. 6, 39, 85, 101, 103, 106, 112, 114, 115, 134, 135, 136, 137, 138, 139A, 141, 142, 144, 149 and 151, made under the

Native Administration Act, 1905-1936, as published in the "Government Gazette" on the 1st November, 1938, and laid on the Table of the House on the 1st November, 1938, be and are hereby disallowed.

HON. E. H. H. HALL (Central) [4.38]:

It is unfortunate that a motion so important should have been introduced at this late stage of the session. However, our duty is to deal with it. Out of consideration both for the "Hansard" staff and for members, we should accordingly try to condense our remarks as much as possible. Knowing Mr. Seddon well, I mentioned to him in a friendly way the other evening that I considered he had occupied too much time in making so many quotations. Of course, it was the Minister's right to deal as exhaustively as he did with the motion; still, had I known him as well as I know Mr. Seddon, I would have been justified in making a similar remark to him. Bearing that in mind, I shall try to be as brief as I can, whilst satisfying myself that I am not shirking my duty as a public man on this very important question.

The people of the State, including members of Parliament, have had the advantage of the results of a recent thorough investigation into this very question. In 1934 the Government agreed to appoint a Royal Commission to inquire into native affairs, and in 1935 the Royal Commissioner made his report. Members of Parliament have had that report to guide them, and members of the Government, who were in office in 1935, have also had the benefit of that document. Last but not least the Minister controlling the department has had available to him the report and recommendations of the Royal Commissioner. The time has arrived to ask ourselves whether Parliament, the Government, and the Minister in control of the department have taken that heed of the document that one might reasonably expect them to do. When the report was issued, I scanned it rather hastily, but this morning I spent two or three hours in studying it. My considered opinion is that neither the Government nor the department has taken due heed of the advice tendered by Mr. Moseley. We know that the Chief Secretary does not now control the department, but he was in charge of it for some years, and is now taking the full brunt of the blame or praise that is due. Last night the Chief Secretary, in a laudable defence of the permanent head of the department, had something to say

about missions. His remarks ran something like this—

No-called missionaries, without any knowledge of natives, without ability to teach or train natives, and without even a thorough knowledge of the Gospel, are away out back hundreds of miles in most cases from any control whatever, interfering with the department and the natives.

Let me examine the Minister's statement. A fair inference to draw is that he knew there were incompetent men at the missions. When we try to do our duty we are always in danger of offending someone. At the expense of giving offence, it is our duty, when we see weaknesses here and there, to deal with them and endeavour to adjust them.

Attention was also directed by the Chief Secretary to the unsuitability of the sites chosen by mission authorities for their settlements, with a view to showing that some of the missionaries did not know this branch of their job any more than they did the teaching side. Let us see what the Royal Commissioner had to say on page 15 of his report about the Government settlement at Moore River. I will not quote his words; they are in the report for members to read. The Royal Commissioner condemned the Moore River Native Settlement that was selected by the Government. I do not say it was selected by the present Government, but it is a Government settlement and has been condemned. Missionaries may have chosen unsuitable sites for their settlements, but the Government of the State has also failed in the same respect. Mr. Moseley dealt very fully with the subject, and members should read what he said.

Appalling revelations were made by the Chief Secretary. I am sorry he made them. A member of the Chamber was so moved that he said he would like the Chief Secretary's speech put into pamphlet form and circulated throughout the world. Another member sitting not very far from me became indignant at the very idea. The Royal Commissioner had something to say on page 16 of his report about the punishments inflicted at the Government settlement. They were not of so serious a nature as those to which the Chief Secretary referred last night as having occurred at mission stations, but the Royal Commissioner was very outspoken about the punishment of inmates at the Government institution. I have been told by members representing the Great Southern

districts of the determination of the present Administration to carry on the Carrolup settlement, which has been condemned by many people. The Royal Commissioner, without professing to have any knowledge of the land, damned this place with faint praise as a settlement for natives. This property, too, was selected by the Government.

I wish now to deal more specifically with the missions. I am conscientiously endeavouring to view this question in a broad-minded way, and have no desire to damn the head of the department or to cast blame upon the missions. The report of the Royal Commissioner is before us, and on page 18 he devotes a special chapter to missions, from which I quote the following:—

I am hopeful that the views I express will not encourage further controversy on this already controversial subject; I hope that nothing I may write will be regarded as evidence of lack of appreciation of what I am sure is a whole-hearted desire of missionaries to benefit the natives. But for such a genuine desire, it would be impossible to find men and women who would be prepared to face the isolation and hardship inseparable from the life on a remote mission. Beyond doubt the missionaries amongst the natives of Western Australia are doing, without exception, a work of great self-sacrifice. I hope that sacrifice will not be in vain.

Members will appreciate what Mr. Moseley implied when he said he hoped the sacrifice would not be in vain. Evidently he intended to indicate the danger of any good the missions might think they were accomplishing being destroyed through want of knowledge of the psychology of the natives. At page 18 he said—

The school work of the missions is, in most cases, carried out on sound lines, and the results as seen by me were encouraging.

Then he dealt with the very vexed question of marriage and the violation of tribal law, and contrasted it with the Christian law that the missionaries are endeavouring to teach. I do not propose to touch upon that aspect; it is too intricate for laymen to deal with; but seemingly we are to-day reaping the fruits of our failure to face this problem. We stand before the world condemned because we have not taken action in these matters. The Royal Commissioner travelled the length and breadth of the State. I am not here to uphold Mr. Moseley or his report, but I conclude that before a man is appointed a Royal Commissioner, the Government must consider he is qualified to con-

duct the inquiry and knows something of the subject. I have heard Mr. Moseley's report commended from time to time, not only by people having a knowledge of the natives, but by members of Parliament generally. Yet when Mr. Moseley makes a report that strikes at the very foundation of the department, his recommendations are apparently ignored. On page 19 of the report he said—

I suggest that provision be made as follows:—

1. That the present system of control by a Chief Protector be abolished, and in lieu thereof a system of divisional control be instituted by establishing districts each of which will be under the control of the divisional protector, who will be responsible to the Minister.

On the following page he remarked—

Apart altogether from the details of the organisation, of which I shall write later, it does seem to me a matter of impossibility that the affairs of the natives should be adequately governed by one officer having his headquarters in Perth.

Surely there is nothing ambiguous in those words.

That is what the present form of administration amounts to.

Mr. Moseley also condemned in no uncertain language the appointment of police officers as protectors. I am prepared to make a long shot and hazard the opinion that the majority of protectors in Western Australia are police constables. On page 17 Mr. Moseley said—

Police officers are by no means suitable for appointment as protectors.

Mr. Moseley advocated what he termed divisional protectors. He said—

The establishment of divisional protectors will do away with the complaint so frequently heard by me during my travels that local conditions are not understood in Perth and that there is no one of authority with whom matters may be discussed on the spot.

While dealing with this subject it may be well to refer to the suggestion made by some witnesses before the Commission that an advisory council should be appointed to help the department in its work. Candidly I do not welcome the idea. If the aborigines were to continue to rely for their protection on one official stationed in Perth and seldom away from that centre, I should consider the suggestion as one of some value. But I do want the divisional protectors to have a free hand, and to be able to decide matters for the welfare of the natives from their own understanding of the native and their personal observation of the situation. The various bodies who would be represented on such a council would still be, as they always have been, able to

place their views before the Minister controlling the department.

There we have an alternative. According to Mr. Moseley we should have divisional protectors; failing the adoption of that system, he would favour the appointment of a board. I cannot help thinking that we might have been spared this debate and saved a lot of heart-burning had the recommendations made by Mr. Moseley been adopted.

The Minister, in the course of his speech, referred to the practice of chaining natives. Many years ago there was a missionary named Gribble in the Kimberleys, and many disclosures were made regarding his mission. If my memory serves me aright, that was the first occasion on which I had read about the chaining of natives. Like most other people who did not understand much about the subject, I thought it a terrible revelation, but later we received an explanation that this chaining was not anything like so dreadful as we had been led to believe. On this point the Commissioner remarked—

I am, of course, not going to be so foolish as to suggest that isolated cases of cruelty to natives do not exist. I have mentioned that during my travels I have neither come across such cases, nor have allegations of such a nature been made to me by witnesses or others I have interviewed.

Evidently the Commissioner concluded that to chain a native was much more humane than to handcuff him, particularly as the handcuffs would leave him no freedom to use his hands in a territory where flies and mosquitoes are so prevalent. We can quite understand that reason.

The replies of the Minister to one or two interjections that I made last night led me to conclude that the files disclosing those frightful instances of cruelty and depravity mentioned by him would be laid on the Table of the House. Consequently I arrived at the House in good time this morning with the object of perusing the files to ascertain whether they contained the corroboration which I maintain the Minister should have satisfied himself existed before giving out to the world what inhuman beings we were in our treatment of the native people, especially so when one member suggested the printing of a special pamphlet in order that the explanation of the department might be brought to the notice of the people who are interested. But I was sadly disappointed. I found only one file, dealing with the native Munmurrie. I invite mem-

bers to obtain the file during the tea adjournment and, if they have had any experience of administration, to tell the House what they think of it. It all boils down to this: that if we have not the courage to do our job we must make way for those who have. A lack of firmness has been displayed. Who is running the Department of Native Affairs in this State—a certain missionary or the Commissioner? For the department to have to argue the point and write numerous letters about such men and their affairs is nothing short of discreditable. How can the officials carry on their work if they allow themselves to be argued with or dictated to or written to in this manner? I am not suggesting who is right or wrong? What I allege is that there has been a lack of firmness in dealing with this matter.

I was considerably disappointed not to find any more files. I was shocked to hear what was told us last night and, with all due respect to the Chief Secretary, I consider that my duty as a member of Parliament was to satisfy myself that the Minister was justified in making the statements he did and in mentioning such terrible cases in Parliament.

Hon. W. R. Hall: Why should he not?

Hon. E. H. H. HALL: I was disappointed that the files were not here.

Hon. G. W. Miles: You can get them by asking.

Hon. E. H. H. HALL: I ask the hon. member to be patient. I telephoned the Minister's office, but unfortunately the Minister was out. However, I established contact with him this afternoon and was asked to call at the office. There I saw the files, or some of them. I did not want to be asked to treat these matters as strictly confidential, but that is all we can do at this late stage, because I am pleased to say that the discreditable incidents referred to occurred some years ago.

In all seriousness I ask, why should they be dragged up now? They happened before the Royal Commissioner visited the places referred to, and he could have inquired into them and furnished confidential reports. From the hurried glance I had of the files—I hope other members will inspect them—I formed the opinion that the charges would not have been substantiated in a court of law because they were based on the evidence

of native boys. I do not say, however, that they are not true. The matter has been mentioned in this Chamber, and it is for us to take notice of it and endeavour to get to the bottom of the allegations. I am not going to suggest that the Minister was wrong in not taking action at the time. Had he done so, a very painful impression would have been created, not only abroad but also amongst our own people. I do think, however, that the Minister, in his anxiety to defend his department last night, overstepped the bounds of prudence, and that for him to have refrained from mentioning these very unsavoury cases would have been preferable.

I cannot support Mr. Seddon's motion. In view of the statements made by the Chief Secretary, I consider that the regulations should be retained. I would like a select committee to be appointed though I myself would not wish to serve on it. Such a committee would have the report of the Royal Commissioner to guide it. The committee could take time to investigate the whole matter and ascertain whether an alteration of the present situation should not be insisted upon. I have met Mr. Neville in order to discuss the affairs of half-castes and have tried to sum him up. He impressed me as being a conscientious officer, but he is only a man like ourselves. No doubt he honestly and genuinely believes that he is doing everything for the best. But if the State were split up into divisions in accordance with the recommendation of the Royal Commissioner, or if a board were appointed to control the department, I think the position would be made more satisfactory.

**HON. J. NICHOLSON** (Metropolitan) [5.7]: I did not intend to address myself to this question, but having regard to the motion of which notice has been given by Mr. Mann, I feel that in the interests of this House and of the State, I should add a few words. My remarks will be few and limited, because we have had the advantage of hearing addresses of a most interesting description, not only from Mr. Seddon who moved the motion for the disallowance of the regulations, but also from the Chief Secretary who replied to Mr. Seddon's statements. The matter has reached a stage which one may regard as of major importance, affecting not only the State, but also the people of Australia as a whole. A very frank case was submitted by Mr. Seddon and we also

heard a very full reply by the Chief Secretary.

*[The Deputy President took the Chair.]*

Hon. A. Thomson: I am afraid it was almost too full.

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: The hon. member must bear in mind that the Chief Secretary had a great responsibility.

Hon. A. Thomson: I recognise that.

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: Certain charges or suggestions were made by the mover of the motion and it was incumbent upon the Chief Secretary to answer them. In doing so, he naturally had to justify his position and that of the department over which he presided until recently. The circumstances disclosed were many, and indicated that a serious position has arisen in relation to the control of natives in this State. I welcome very heartily the motion of which notice was given by Mr. Mann to-day. I do not intend to traverse—

The DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Order! The hon. member must not anticipate the notice of motion.

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: I do not intend to anticipate anything, but notice of the motion has been given. I do not wish to take up the time of the House by traversing either the points raised by Mr. Seddon or the reply given by the Chief Secretary by way of justification of the regulations to which exception is taken. The duty of the Chief Secretary was manifest. He had to uphold the regulations and to furnish reasons for their introduction. The statements made by the Chief Secretary have created a position that is alarming in the extreme. The Minister was justified in making those statements. I am not blaming him for having done so, because he had a duty both to himself as Minister formerly in charge of the department and to the department. But those statements were sufficiently important and alarming to warrant the fullest investigation.

Hon. A. Thomson: I think we must have an investigation.

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: I agree with the hon. member. Mr. E. H. H. Hall has suggested that such an inquiry should be made by a select committee, but I think he will agree, on reflection, that that would be useless.

Hon. C. F. Baxter: In a matter of this kind, it would be useless.

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: An investigation of this description would be prolonged and would necessitate visits to many centres so that the fullest inquiry might be conducted into every one of the charges or statements made. True, all the matters referred to by the Chief Secretary occurred some years ago.

Hon. L. Craig: How will evidence on such matters be secured?

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: We should have to ascertain what could be done in that direction; certainly the statements are sufficiently important to warrant inquiry. In the period that has intervened since the occurrence of those incidents, however, a great improvement has taken place in the management of native affairs, a fact which the Chief Secretary would be the first to acknowledge.

Hon. G. W. Miles: We amended the Act for that purpose, so that more power would be given to those having charge of natives.

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: The report furnished by Mr. Mosley in January, 1935, was based on a resolution of Parliament passed in February, 1934. Nearly four years have elapsed since the report was presented. Everyone acknowledged that it was a most comprehensive report and that the Commissioner had dealt with the subject with characteristic thoroughness. In the period that has elapsed since the submission of the report, an Act dealing with the control of natives has been placed on the statute-book. The Royal Commissioner recommended that the control of the department should be entrusted to one commissioner with divisional protectors, but since then incidents have occurred that point to the advisableness of adopting the suggestion made when the Native Administration Bill was before the House, namely, that the management of native affairs in this State should be placed in the hands of a properly constituted board. If another Royal Commission is appointed, one of its duties might well be to consider the present Act and suggest desirable amendments. In the intervening period we have had a sort of tightening up, may I say, by the Commissioner of the various bodies that have been taking an interest in the natives. In view of this, I believe, the position now is that affairs generally in regard to natives and missions are managed and controlled with greater thoroughness than probably was attained in former years.

The suggestion has been made that this is a matter in which the Commonwealth Government would be the better authority to be entrusted with the entire management of the natives. If that could be arranged, the State would be relieved of a great responsibility, and at the same time of the odium which has been cast upon us in regard to the native question. There is much, I am sure, that is misunderstood by people and authorities outside Australia about the natives and their affairs. That misunderstanding can be removed only by a most thorough investigation, one which will eradicate from people's minds the idea that we are heedless of the duty devolving upon us to care for the natives and do what is best in their interests. The Chief Secretary frankly acknowledged towards the conclusion of his speech—after criticising, as he was quite entitled to do, certain episodes by way of justifying his opposition to the motion—the great help which has been received from missions, and the department's desire that the missions should co-operate towards achieving a more successful result than could be obtained in the absence of their co-operation. In a territory so wide as Western Australia, with missions far scattered and isolated, there ought to be a desire on the part of their conductors to do the best possible in conjunction with the Department of Native Affairs. I feel quite sure that the missions and all persons engaged in work amongst the natives are desirous of doing everything possible to further the progress and development of the aborigines to a higher state of civilisation than the majority of them is in at present. If thorough investigations be made now, in the light of the experience we have had during the four years since the report was made, some definite good will be achieved.

At this stage I prefer to refrain from stating whether I can support the motion. I feel, however, that it would be in the interests of other suggested motions about to be presented to the Chamber to vote in support of Mr. Seddon.

Hon. G. W. Miles: Then what about the regulations in the meantime?

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: Mr. Seddon's motion asks for the disallowance of certain regulations only, not for the disallowance of all the regulations.

Hon. A. Thomson: The Chief Secretary said last night that he needed those regulations.

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: It may be possible to do something meantime to meet the case.

The Chief Secretary: All the regulations are in accordance with the Act. Many of them follow its provisions word for word.

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: Then I think the scope of any Royal Commission might well be extended to a reconsideration of the provisions of the Act as it stands. I regard the matter from the aspect of obtaining a more satisfactory working of the Act.

The Chief Secretary: There has not been a chance yet.

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: The first regulations were issued about six weeks ago. Following thereon, regulations have been re-gazetted, and it is with those we are dealing now. The re-gazetted is largely a re-enactment of regulations objected to previously. I hope that Mr. Angelo's suggestion to have the Chief Secretary's speech printed and circulated will not be carried into effect.

Hon. A. Thomson: Not yet, anyhow.

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: Not at this stage. What has taken place is detrimental enough to us as a State. To print and publish certain statements would, I consider, be most unwise. Even though the regulations which Mr. Seddon's motion seeks to disallow be not upheld, the remainder of the regulations would be in force, and probably would be ample, for the time being, to enable the department to carry on its work in accordance with the Act.

The Chief Secretary: These are very important regulations.

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: They may be important from certain aspects, such as that of permits. However, in the meantime inquiries could be made, and the disallowance of these particular regulations would keep the subject before the House in a manner that otherwise would not obtain. I shall look forward with interest to the discussions that may take place on the motions of which notice has been given.

**HON. L. CRAIG** (South-West) [5.30]: I shall not take long in discussing the motion. The debate, lengthy as it has been, has developed in consequence of certain serious charges made by Mr. Seddon against

the Department of Native Affairs. I think I am right in saying that Mr. Seddon based those charges on evidence submitted to him mainly by Mr. Schenk. The Chief Secretary, in my opinion, was perfectly justified in answering the charges as fully as possible. Had he not done so, I believe the regulations would have been disallowed. I would have agreed to that course because the charges seemed to be so true, and Mr. Seddon's reputation is such that I and many others who do not know the full purport of the regulations would have been willing to disallow them. In my opinion the Chief Secretary, speaking for the department, has very fully and completely answered those charges. We have this most important fact, which to me seems to be the fundamental principle underlying the control of the affairs of the natives, that those people are the wards of the State. That is most important. The State has responsibilities regarding the natives just as much as any one of us would have in respect of a child placed under his protection as his ward. Being wards of the State, and the department being in the position of the parent, upon the department devolves the responsibility of deciding how the natives shall be brought up and treated.

However good and earnest anyone may be who desires to participate in the handling of natives and their affairs, that individual should be permitted to do so only with the approval of the department. I care not who the person may be. We must also remember that nearly all the complaints against the administration of the department have come from missions. I agree that most of the missions are carrying out excellent work. There may be some misfits, people who are imbued with a desire to do good work amongst the heathen natives, but their hearts sometimes rule their heads. They may have no administrative ability. We know many of them, including parsons, who are excellent men, but some of them we would not put in charge of a poultry yard. They have not the necessary ability. I could relate delightful stories of some of the dear old chaps. I remember telling one old parson that my lambs were very late. He asked me how I accounted for that. When I told him that I had not put the rams to the ewes at the usual time, he was quite surprised.

Hon. C. F. Baxter: Yes, surprised at your carelessness.

Hon. L. CRAIG: According to the departmental records, the missions are in touch with only 2,000 natives out of a total aboriginal population of 40,000. I believe that is the aggregate number.

The Chief Secretary: Between 30,000 and 40,000.

Hon. L. CRAIG: The missions are not in very close touch with all of those 2,000. Nevertheless, criticism has emanated from the missions, and some of it may be justified. We must remember that Parliament is comprised almost entirely of laymen who know very little of native affairs. In the circumstances, Parliament can very well leave the control of natives to those whose duty it is to look after their interests. When charges are effectively answered as they were by the Chief Secretary, I, admittedly a layman, am prepared to leave the administration in the hands of those who have had experience over a number of years. I agree that no person should be allowed to go into a native camp without the permission of the department. I ask those people who have in the past so severely criticised the department, whether, insofar as the department is effecting improvements, these efforts must not be all to the good, because nothing could be worse than the situation in the past. Immediately regulations are introduced by people who undoubtedly have greater knowledge than we have, we should recognise that position and at least give the department time to try out its proposals.

Hon. C. F. Baxter: What are you going to do if they are not right?

Hon. L. CRAIG: We can cancel them. The Government is not out to frame regulations that are detrimental to the interests of the natives.

Hon. A. Thomson: Once the regulations are promulgated, what are you going to do?

Hon. L. CRAIG: Do members say that any Government would continue regulations that had been proved to be detrimental to the natives? Is one Government different from another to that extent? Are we capable of saying the regulations are wrong? Is Mr. Thomson capable of saying that? Has he sufficient knowledge of the natives to enable him to advance that contention? Does any member of this House claim to have a greater knowledge of natives than has Mr. Neville?

Hon. A. Thomson: Are you capable of saying they are right any more than others are capable of saying they are wrong?

Hon. L. CRAIG: I am prepared to leave the affairs of the natives in the hands of people who have a great deal more knowledge than I possess. I have read the regulations and some do seem foolish. On the other hand, I have no evidence to prove that those regulations are not necessary. I submit that regulations are not introduced without reason. The department has nothing to gain.

This House will assume a huge responsibility if it does not permit the department to give effect to the policy it believes to be right. That responsibility is indeed grave. To my mind any additional inquiry will do no good. The statement made by the Chief Secretary, as Mr. E. H. H. Hall pointed out, referred to matters that occurred some years ago. Since then Mr. Moseley as a Royal Commissioner obtained all the evidence that any new Royal Commission could obtain. To my mind no great advantage would accrue from a further inquiry. However, I shall not discuss that question. I urge members to think very seriously before they disallow the regulations. If they do support the motion for disallowance, they should take that action with a full knowledge of what they are doing and of the purport of the regulations they desire to set aside.

**HON. A. THOMSON** (South - East) [5.40]: When I rose, prior to Mr. Craig's speaking, with the intention of moving the adjournment of the debate, I assure members I had no wish to shirk my responsibilities regarding the motion. Members have indicated that they desire the debate to proceed. When I interjected to Mr. Nicholson that the Chief Secretary's statement was rather too full, I had in mind that the impression would go abroad that the people of Western Australia were decidedly inhuman and had encouraged the ill-treatment of natives. Every member realises the duty the State owes to the natives. One reason why the State has not succeeded to the extent that could be desired is that the whole of the administrative work has been centred in one man. In view of the immense territory over which the natives are scattered, we are asking that officer to undertake too much. I regret that the discussion has drifted from the aspect of a public ques-

tion to that of a dispute between the department and certain missionaries. I have given much consideration to this subject and have reached the opinion that the natives should be treated in two different sections. There is no comparison between the positions of the natives in the North and of those in the more settled southern areas.

The Honorary Minister: They represent different propositions.

Hon. A. THOMSON: Quite so.

Hon. E. H. Angelo: Mr. Moseley pointed that out in his report.

Hon. A. THOMSON: With that we all agree. All Mr. Moseley's recommendations were not adopted, but I do not blame the Government or the Chief Secretary on that score.

Hon. V. Hamersley: We must blame Parliament.

Hon. A. THOMSON: Legislation was introduced and, after much discussion, this House passed the Bill. I shall not agree to take from the Department of Native Affairs the regulations promulgated for the general welfare of the natives. However, in view of the alarming statements made last night by the Chief Secretary, we must, in the interests of the State, definitely clear this matter up. The only way in which that can be done is as Mr. Mann has suggested, namely, by the appointment of a Royal Commission. I wish to congratulate Mr. E. H. H. Hall upon the well-thought out speech he delivered. I cannot believe that he would make a statement that was not correct, particularly as he had come almost direct from the department. We have been told that some of the reported happenings mentioned by the Chief Secretary date back many years, and I consider that the Minister made a serious blunder in reviving them.

The Chief Secretary: I wanted the House to appreciate what had occurred.

Hon. A. THOMSON: Parliament realised that steps must be taken to ensure better treatment for the natives of Western Australia and passed legislation accordingly, and for the Minister to revive happenings of ten years ago was, I consider, a mistake on his part. He has given out to the world that our missionaries have been immoral and that they have been robbing and cheating the natives.

Hon. E. H. Angelo: And the Government.



Hon. A. THOMSON: Yes, the Government also. This, to my mind, demonstrates that the administration of the Government has been particularly lax. It is discreditable to the Government that such a statement should have been made.

Hon. L. Craig: You have to find out those things before you can stop them.

Hon. A. THOMSON: That is so, but when the State was paying £700 to £1,000 to a certain mission, surely some return would be supplied to the Government giving details of how the money had been expended. We were told last night that the money had been paid by the Government for wild dog scalps.

The Chief Secretary: That is so.

Hon. A. THOMSON: And that the natives were given a handful of flour and some other trifles for the scalps supplied to the missions. The Minister did say that doubtless the money had been utilised for the benefit of the other natives at the mission. If the missionaries were actuated by the community spirit, I cannot think for one moment that they were guilty of any crime. My point is it was not a matter to broadcast to the world that men and possibly women, who were sacrificing their comfort and probably also their lives in the interests of the native population, had been dishonest or had been guilty of actions tantamount to robbing the natives. Such a matter could be cleared up by inquiry. I can quite understand the Chief Secretary's position. He felt that serious charges were being made against the department, mainly by one particular missionary. I have no wish to hurt the Chief Secretary's feelings, but candidly I think that his action in reviving incidents of ten years ago was not in the interests of the natives or of Western Australia.

The Chief Secretary: I quoted the incidents in support of the regulations that were being objected to.

Hon. A. THOMSON: I believe that the Minister, on further consideration, will realise that he made statements that would have been better left unuttered.

The half-caste problem is one that must be faced. I believe that the department is endeavouring to deal with it. Certainly that problem is more pronounced and more serious in the southern than in the northern part of the State, and the sooner it is grappled with, the better for all. We are told that the half-castes can become useful citizens

and that many have proved themselves capable of becoming good citizens, but I say with all earnestness that the permit system has been most detrimental to those in the southern part of the State, although doubtless it was introduced with the best intentions to assist the half-castes.

In my opinion there is only one solution of the problem. We have taken the country from the natives. Those in the north still have opportunities to go out and procure food, but what opportunities have the natives to get food in the southern parts of the State, which are now thickly populated? There is nothing more pitiful than to see natives and half-castes congregating in country towns, hanging about the streets, unwanted by anybody. Some of them have a genuine desire to become useful citizens. Recently a half-caste came to see me. He and his brother had served for three years in the Great War. He said, "I was good enough to fight in the war; why should I have to ask for a permit so that I can enter a hotel or go where I wish?" I agreed with him, and wrote to the department, but the department insisted upon his applying for a permit. Surely a man who has fought for his country should be entitled to the full rights of citizenship and should not be required to obtain exemption. For many years that man has been employed by one of the Commonwealth departments. Though he may not be all that some of us could desire, his parents have lived the lives of white people. Mr. Piesse can endorse that statement. The time has arrived when these small settlements or camps, which must be breeding places of corruption to the natives, should be abolished. How can we expect half-caste girls to escape the dangers when they are compelled to live in those camps?

Hon. E. H. H. Hall: The Royal Commissioner reported on that.

Hon. A. THOMSON: Yes. The State should do as has been done by other countries, namely, say to the natives, "Here is an area that belongs to you. It is your reservation and your home. If you as a half-caste are going to live as a native on that reserve, you must be treated as a native, but if you wish to live according to white standards, the opportunity will be afforded you and you will receive all the privileges."

Hon. E. H. Angelo: Is not that the object of one of the regulations?

Hon. A. THOMSON: That may be the aim of the department, but I cannot see that much progress has been made so far.

Hon. E. H. Angelo: The department has not had a chance yet.

Hon. A. THOMSON: I am not opposing the regulations, but I cannot understand how the department can hope to succeed under present conditions.

The Chief Secretary: Would you make exemptions for half-castes general?

Hon. A. THOMSON: If they wish to live according to white standards, as many of them do, my reply is, "Yes," but if they wish to associate with natives, they must be treated as natives. I could take the Minister to Narrogin, Wagin, Katanning and other towns on the Great Southern line and show him the conditions under which half-castes have to live, and if he could say that there was any reasonable chance of their becoming anything better, well, I have a lot to learn. We robbed the natives of their country and the least we can do is to provide a reserve for them, though some people contend that it is useless to remove natives from their own territory and place them in unfamiliar country. No time should be lost in taking in hand the young people and teaching them to work. That is not being done at present.

Good service for the natives has been done by Mr. Seddon in objecting to the regulations and raising the whole question of native administration. Members certainly have a better grip of the work of the department and its intentions than when the regulations were promulgated, but I am afraid that in the process Western Australia has received an advertisement of which it will have no reason to be proud. In fact, I doubt whether we shall ever be able to live down its effects, because in this State, in the Commonwealth and elsewhere, there are people ever ready to believe the worst and ever loth to believe the best of anybody. While there may be a few isolated cases as bad as those cited by the Chief Secretary, any unprejudiced judge, I believe, would admit that Western Australia has honestly tried to do its duty towards the natives as a whole.

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

## **BILL—WORKERS' HOMES ACT AMENDMENT.**

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

## **BILL—JURY ACT AMENDMENT.**

*Report of Committee.*

HON. J. NICHOLSON (Metropolitan) [5.59]: I move—

That the report be adopted.

Hon. G. W. MILES: May I move an amendment to consider the matter this day six months?

The DEPUTY PRESIDENT: That would be a very unusual course. I suggest the hon. member move in that direction on the third reading.

Question put and passed.

## **BILL—BUREAU OF INDUSTRY AND ECONOMIC RESEARCH.**

*Second Reading—Defeated.*

Debate resumed from the 22nd November.

HON. W. J. MANN (South-West) [5.59]: My remarks on the Bill will not be lengthy, although there has been a good deal of debate upon it. With the objects of the Bill I am in complete sympathy. I realise, as I think hon. members must, that without research and investigation into the problems facing the State to-day, very little progress can be made. This is exemplified by some countries in Europe that have made considerable advances during the past few years by concentrating to an enormous extent upon research into economic and industrial matters. If we desire to arrive at the same position, although I do not contend we can altogether do that, we must follow the example set us. At least we have been made aware of the necessity for taking every possible advantage of the latest methods that have been made possible by scientific research. I believe that, with a personnel capable of performing the functions of the proposed bureau, we shall find it to be of the greatest advantage.

I am not as optimistic as is the Minister who introduced the Bill. He seems to be imbued with the idea that if this bureau is established, most of our troubles will be easily solved. I do not think that is likely

to be the result. We may have light thrown upon some of our problems and we may obtain better viewpoints, such as we are not likely to obtain from the C.S.I.R., which is engaged upon similar work. In my opinion, we should give the bureau a trial. I shall vote for the second reading of the Bill, so that the matter may be discussed still further. When in Committee we shall have an opportunity of closely examining some of the clauses of the Bill. There are many phases of the measure that need elucidation and explanation.

If we pass the second reading, I hope some drastic action will be taken. In my opinion, it is unnecessary to build up a huge and expensive department. As I read the Bill, the proposal is to set up an extensive organisation, likely to cost a large sum of money. While realising that an organisation of this description may justify such an expenditure, I am of the opinion that unless we secure the services of the right persons we might spend that money with very little result. Until we have had experience, we should proceed cautiously.

The success or failure of the bureau will depend wholly upon those in charge of it. In my opinion the bureau at the outset should comprise a director and perhaps two members, provided these men possess the highest qualifications. If we cannot secure such persons, then we should select men of exceptional promise. Three men, with power to co-opt others for assistance and advice, should be sufficient. To appoint a bureau of 11 members seems to me to be out of all reason. If we are to have a bureau, I contend that it should not consist of so great a number as the Bill proposes.

I do not favour the appointment of a director for a long term of years. Three years should be long enough. If at the end of that term we find we have a director in every way suitable, he can be given a long-term engagement. His appointment should be on lines similar to those governing the appointment of the Commissioner of Railways and the Public Service Commissioner: that is, the appointment must be subject to the approval of Parliament. Parliament has quite a lot of wisdom. In a matter of this description, where big issues are involved, Parliament should have some say.

Clause 27 of the Bill details a long list of functions. This list needs overhaul and should be carefully considered. One phase of the Bill that does not meet with my ap-

proval is that it provides for quite a lot of Ministerial control.

Hon. L. B. Bolton: Quite a lot? All!

Hon. W. J. MANN: Although it is proposed to clothe the director with certain powers, in the final analysis the control will be vested in the Minister. I do not think that is wise.

Hon. C. F. Baxter: Do you mean to appoint Mr. Wise as director?

Hon. W. J. MANN: I have not anyone in my mind for director. To mention a Cabinet Minister is not very wise.

Hon. C. F. Baxter: You are mentioning his name again.

Hon. W. J. MANN: Well, shall I say it is not very sporting?

Hon. A. Thomson: It would be unwise to adopt the suggestion.

Hon. W. J. MANN: I shall support the second reading of the Bill, but am reserving to myself the right to move to amend several of the clauses.

**THE CHIEF SECRETARY** (Hon. W. H. Kitson—West—in reply) [6.10]: In view of the considerable misunderstanding, and, I might add, misrepresentation, which have characterised the speeches of members opposing the Bill, I might well recapitulate the objects the measure sets out to achieve. Briefly, they are to provide machinery to enable the Government and private industry to benefit by the guidance of an expert body that will engage in patient and co-ordinated research into all phases of industry, but, more particularly, into the means of diversifying production. In short, this Bill is the expression of the Government's belief that the key to the future advancement of this State is to be found not in fortuitous action, but in the planning and organisation of our economy.

I am reluctant to believe that even those who have opposed the Bill will disagree with my statement that success in tackling the complex problems of this State can best be achieved when patient and co-ordinated research is made the basis for Government and private action. When, however, it is a question of giving effect to a principle that surely must commend itself to everybody having the interests of the State at heart, members have seized the excuse to

criticise the Government's proposals. Mr. Wood, for example, said—

The proposal to establish a bureau is an insult to the people we have already capable of doing the work.

His statement was on all fours with that of Mr. Baxter, who suggested that the proposed bureau would override the State departments. Similar statements were made by other members. Criticism of this kind is excusable in the case of Mr. Wood, but, when it comes from one who has had administrative experience, it can only be characterised as arising from a desire to discredit the Bill.

Hon. C. F. Baxter: That is just why I said it.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: I can only believe that the statement was made by the hon. member with a desire to discredit the Bill, irrespective of its merits.

Hon. C. F. Baxter: No. It was my experience that caused me to make that statement.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: Mr. Baxter must be aware that his statement is a total misrepresentation of the position that would arise from the establishment of the bureau.

Hon. C. F. Baxter: No, it is not.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: I think it is.

Hon. C. F. Baxter: It is not.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: The bureau is to consist of not less than nine members, three of whom shall be appointed to represent the Government of the State, the technical education branch of the Education Department, and the Government Statistician, respectively.

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

The CHIEF SECRETARY: The bureau will be a body acting in liaison between the Government, the research workers and other experts, and the professionals of the Public Service and private industry. To quote again the Royal Commissioner, it will be—an organisation in closer touch with the executive Government, yet having at its command a complete survey of the economy—an organisation where education, science (as related to industry), the professions, and economics meet.

That is a very apt description. Does Mr. Baxter seriously suggest that the establishment of such a body involves the supersession of the Government departments, or that the existing departmental machinery lends itself to the performance of the func-

tions that the bureau would be called upon to perform? I should like to reiterate that the Government's difficulty is that it has no organisation capable of carrying out continuous and exhaustive investigations into every phase of the economic life of the State. Therefore we desire to establish this bureau, the members of which will have the training and ability necessary to investigate and report on any proposal in respect of which the Government, or private industry, desires expert guidance.

Every phase of economic activity is inter-related in some degree. The Bill therefore provides that the bureau shall consist of men with a special knowledge of secondary and primary industry, the mining industry, commercial and financial activities, and the working conditions that prevail in this State. With such a representative personnel, the Government feels that the bureau will be in a position to take a broadly balanced view of all matters coming within its purview, and be entirely free from any bias that might be inherent in a smaller and less representative body, such as that suggested by Mr. Bolton.

Where it is desired to have the benefit of other industrial, economic or scientific knowledge, the bureau may co-opt outside persons to act in an advisory capacity. Moreover, power is given for the appointment of sub-committees and advisory committees where any special investigation or inquiry is involved. This provision, I submit, overcomes one of Mr. Bolton's objections when he said he "desired to point out how unwieldy and costly the proposed body will be, merely overlapping the excellent work performed by the Council for Scientific and Industrial Research."

I assure the House there will be no overlapping with the C.S.I.R. The Commonwealth body has already indicated that it will welcome the activities of the State organisation. The C.S.I.R. has done remarkably good work that has proved very valuable to Australia. Every State has benefited more or less from the scientific research that has been carried out. We cannot expect the C.S.I.R. to pay much attention to the work that will be done by the State bureau. There is no reason, however, why our organisation should not take advantage of anything that has been accomplished or that may be accomplished in the future by the Commonwealth body.

Some members referred to other organisations that at various times had done good work, as well as to individuals who, in an honorary capacity, had given much of their time and devoted their abilities to the welfare of the State. The Government greatly appreciates all that has been done in that direction. I do not wish to belittle anything that has been accomplished in the past, but give every credit to those organisations and public-spirited men who have done so much for the State. No doubt some of the individuals referred to will be associated with the proposed bureau, but I am sure no member would expect them to devote their whole time to the systematic work that must necessarily devolve upon the officers concerned.

The Bill provides that members of the bureau shall be paid fees and expenses. They will be called upon to attend meetings only periodically, and the expense will not be great.

Hon. W. J. Mann: We are not certain that such circumstances will prevail.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: It is apparent from the Bill that they will prevail. The director, who will be a full-time officer, will, of course, receive a salary. I wish here to reply to statements made as to the type of man required to fill this position. The salary we may have to pay and the term of office for which the officer may be appointed have not yet been determined. In introducing the Bill I stated that the Government had no man in view. That is so. Much will depend upon the man available as to what salary will be offered. We have not said whether the salary will be £1,000 or £2,000 a year; neither have we said the appointment will be made for seven years, although provision for that term is contained in the Bill. We may have an opportunity to appoint a gentleman who would not be prepared to take the position for less than seven years, or the Government may be able to adopt the suggestion offered by some members that the gentleman chosen for the position should be appointed for a limited term only, on probation, as one member suggested, and then be given the appointment permanently. The proposal is a new departure for Western Australia.

The Minister for Employment has stated he will not be antagonistic to any reasonable amendment that may be moved in Committee. All that we seek is to make the Bill a

success. Seeing that a Royal Commissioner was appointed and made recommendations, inclusive of the establishment of the proposed bureau, provided we can secure the services of the right man and men for the positions set out in the Bill, eventually great value will accrue to the State. I do not suggest that Western Australia would immediately reap any benefit from the establishment of the bureau, for whoever is appointed will require time in which to survey the position.

Hon. A. Thomson: It will at least be a start.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: Yes. For this reason I suggest that members, instead of opposing the Bill, should pass it so that a start may be made with the scheme as early as possible. If they consider some of the features of the measure are undesirable, these can be dealt with in Committee, and the Government will give consideration to any suggestions offered. Some members consider that the bureau will be costly. We have no accurate estimate of the cost.

Hon. H. Tuckey: Would all the members of the bureau be paid?

The CHIEF SECRETARY: The director would be a full-time officer, and he must necessarily be paid a comparatively high salary. The other members of the bureau will receive fees only when attending meetings, and be repaid any expenses they incur in connection with their work. We expect the bureau to cost not more than £5,000 a year, and certainly less than that to begin with.

Members have suggested that a big staff would be built up, and that before long an expensive organisation would be brought into being. The Bill provides that advantage may be taken of the various Government departments to assist in carrying on the operations of the bureau. As much use as possible will be made of all existing organisations within the Government service. This will be of great help. Once the director has settled down to his work, he will make recommendations from time to time. These will be considered by his colleagues and eventually brought before the Government. Cabinet will then decide whether they shall be given effect to. I see no prospect of any big organisation being brought into being, at any rate for some time to come. The cost may be considerably less than the figure mentioned, especially

should it be found that there is a sufficient number of public-spirited men of the necessary qualifications willing and ready to act in an honorary capacity. The Bill expressly sets forth that the bureau shall co-operate with Federal and State institutions or bodies whose powers and functions are either wholly or in part of a nature similar to those of the bureau, and to collaborate with such bodies when such collaboration may be beneficial to the development of the industries in the State. Scientific problems are only part of the difficulties that have to be overcome if more industries are to be established in this State.

The necessary foundations of knowledge on which to base a policy of industrial development and action in furtherance of that policy are much wider and more complex than a mere acquaintance with certain technical aspects of industry. What is required is as much information as possible regarding every factor that bears on the economic progress of this State, so that a systematic attempt can be made to devise means of pushing ahead with the development of our secondary industries.

Both Mr. Parker and Mr. Holmes see in the Bill an admission of the incompetence of the Government. If it is an admission of incompetence to desire to obtain in a systematic manner a complete and expert knowledge of the State's industrial activities and possibilities for future development, then the hon. members are no doubt correct in their contention. The Government believes that the economic problems of the day are too intricate to enable any degree of certainty to be achieved by the old haphazard methods. The idea that action without study—whether in respect of private industry or Government—is good enough for the practical world in which we now live is one calculated to disturb even the most complacent citizen.

Another statement by Mr. Parker was that the whole Bill was designed to aid the Minister to do a job the Minister himself should do. I ask the hon. member to read Clause 27 of the Bill again, and then explain how it is possible for any Minister absorbed in the duties of administration to undertake the full time job of carrying out all the various duties and functions enumerated in that clause. While many duties are outlined in the Bill, nobody expects that the bureau will

be giving consideration to all those matters at the one time. They are merely an indication of the field to be covered by the bureau as opportunity offers. No Minister could be expected to have the same degree of specialised knowledge as would be made available to Cabinet through the medium of the bureau.

Quite a number of members have referred to the fact that South Australia has been able to accomplish quite a lot without having a bureau established by Parliament. Very little has been said about the Queensland bureau which, I believe, was the first of its kind established in Australia. That bureau has met with quite a lot of success. I do not wish to belittle what has been accomplished in South Australia. I believe that the men who have been advising the South Australian Government have been actuated by the best of motives and have been very successful in certain directions. Only this week there is a reference in the Press to a new industry to be established in South Australia.

Hon. L. B. Bolton: Because the conditions were so favourable there.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: That industry is to employ something like 300 men. A few days before that I read in the Press or in a magazine a statement that the self-same industry was likely to be established in Victoria, on the outskirts of Geelong. Evidently South Australia has been able to offer to this British firm conditions preferable to those available in Victoria. The establishment of this industry has some connection with the defence policy of the Commonwealth. But does it matter very much what method we adopt, so long as we are successful in increasing the number of industries in Western Australia, or improving the industries already established here? If we are successful in assisting established industries carrying on in a small way to extend until they reach large proportions and provide employment for men and particularly for the youth of the State, the objective will have been attained. This Bill represents an ideal based on the recommendation of the Royal Commission, and as such is entitled to all possible consideration. Recently there visited this State a prominent South Australian in the person of the Hon. E. W. Holden, M.L.C., who has been referred to by various speakers on this measure.

Hon. A. Thomson: He condemned the Bill for a start and blessed it in the end.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: That is why I wish to refer to him. I wish to show the danger that exists in giving information to a gentleman of the standing of Mr. Holden that was perhaps erroneous or did not contain the whole of the facts. The Minister for Employment (Hon. A. R. G. Hawke), who every member will agree is very conscientious in his work and has been very keen to get something in the nature of the bureau established, took the opportunity to have interviews with Mr. Holden. Mr. Hawke had also read some of the remarks passed in this Chamber, and he has written a few lines to me telling me that if I cared to use them, I might do so. Perhaps it would be advisable at this stage to inform the House what Mr. Hawke had to say on this phase. He wrote—

As a result of receiving information from different sources regarding the possible opposition of members of the council of the Chambers of Manufactures to the Bureau of Industry Bill, I had a discussion with Mr. Bartington, the President of the Chamber. Subsequently, I met the majority of the members of the council on Tuesday, the 8th November, 1938. The principle and provisions of the Bill were fully and frankly discussed, with the result that many misunderstandings were removed. Some of the members of the council to whom the provisions of the Bill had been wrongly explained by its opponents personally conveyed to me their approval of the principle of the Bill and of its contents generally.

The Hon. E. W. Holden, M.L.C., who was recently elected as president of the United Chambers of Manufactures of Australia, discussed our Bureau of Industry Bill at some of the meetings he addressed in Perth recently. He expressed his approval of the principle in the Bill, but criticised the machinery provisions and expressed the opinion that the object in view could be better dealt with by other means.

#### *Point of Order.*

Hon. C. F. Baxter: On a point of order, is it permissible for the sponsor of a Bill in another place to have a statement by him read in this House? It is certainly very unusual; I have never known it to be done before.

The Deputy President: The Chief Secretary is quite in order if the Minister for Employment made those remarks outside the precincts of the House. The hon. member may take them for what they are worth.

The Chief Secretary: I am not quoting anything that was said by the Minister in another place.

Hon. C. F. Baxter: It is very unusual; you are creating a precedent.

The Chief Secretary: It may be unusual.

Hon. C. F. Baxter: Very unusual.

The Chief Secretary: Still, I do not see anything wrong in what I have done. I am informing the House of something that actually occurred and I think I am quite in order in doing so. This statement describes something that took place outside Parliament and indicates what happened regarding the Chambers of Manufactures and their attitude to this measure.

The Deputy President: I can find only two Standing Orders having any bearing at all. Standing Order 390 states that no member shall read extracts from newspapers or other documents referring to debates in the Council during the same session. Members will agree that that Standing Order is more often honoured in the breach than the observance. Standing Order 392 states that no member shall allude to any debate of the current session in the Assembly, or to any measure impending therein. That is another Standing Order more often honoured in the breach than the observance. What the Chief Secretary is doing does not infringe either of those Standing Orders.

#### *Debate Resumed.*

The CHIEF SECRETARY: In quoting what another Minister has written to me, I consider that I am merely following the procedure that has been adopted by almost every member who has read communications received from various sources. This is an important measure, and as the Chambers of Manufactures have been mentioned and as Mr. Holden has been held up as an authority and frequently quoted, it is just as well for members to know exactly what happened. Most members have suggested that Mr. Holden is a man whose views we can safely accept and possibly follow. Therefore I think it only right that I should tell members what happened between Mr. Holden and the Minister who introduced the Bill in another place. Mr. Hawke's communication continued—

I had two or three private discussions with Mr. Holden, and it was subsequently arranged that I should again meet the members of the council of the local Chamber of Manufactures and that Mr. Holden should be present at the meeting. The meeting was held on Friday, the 11th November, 1938. Mr. Holden expressed his views regarding our Bill and also explained what had been done and was being

done in South Australia in an endeavour to increase the volume of manufacturing industry in that State.

It appeared to me Mr. Holden did not have very much knowledge regarding the provisions of our Bill. He was asked whether he had studied the Bill carefully. He admitted he had not even seen the Bill, but had been told about it by some of those who were opposed to it.

I again fully and frankly discussed the principle and provisions of the Bill with Mr. Holden and the manufacturers present. At the conclusion of the discussion, there could be no doubt but that every person present realised that the Bill, if approved and passed into law, would be a very valuable means of promoting secondary industry in Western Australia.

Hon. L. B. Bolton: That is entirely wrong.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: Mr. Hawke continued—

Mr. Holden himself expressed the view that as legislation had been decided upon, our Bill, with certain modifications, should be passed. He stated that the scheme set out in the Bill would depend very largely for its success upon the ability and suitability of the person chosen to be the director of the bureau and on the actual work carried out by the bureau. It was arranged that a copy of the Bill should be obtained and placed in the possession of Mr. Holden during the day. As he was leaving for Adelaide the following night and as his programme prior to leaving was a very busy one, he said he would not be able to study the Bill until after his return to Adelaide. He undertook to forward to me, in writing, views and suggestions as to how our bureau, when established, could co-operate upon the most progressive lines.

Hon. L. B. Bolton: That is entirely wrong and misleading. I was present.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: That is all I desire to quote. The hon. member says that the Minister for Employment is entirely wrong.

Hon. L. B. Bolton: His impression is entirely wrong.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: We can leave members to determine who is right and who is wrong from Mr. Holden's public statements which most members have read and some of which have been quoted in this Chamber.

Hon. L. B. Bolton: I myself quoted them.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: The bureau is a new departure, an experiment that we believe will be of very great value to the State. If it cost £5,000 a year and were successful, it would be a cheap experiment indeed and one that would lead to additional prosperity for the secondary industries of Western Australia. I suppose we

are all imbued with the one idea of increasing the prosperity of Western Australia as quickly as possible. If we can do as we hope to do, namely, increase the number of secondary industries operating in this State, or even if we can only increase the operations of industries already established here, great benefit must accrue, particularly as we cannot now rely upon our primary industries as we have done in the past. Notwithstanding the opposition voiced against the measure, I hope the second reading will be agreed to. If members feel there is room for an alteration to some of the provisions of the Bill, by all means let us have a chance of studying those provisions so that we may give a start to an organisation, the formation of which can only be in the best interests of the State.

The DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Before I put the motion for the second reading I remind hon. members that if any remark was made by the Chief Secretary with which they did not agree, they will have an opportunity of referring to it provided the Bill reaches the third reading stage.

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

Ayes	..	..	..	8
Noes	..	..	..	11
				—
Majority against	..	..	..	3
				—

#### AYES.

Hon. J. M. Drew	Hon. W. J. Mann
Hon. G. Fraser	Hon. T. Moore
Hon. E. H. Gray	Hon. A. Thomson
Hon. W. H. Kitson	Hon. C. H. Wittenoom (Teller.)

#### NOES.

Hon. C. F. Baxter	Hon. J. Nicholson
Hon. L. B. Bolton	Hon. H. V. Piesse
Hon. J. A. Dimmitt	Hon. H. Tuckey
Hon. V. Hamersley	Hon. G. B. Wood
Hon. J. M. Macfarlane	Hon. E. H. Hall (Teller.)
Hon. G. W. Miles	

#### PARTS

Ayes	Noes
Hon. W. R. Hall	Hon. H. Seddon
Hon. E. H. Angelo	Hon. J. J. Holmes
Hon. L. Craig	Hon. J. T. Franklin

Question thus negatived.

Bill defeated.

## BILL—LOTTERIES (CONTROL) ACT AMENDMENT.

### Second Reading.

Debate resumed from the 3rd November.

HON. L. B. BOLTON (Metropolitan) [8.7]: A similar measure for the continuance of the Lotteries (Control) Act has



been brought before the House each session since I have been a member, and I have very few remarks to offer now. I intend to oppose the suggestion that the Act should be continued for more than one year, the period agreed to on each occasion in the past. The House has always taken the precaution of providing for a continuance of the measure for one year only, and it is now more than ever necessary that the same period be stipulated in view of the outlook and the forthcoming elections. I make no bones about that. Because of those facts the House should retain the right to review the Act annually. As I and other members have said on former occasions, a yearly review makes for better working and generally means that there are likely to be fewer complaints. I desire to give the commission credit for the good work it has done but, good as the work has been, naturally it has not met with the approval of everybody. That is another reason why the House should keep a close watch on the operation of the Act and have an annual review.

I was sorry that the Minister, in his second reading speech, did not supply us with figures of the operations of the commission for the previous 12 months, as he did last year. I have no desire to over-criticise the Government, but when one moves around the State, as I do, one cannot help hearing complaints. One cause for complaint was brought under my notice recently when I saw in a country newspaper something that made me wonder whether certain hospitals are putting to the best possible use the large amounts of money granted to them by the commission. I refer to an advertisement stating that no out-patients whatever would be treated in the future unless they paid cash for such treatment. I strongly object to an advertisement of that kind coming from a public hospital.

Hon. A. Thomson: Is that a committee hospital or a Government hospital?

Hon. L. B. BOLTON: It is a committee hospital, assisted by the Government. According to the records it has received large sums of money. Everybody knows that many members of the general public who can pay hospital fees do not do so. I have had considerable experience of hospital control, and I know the difficulties those managing such hospitals experience with people who can but will not pay. At the same time

members will agree that for a hospital to insert in a paper such an advertisement is not right. That hospital is a little over 100 miles from Perth. There is one local doctor who does all the work. I have a tremendous amount of sympathy for that doctor because there are people who go to him for treatment and can afford to pay but do not pay. Some inquiry ought to be made as to the reason for that advertisement in view of the fact that the Lotteries Commission donates so much per annum towards these institutions.

Hon. A. Thomson: Is the man a Government doctor?

Hon. L. B. BOLTON: I cannot say: I only know he does a tremendous amount of charitable work, and I presume he would be paid by the Government for a portion of his work, because he has the oversight of a native camp about 14 miles from the hospital. I have been in his presence when he has been called out to the camp at all hours of the night, and he has willingly attended to the natives requiring his help.

The Chief Secretary: Could you supply the name of the hospital?

Hon. L. B. BOLTON: Yes. I refer to the Moora Hospital, and Dr. Miles is the gentleman I have mentioned. The Moora hospital has received a great deal of help from the Charities Department, and I do not think the institution was within its rights in advertising as it did, especially in times like these, though Moora, having a good season, will be in possession of a little cash. In any case, the advertisement is not of the kind that should be published by any hospital receiving Government assistance.

Last year the Chief Secretary told us the Lotteries Commission had distributed £28,590 to hospitals. This year the amount is £37,652. There is on the list for this year an item which I did not see last year, of £1,247 for hospital social service. Again, last year we were told £8,538 was distributed amongst the various orphanages. All institutions assisted were enumerated on that occasion. Members should be furnished with that information once a year. That is why I favour a continuance of the Lotteries Commission for one year only. Another amount that attracted my attention in 1927 was £4,119 donated to "General Distress" for the purchase of blankets, sheets, and other goods. This year the amount is £3,635. While I am pleased to see a reduction in the amount,

yet I am sorry that so much money is being taken from the commission for that purpose. I have previously expressed the opinion, and I express it again, that the commission's funds should be devoted primarily to hospitals, orphanages and so forth, and that money to relieve the distress mentioned should not come out of lottery funds.

The Chief Secretary: It is all in accordance with the Act.

Hon. L. B. BOLTON: That may be, but I consider that all lotteries funds should be devoted to hospitals, orphanages and so forth. I expect this measure to pass the second reading, but I sincerely hope that members will agree with me that the term should be for one year only. I have no desire to delay the House by discussing amendments which will be fully dealt with in Committee.

The only other matter I wish to mention is one which does not meet with the approval of the powers that be. I still oppose the numerous permits given for street collections and raffles for charity. If the Lotteries Commission intends to continue granting such permits, the greatest care should be taken before they are issued. The commission should adopt a policy operating more fairly than the policy which has resulted in certain permits having been given or having been refused. In a certain town an application for a permit was made by the local branch of the Country Women's Association. No one will deny that the branches of the association do wonderful work in numerous districts. For years this branch had received a permit to raffle a huge Christmas stocking in aid of the branch funds. Almost by the same mail an application was made on behalf of a local church for a permit to raffle a £1 note in aid of the church funds. The church was given permission immediately; but only after strenuous efforts, and two or three weeks' delay and wire pulling, was permission obtained for the Country Women's Association raffle. That is another reason why I consider it wise that the House should have an annual opportunity to overhaul the Act. I shall vote for the second reading of the Bill, but in Committee I shall oppose continuance for more than one year.

HON. G. B. WOOD (East) [8.21]: The time has arrived for us to acknowledge that the lotteries have come to stay. The lottery

scheme has been in the experimental stage for six years, and I venture to say that to-day very few members of Parliament would be prepared to abolish the lotteries. Therefore let us be honest with ourselves, and not fool around with the subject from one year's end to the other. I am definitely in favour of making the Act a permanent statute, and I shall vote accordingly. I have to admit that when Western Australia first decided to raise money by lotteries, I thought the State had slipped; but, like other people, I have got used to lotteries. Nearly everyone now accepts lotteries as a desirable way of raising money. That is not peculiar to Western Australia. The Minister has told us about other countries that conduct lotteries, and we know that in various Australian States a Lotteries Act is a permanency on the statute-book.

As regards the commissioners, I consider that if a man is worthy to be appointed for one year, he is worthy to stay in the position three years. That is not too long a term. If after three years he is found to have misbehaved in any way or not to have carried out his job, Parliament has the remedy. The chairman of the Lotteries Commission has held the position for two years, and has proved himself quite a desirable chairman.

I have examined the disbursements of the Lotteries Commission closely. To take just one month or one quarter is useless; one must examine the disbursements over the whole period of 12 months. Looking at a single return, one might think that a particular section of charities had received preference; but the next succeeding return would show corresponding treatment of another section of charities. An examination of the disbursements during a year would show that all charities and other causes in need of money had received fair treatment. Country hospitals and infant welfare centres, in particular, have received considerable amounts of money which they would not have received but for the lotteries. That is one of my chief reasons for supporting the Bill.

The measure stands in need of amendments. One relates to the number of lotteries to be drawn. In Queensland and elsewhere numerous lotteries are drawn, just according to the time required to fill them. When 100,000 tickets have been sold, a lottery is drawn. Recently a Queenslander sent

along his 10s. or £1 for a ticket in No. 59 lottery. He was too late for that lottery, but got into the next one and proved to be the winner of the £30,000 prize. I see no harm in that arrangement. I have looked into the business of the commission and have found 15 to 20 girls and men sorting marbles for the next lottery. That system is antiquated, and requires altering. I do hope the Act will be placed on a more permanent basis, so that the commissioners will be able to operate lotteries on somewhat the same lines as obtain in Queensland and New South Wales. I support the second reading.

**HON. L. CRAIG** (South-West) [8.27]: I have no strong convictions about the Bill, but I have previously voted for the extension of the Act, though not always approving of the extension of the appointment of the commissioners. The Bill proposes to extend the life of the commission by three years, instead of one year. It also seeks to extend the terms of the commissioners similarly. However, there is a safeguard, which has not been mentioned by members who have spoken so far. The Bill provides that any servant of the commission, including the commissioners, shall not be entitled to any compensation if their appointments are terminated before the end of the three years. That, in effect, means that the commission may be terminated by Parliament at any time. Therefore an extension of the life of the commission to three years is perfectly safe. In any one of the three years Parliament may order the commission to stop, and no compensation will be due to anybody associated with the commission.

**Hon. J. M. Macfarlane**: That makes it a permanent measure.

**Hon. L. CRAIG**: Nothing of the sort.

**Hon. J. Nicholson**: You are wrong there, quite wrong.

**Hon. L. CRAIG**: I am not wrong.

**Hon. J. M. Macfarlane**: Other commissioners could be appointed.

**Hon. L. CRAIG**: Not necessarily. If that is not so, my interpretation must be wrong. However, the point can be discussed in Committee. The amendments proposed have been mentioned by various members, and I need not repeat them. It is certainly desirable that the commission should not have to state a commencement and a closing date for a lottery. The Bill provides

that when the quota for a lottery is filled, any applications received after that shall automatically go into the next lottery. That is all I have to say on the Bill. I shall support the second reading, and if I have misinterpreted the meaning of the clause referred to, I will perhaps receive the explanation during the Committee stage.

The Chief Secretary: Look at Clause 9.

**HON. A. THOMSON** (South - East) [8.31]: No doubt the Government intends to make this legislation permanent. One reason why this House has insisted upon its being reviewed each year is that Parliament shall control the situation. By that means if we should consider anything wrong with the conduct of the lotteries, we have an opportunity to deal fully with the matter when the re-enacting legislation is before us. I am prepared to adopt the course followed in the past. When the late Mr. Scaddan, who lost his seat in Parliament through sponsoring legislation to establish lotteries, introduced the Bill, the intention was to stem the volume of money that annually left the State for investment in consultations in Tasmania and Queensland. The point was made at the time that if the money were retained in the State, hospitals and charitable institutions could be assisted. I admit that the State lotteries have functioned usefully. One reason advanced by the Chief Secretary in favour of the legislation being made permanent was that the members of the commission could then maintain continuity of policy. During the course of my negotiations with the commission I have found that any proposal that came within the scope of the Act was accorded every consideration, and support was rendered to the extent found possible.

In referring to the Perth Hospital the Chief Secretary said the Government hoped that if the legislation were made permanent, the Lotteries Commission would be able to provide interest and sinking fund payments over a number of years on the cost of erecting the new buildings. The cost of the new Perth Hospital has been estimated at £765,000, and the Minister informed the House that the money could not be provided from ordinary revenue. I was a member of another place when the original Lotteries (Control) Bill was introduced, and if my memory serves me aright, no inten-

tion was then indicated that the commission would be required to provide funds for any such purpose in the metropolitan area. When the Minister said that the Government could not provide the money from revenue, I interjected that the Government might consider imposing in the metropolitan area the form of taxation levied in the country districts. The Chief Secretary retorted that that subject was somewhat threadbare. When I raised the point on a previous occasion, we were told that the main reason why no financial assistance was required from the people in the metropolitan area in support of the Perth Hospital was that the vast majority of the patients treated there came from outside the metropolitan area.

The Chief Secretary: I do not think that statement has ever been made.

Hon. A. THOMSON: The Honorary Minister interjected to the effect that a large proportion came from outside the metropolitan area.

The Chief Secretary: You referred to the "vast majority" of the patients.

Hon. A. THOMSON: Well, I will say that he meant a large number of the patients came from outside the metropolitan area, and the Honorary Minister therefore asserted that the institution was a national hospital.

The Chief Secretary: There is a great difference between a "large number," and the "vast majority."

Hon. A. THOMSON: At any rate, that was the explanation of the differentiation between the city and the country areas. In view of that contention, I thought it time the matter was clarified and, on the 23rd August, I asked the following questions:—

1. (a) What was the total number of patients treated at the Perth Hospital during the year ended the 30th June, 1938? (b) How many of those patients were admitted from outside the metropolitan area? 2. (a) What were the total numbers of patients treated at the Government Hospitals at Busselton, Albany, Katanning and Merredin? (b) How many of such patients were admitted from outside the respective districts?

To those questions the Chief Secretary replied—

1. (a) In-patient admissions 5,810; (b) 815, but possibly some country patients may have given metropolitan addresses. 2. (a) Busselton, 507; Albany, 670; Katanning, 723; Merredin, 711. (b) Busselton, 114; Albany, 255; Katanning, 282; Merredin, 209.

Members will see from the questions and answers that the Perth Hospital treated 815 patients who came from outside the metropolitan area. As the total number treated was 5,810, the percentage of outside patients was 14. At the Busselton Hospital, the patients treated who came from outside the district represented 22 per cent.; at Albany, 38 per cent.; at Katanning, 39 per cent.; and at Merredin 20 per cent. I emphasise the fact that the four country hospitals I have quoted are Government institutions, and not committee hospitals. The total number of patients treated by those four hospitals was 2,611, and as the number of patients from outside those districts was 860, the average percentage of outside patients treated at those institutions represented 32 as against 14 in the city. The amazing thing is that, despite the fact that the four country hospitals I mentioned are Government institutions, the districts concerned cannot secure funds for the erection of the buildings unless the local authorities are prepared to find half the money. Although I have drawn attention to this point so often, I again ask, in justice to the people residing outside the metropolitan area, whether the House considers it reasonable or fair that the country people should be required to find half the cost of their buildings, whereas the people of the metropolitan area are not required to contribute at all towards the construction of their hospital. The country people are required not only to provide half the money for their buildings, but also to pay a hospital rate each year.

The Chief Secretary: Do you think your comparison is fair?

Hon. A. THOMSON: Quite fair, because all four institutions are Government hospitals. The Perth Hospital is a Government institution. Why should there be separate policies, one for the country and the other for the city?

Hon. V. Hamersley: And even so, you have referred to four hospitals only, whereas there are hospitals scattered right through the country areas.

Hon. A. THOMSON: That is correct.

The Chief Secretary: Is it not rather a matter of the metropolitan area as compared with road board areas?

Hon. A. THOMSON: That is quite a different proposition. Practically half the population of the State resides in the metropolitan area. Nevertheless, the Government

is prepared to supply those people with a new hospital at a cost of £765,000, and desires the interest and sinking fund payments to be provided by the Lotteries Commission over a series of years. The Government does not apply that policy to the country areas. The people in the outer areas do not take exception to the payment of the hospital rate, or even to the raising of funds for the erection of the hospital buildings, but they do take exception to a different policy being adopted in the thickly-populated metropolitan area.

Hon. V. Hamersley: Even though you pay, you cannot gain admission to the Perth Hospital.

Hon. A. THOMSON: That is so, whereas in the country districts we have provided intermediate wards where patients can secure accommodation.

Hon. V. Hamersley: And are never refused.

Hon. A. THOMSON: I hope that the Government, when they erect the new hospital buildings, will make provision for paying patients to get treatment.

The Chief Secretary: That is one big difference between the Perth Hospital and those of which you speak.

Hon. A. THOMSON: No. Anyhow, I have quoted the percentages. Even if the country percentage were cut down by one half, the present system would still be unjust to the rural centres.

I was rather surprised at the reason advanced by Mr. Wood for supporting the Bill. He considered the present commissioners should be appointed for three years. I do not think that any member who favours the continuance of this legislation has any desire to cast a reflection upon the chairman of the commission. At the same time, those who believe in Parliament retaining control do contend that the question of the continuance of the lotteries should come up for review each year, so that if there is anything of which members do not approve an opportunity will be afforded to discuss it. Mr. Kenneally has occupied the position of chairman of the Lotteries Commission for three years, and no question of confidence in him is involved. The request for this annual review is based on principle.

The difficulty encountered by the Country Women's Association in obtaining permission to conduct a lottery has been dealt with by Mr. Bolton. I am sorry that the work

of this organisation is not regarded by the Lotteries Commission as work that it can assist. The Great Southern branch of the association consists of women banded together to help their own sex.

Hon. J. M. Macfarlane: The organisation is entirely non-political.

Hon. A. THOMSON: That is so. One object for which the association has been working very hard is to establish a seaside home at Albany so that women and young children from the Great Southern districts, who are not in a position to pay boarding-house fees but can afford nominal fees, may have an opportunity to go to the seaside for rest and recuperation. Members representing Great Southern constituencies waited on the chairman of the Lotteries Commission and submitted the case for consideration. I regret the decision of the chairman that this activity did not come within the list of those that the Act authorised the commission to assist. The association, as Mr. Macfarlane interjected, is non-political and it is also non-sectarian, and for those reasons I am a very keen supporter of it. I wish it were possible to include this work amongst the various objects that might be assisted by the lotteries. I have no objection to the commission paying out money to help people in need of blankets and warm clothing, but if the commission interprets the Act in such a way that aid can be granted for those purposes, surely it should be able to help a movement for providing assistance of this sort.

I am quite in accord with the proposal that the lotteries should be drawn as soon as filled. I can see no objection to that. Provision is made for the Auditor General to conduct a full audit. Since the inception of the lotteries the books have been audited by men who know their work and against whom no complaint whatever has been made. If the Auditor General has to detail an officer of his department to make the audit, there will be no saving in cost. The present auditors should be allowed to continue, the Auditor General could still exercise oversight, and a system that has proved satisfactory could be retained. Some people contend that we, by continuing the lotteries, are condoning gambling.

The Chief Secretary interjected.

Hon. A. THOMSON: But the Auditor General could do what he does for other departments: he could check the work of the

regular auditors and submit his report to Parliament. The Minister has in mind another matter that is not under discussion at present. I have no desire to delay the measure. I support the second reading, but hope the House will retain control by insisting upon this legislation being submitted for renewal each year.

**HON. H. V. PIESSE** (South-East) [8.52]: The second reading of the Bill will certainly have my support. When this legislation was introduced five or six years ago, I was a supporter of a three-year period, and on this occasion I intend to give that matter serious consideration when the Committee stage is reached. Those who have had an opportunity to see the work made possible by the grants of the commission must congratulate that body upon its excellent achievements. The members of the commission have made many inspections of country districts and have acquired considerable knowledge of the work in the districts in which the money has been expended. I was pleased to hear Mr. Thomson refer to the Perth Hospital project. On four different occasions I have endeavoured to get men admitted to the Perth Hospital, and only once was I successful. On that occasion I managed to persuade the authorities to accept a patient from Katanning for an operation, but perhaps the doctor in charge agreed because his wife happened to be in hospital at the time. In the other instances I was unsuccessful. The Katanning hospital is used by people from all parts of the Great Southern. There are two resident doctors, and though I do not claim that they are better than doctors in other centres, they certainly are good men. During the last 15 months difficulty has been experienced in obtaining doctors. Dumbleyung and Kondinin have been without a resident doctor for some time. There have not been enough doctors to provide the medical services required in various centres.

We in Katanning have an excellent ambulance, a large proportion of the cost of which was provided by the Lotteries Commission. We have been very grateful for the assistance rendered by the commission. Some of our requests for equipment have not been granted immediately, but I understand that the X-ray plant at the Katanning hospital is one of the finest in any

country town. I have been pleased to visit towns like Narrogin, Pingelly and Mt. Barker, to note the neatness of the hospitals and to learn of the good work being carried on in those centres. The provision of hospital comforts has been made possible largely by the grants of the Lotteries Commission.

Hon. A. Thomson: Do not forget that the people of Katanning raised thousands of pounds as well.

Hon. H. V. PIESSE: I have mentioned that before.

The Honorary Minister: It is a good centre.

Hon. H. V. PIESSE: The people are certainly to be congratulated upon the work they have done. The local branch of the R.S.L. provided an operating table for the Katanning hospital, and I have been informed that there is none better in Australia. Everybody has been ready to help in the work of assisting the hospital. The people of Katanning are not singular in this respect. In many other towns the people have worked equally well to assist the hospitals. They have not only given individual help but have also rated themselves. In view of the large hospital projected for Perth, surely the ratepayers of the city should contribute to its cost.

When I was in Queensland recently I took an opportunity to inspect some of the admirable hospital buildings there. Those hospitals have been erected from the proceeds of lotteries. Undoubtedly it is an excellent way of providing funds to instal this most necessary service for the sick. One of our first considerations should certainly be for the sick.

Hon. J. M. Macfarlane: Out of evil cometh good.

Hon. H. V. PIESSE: That is so, but it cannot be gainsaid that the raising of money by lotteries has not proved to be such a serious matter as some members feared when this legislation was originally introduced. Not many years have elapsed since it was impossible to walk down the streets of Perth without being held up to buy lottery tickets. Although quite a number of people are selling lottery tickets today, I understand that the control of ticket-selling is well in hand. Certainly I have heard no complaints on that score.

Reference has been made to the auditing of the commission's accounts. I hap-

pen to know a little about auditing and perhaps I shall be able to give the Chief Secretary a little information. Where auditors are appointed in a joint capacity, it does not necessarily follow that they are being paid double fees.

The Honorary Minister: It means double expense.

Hon. H. V. PIESSE: That is not so. If the Auditor General were called upon to audit the books of the Lotteries Commission, there would be no greater expense to the Commission, because the cost would be practically divided. Various societies, such as the A.M.P., have joint auditors. The reason for adopting this system is that those bodies obtain better information from the principals of the two firms employed, and thus get better service. Throughout Australia leading insurance companies to-day are employing joint auditors. The firm performing this audit in conjunction with the Auditor General receives a small remuneration. Why should we not adhere to the principle of joint auditors? If this private firm is no longer employed, the staff of the Auditor General will have to be increased to cope with the additional work.

Hon. J. M. Macfarlane interjected.

Hon. H. V. PIESSE: I think the principle is sound so far as public funds are concerned. If private concerns consider the appointment of joint auditors desirable and necessary, surely such an appointment is desirable and necessary in this case. I have no objection to the extension of the term of the commission to three years. If men have been in a position for 12 months and are found to be satisfactory, no objection should be raised to their being appointed for a term of three years, which is not very long. The chairman of the commission and his colleagues have performed their duties in an excellent manner. Like Mr. Wood, I visited the lotteries office at the invitation of the chairman. I saw young ladies at work separating the marbles and putting them back ready for the next draw. What I saw makes me a staunch supporter of the amendment now before the House which will have the effect of doing away with that unnecessary work. A saving of £50 on each lottery will result, so Mr. Kenneally informed me, if that work is discontinued. Lotteries should be drawn immediately they are filled. That is the practice in Queensland and Tasmania. The Lotteries Commission is at present more

necessary than it has ever been for the raising of money for charitable purposes. I support the second reading of the Bill, reserving to myself the right to arrive at a decision upon the suggested three years' period after I have heard the discussion.

**HON. J. M. MACFARLANE** (Metropolitan-Suburban) [9.4]: Ever since this legislation was introduced, I have supported the provision for its renewal each year. I have not altered that view. I do not favour the suggestion to make the commission permanent, or to extend its term to three years. The measure was first introduced to regulate scandalous conditions that prevailed at the time, conditions somewhat similar to those now prevailing and under discussion in another place. Those members who objected to the gambling instincts of our people being pandered to felt that gambling could be regulated by a State lottery. By that means all other lotteries then conducted for various purposes, including, it was said, political purposes, would be abolished. The crossword puzzle was a gambling stunt at the time and, as members are aware, it was then anything but pleasant to walk along the streets of the city and note the gambling that was going on. I supported the measure at the time, as Parliament was afforded an annual check of the operations of the Lotteries Commission. We decided to limit the legislation to one year, because it was thought the machine might be used for purposes other than regulating gambling. For that reason I oppose the extension of the term of the commission.

I realise the excellent work the commission has carried on year by year. Our country hospitals have benefited greatly by the commission's support. I desire to pay a tribute to our country people who have established hospitals in various districts, whether the hospitals be committee hospitals or Government hospitals. To provide hospital facilities these people tax themselves over and above the ordinary taxation that they pay. I cannot agree with the argument advanced by Mr. Thomson in regard to the Perth Hospital. In my opinion, he made an unfair comparison.

Hon. A. Thomson: I do not think so; otherwise I would not have made the comparison. I am not contending the Perth Hospital should not be re-built.

Hon. J. M. MACFARLANE: I accept that statement, but I still contend the hon. member made a wrong comparison. The Perth Hospital admits country cases, cases that cannot be dealt with by the country hospitals. Some country patients are nursed at the Perth Hospital for months, even years.

Hon. A. Thomson: That applies to country hospitals.

Hon. J. M. MACFARLANE: But the percentage would be considerably lower. As a rule, country patients are not in hospital for any great length of time. When the Perth Hospital has been rebuilt, it will probably accommodate still greater numbers of country patients.

I agree that each lottery should be drawn immediately it is filled, and not drawn *pro rata*, as now, if it is not filled. Clause 8 of the Bill proposes to amend Section 15 of the Act, dealing with the granting of permits by the commission for lotteries. I hope there will not be an increase of lotteries, as they might then become a nuisance and even a menace. While we can congratulate the commission upon what it has accomplished, I think we may also congratulate Parliament for the way in which it controls the operations of the commission year by year. Another item with which I wish to deal is the appointment of outside auditors. I have a clear recollection that when this legislation was first introduced, a suggestion was made that the Auditor General should have the oversight of the outside auditors. I feel sure members will agree with me in that.

The Chief Secretary: The Act contains that provision. It was an oversight that private auditors were not previously eliminated.

Hon. J. M. MACFARLANE: It was not an oversight. The intention was that the Auditor General should supervise the work of the outside auditors, in much the same way as Parliament has an oversight of the work of the commission. I oppose the extension of the term of the commission, but will support the second reading of the Bill with a view to securing amendments upon those points that I do not consider favourable to my views.

HON. C. H. WITTENOOM (South-East) [9.13]: I shall be very brief, because the measure is essentially one for discussion in Committee. Like most members, I shall vote

for the second reading, because of the excellent help that has been afforded in all directions through the efficient work carried on by the chairman of the commission and all those associated with him. I doubt if we could secure other persons to conduct the lotteries as they have been conducted hitherto. The commission has assisted country hospitals to erect additions. It has also given financial assistance to other hospitals and infant health centres, besides dispensing various other kinds of charity. Since the establishment of the Lotteries Commission, there has been a great difference in our system of raising money for charity. The selling of buttons in the street has almost been discontinued.

Hon. A. Thomson: It is not likely to be wholly discontinued.

Hon. C. H. WITTENOOM: Perhaps not. I would be sorry if the Lotteries Commission were done away with. Regarding the proposed amendments, I shall reserve my decision until the Bill reaches the Committee stage. The lotteries have had a trial extending over several years. I too have gone into the office of the commission and seen what is done there with the marbles. If some other system could be devised, a good deal of economy could be effected. I was told by one member how much could be saved every month if some other than the marble system could be adopted.

Hon. A. Thomson: As soon as a lottery is filled the drawing could take place and the next lottery be proceeded with. That would obviate the necessity for a readjustment of the marbles.

Hon. C. H. WITTENOOM: That is a good idea. The work that has been done is a tribute to Mr. Kenneally and his colleagues. I shall vote for the second reading, and in Committee will give consideration to the various amendments.

On motion by Hon. V. Hamersley, debate adjourned.

## BILL—INSPECTION OF SCAFFOLDING ACT AMENDMENT.

*In Committee.*

Hon. G. Fraser in the Chair; the Honorary Minister in charge of the Bill.

Clauses 1, 2—agreed to.



Clause 3—Amendment of Section 2:

Hon. A. THOMSON: I move an amendment—

That paragraph (b) be struck out.

Unless this paragraph is deleted any scaffolding that is less than 8 ft. from the ground can be brought within the scope of the Act, and an inspection thereof made. That is wholly unnecessary.

The HONORARY MINISTER: This Bill has been brought down as a result of the experience of the department. The Act itself is administered with ordinary common-sense. No fault would be found with a scaffolding unless there was some weakness in it, or it constituted a danger to the life and limb of men working upon it. As the law stands, inspectors can take no action in respect of a scaffolding that is less than 8 feet high, no matter how dangerous it may be. The Bill has been inspired by the Chief Inspector.

Hon. C. F. Baxter: Then he has gone down in my estimation.

Hon. J. M. Macfarlane: Have any accidents occurred to men who have worked on scaffolding less than 8 feet in height?

The HONORARY MINISTER: Yes. No further cost will be placed upon contractors by the passage of this clause.

Hon. C. F. BAXTER: This paragraph may be deemed to apply to a plank that is placed upon two boxes. If a person used such a stand, he would have to notify the department. The Act could then be made to apply to the very smallest of jobs.

The CHAIRMAN: I point out that if the amendment is carried, the section will terminate at the word "structure," and there will be nothing to show what that word means.

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: The point taken by Mr. Baxter is a material one. But for a limitation in the height of scaffolding, it would have applied to a box upon which a woman was standing whilst cleaning a window. The definition of scaffolding was originally embodied in the Act of 1924. It applied to any structure exceeding 8 feet from the horizontal base that was used for the support of workmen. If the words are struck out of the Act, "scaffolding" will mean any structure, and thus we would be widening the definition to include something that was never intended. Much trouble would inevitably be caused.

The HONORARY MINISTER: I cannot imagine that Mr. Nicholson is serious. Scaffolding for carpenters, painters, plumbers, and others working on wooden buildings is clearly defined in paragraph 6 of the Schedule to the Act, and I certainly cannot picture a householder working on scaffolding that would require standards of not less than 3in. x 2in. of hardwood or 4in. x 2in. of pine spaced not more than 9ft. apart, etc., as is there prescribed. The hon. member's argument is hopelessly foreign to the proposal. To say that anyone using a couple of boxes and a plank would be subject to inspection is absurd. We merely ask that all scaffolding as defined be brought under the Act.

Hon. J. M. Macfarlane: Are not you widening the definition under this Bill?

The HONORARY MINISTER: Yes, to bring in scaffolding.

Hon. J. M. Macfarlane: You said something about rotten planks being used.

The HONORARY MINISTER: Unsafe scaffolding that is exempt under the Act has been used, and the inspector has had no power to enforce requirements.

Hon. A. THOMSON: Under the Bill any plank used at any height will be subject to inspection. I am not objecting to a later provision to deal with scaffolding that might be dangerous to life or limb. Men working on scaffolding exercise commonsense; the average man values his life sufficiently to safeguard himself to a large extent, though accidents of course will happen. Under the Bill, however, scaffolding only one foot or two feet high would have to be inspected.

Progress reported.

## BILL—COMPANIES ACT AMENDMENT.

### *Second Reading.*

HON. C. F. BAXTER (East) [9.41] in moving the second reading said: This is not a voluminous Bill. One might have classed it as a very vigorous tree when it was introduced in another place, but a tornado struck it, and only one branch remains. That branch, however, is important in that it relates to the hawking of shares, and if this House approves of the measure, an end will be put to that practice. People need protection against salesmen who go from house

to house and from business to business with the object of taking advantage of the unsuspecting by pushing share transactions.

I have a vivid recollection of an incident in Perth not 12 months ago. A business man who holds a large parcel of shares in New Zealand pine forests received a letter from Sydney referring to his holding, and informing him that the value of the shares was 42s. A fortnight later he received another letter advising him not to dispose of his shares. A month afterwards he received a letter from a solicitor in Melbourne, informing him of the likelihood of a big move occurring and of the chance of his doing excellent business. Yet a month later he received a visit from two very smart gentlemen from Sydney, and the proposition they put to him was, "You hold so many shares in New Zealand pine forests. If you purchase half that number from us, we are prepared to supply them at 30s. and within a period of three or four months we guarantee to sell the whole of your shares for you at 42s." The bait was, "This offer is open only to present shareholders." Inquiries were made in Sydney as to the identity of the visitors, and they were found to have a little office in a back street and to be of no consequence and no standing. The Melbourne solicitor was found to belong to the snide class—one of the type prepared to do any business of that nature. No business was done; the man naturally suspected the existence of a nigger in the woodpile.

Subsequently, the two men were arrested in Sydney, but not before they had obtained a large sum of money from various people. One person in Fremantle lost £600 through the machinations of the same men. Legislation is required to protect people against salesmen of that sort. To say that people should not be foolish is well enough, but these smart business men seem able to find mugs on every day of the week. They are certainly very clever in presenting their propositions to prospective victims. That is practically all the Bill provides for. This is essentially a matter for consideration in Committee, and if any further information is desired by members, it can be supplied at that stage. I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

On motion by the Chief Secretary, debate adjourned.

## **BILL—QUALIFICATION OF ELECTORS (LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL).**

### *Second Reading.*

Debate resumed from the previous day.

**HON. C. F. BAXTER** (East) [9.45]: We have had Bills of this description before us on several occasions, although the measures have varied a little. I cannot understand why a Bill of a more comprehensive nature has not been introduced, in order that this House might be put on a more solid foundation. Over and over again the statement has been made that the Legislative Council represents only a small section of the people—that it represents only a minority. People say this is not right, and that such a state of affairs should not be allowed to continue. I think there are about 86,000 people on the Legislative Council roll for the ten provinces. Admittedly that is not a very large number, especially when compared with the total enrolment for the Legislative Assembly, which is 240,000 odd. The enrolment for the Council is about a third of that for the Assembly. Accordingly there seems to be some ground for complaint regarding the relatively small number of people on the Legislative Council roll.

This position is not due to the franchise not being broad enough. It arises from two causes. One is the neglect by people having the requisite qualifications to seek enrolment; and the other, worse still, is the neglect of Governments over a long period of years to provide funds to enable the Legislative Council roll to be put in order. The number of people on the roll for the Central Province at the last election was 5,980. I have no hesitation in saying that if the roll were brought up to date, more than double that number of people would be enrolled.

**Hon. J. M. Macfarlane:** It is the same in every province.

**Hon. C. F. BAXTER:** Pretty well the same. Members representing the provinces have had to attend to the roll, but they cannot afford to finance such work. Six years ago, 18 months before an election, I set out to bring the roll up to date. Before I had gone very far I realised it was a tall order. I placed 800 names on the roll within a few months, and discovered that by spending a large sum of money, and by going to a good deal of trouble, I could increase that

number considerably. This should not be the duty of members. People should be impressed with the necessity for enrolling and money should be provided by the Government to bring the roll up to date.

On the other hand a lot of dead votes are recorded, because of people voting that have no right to be on the roll. For the province represented by Mr. Hamersley, Mr. Wood and myself, there are, according to the roll, 10,798 electors. A little while ago there were over 12,000. I guarantee that 20,000 names would appear on the roll if all those entitled to vote filled in claim cards. The same remark applies to other provinces. Again, the representation is **very unwieldy** and certainly is not reasonable. The Central Province has 5,980 electors and the East Province 10,798, or nearly double.

Hon. J. M. Macfarlane: What about the Metropolitan-Suburban Province?

Hon. C. F. BAXTER: I am coming to that. An elector in the Central Province, therefore, has twice the voting power of an elector in the East Province. The Metropolitan-Suburban Province has 31,000 electors as against 6,982 for the Metropolitan Province. That represents close on five to one in favour of the Metropolitan Province. The North-East Province has 4,190 and the South-East 3,343. Those figures are less than the figures for the Central Province and half of those for the East Province.

The Bill contains no provision to bring about a more satisfactory state of affairs with regard to claim cards. Only a little while ago it was freely stated, and not without cause, that something like 1,500 claim cards were presented to the Electoral Department in the last week before the closing of the roll. It was absolutely impossible for the department to go through each enrolment card to ascertain whether it was in order. The consequence was that people who were subsequently struck off the roll were yet able to vote at the election following the adjustment of the roll.

Hon. J. Nicholson: Although they were not really entitled to vote?

Hon. C. F. BAXTER: Many of them were not entitled to vote and their names were struck off the roll after the election. On the occasion of the latest election 700 names were submitted on practically the last day before the closing of the roll and 100 were rejected. Because of the small amount of money available to the department, and

consequently the smallness of the staff, to safeguard this position is most difficult.

The Bill revives the principle of one elector one vote. If the measure is agreed to, an elector will be entitled to vote in only one province, no matter what property he may have in other provinces. There has long been a keen agitation for enrolment on the basis of adult franchise.

Hon. H. Tuckey: People already on the roll do not exercise their right.

Hon. C. F. BAXTER: We cannot be held responsible for that. The opinion has been expressed time and again that if it is good enough for members of the Commonwealth Senate, which is more important than any State Parliament, to be elected on an adult franchise, it should be good enough for members of the Legislative Council of this State to be similarly elected. But the circumstances are entirely different. The representation of each State in the Senate counterbalances the unwieldy and disproportionate representation of New South Wales and Victoria in the House of Representatives. The Senate and the Western Australian Legislative Council cannot be compared. The members of this House represent people who have a stake in the country. That stake is a rental valuation of a little over 6s. a week or a property valuation of £50. Surely that qualification is low enough. Is it reasonable to suggest that people with no stake in the country, who do not contribute one penny piece in taxation and yet enjoy all the free services offered by the State, should have a vote and be able to determine the conduct of business in this House? Is it right that they should be able to say how the revenue of this country shall be used, and how the affairs of the State shall be administered? Is it right that the people who never find a penny-piece by way of taxation should be able to say to those that do pay, "You must do this" or "You must do that"? The argument is unreasonable and will not bear investigation.

If the House agrees to the second reading of the Bill, I hope it will not approve of that particular clause. Owing to the representation of various electorates in another place becoming unbalanced, investigations were made a little while ago, as they had been made previously, regarding the best means of effecting a redistribution of seats, which is long overdue. The Commis-

sion also recommended that the representation in this House should be made the subject of an amending Bill, but nothing was done. The Commission did a large amount of work in preparing an electoral Bill, which was a very good one. What has become of it? No advantage has been derived from it. The measure has been laid aside and another Bill has been introduced, which we cannot support unless it is extensively amended. If this Bill passes the second reading, the House will be able to amend it in Committee, make a satisfactory measure of it, and so improve the Constitution under which we are working. I do not say for one moment that I am going to agree to the deletion of Section 15 of the Constitution. For the adoption of such a course I cannot see any justification.

Hon. J. Nicholson: Would it not be better to leave the Act as it is until there is a redistribution of seats?

Hon. C. F. BAXTER: The question is, when are we going to have a redistribution? We should consider the Bill before us, and try to improve the various clauses. I prefer to do that rather than to reject the Bill. If it is the desire of another place to abolish the Legislative Council and that came to pass, it would be a sorry day not only for the people of Western Australia but also for members of another place. Such a proposal is almost laughable. Our predecessors in this Chamber established the Legislative Assembly, and this Chamber should have the right to say, "If there is now to be only one House, abolish the Assembly."

Hon. J. Nicholson: Do you think some members in the other place still thank the Almighty that there is a Legislative Council?

Hon. C. F. BAXTER: That sentiment was uttered only yesterday, privately, "Thank God for the Legislative Council!" Undoubtedly the Legislative Council is a wonderful bulwark for the Government of the day.

Hon. J. Nicholson: The Honorary Minister acknowledged that.

Hon. C. F. BAXTER: I feel disposed to support the second reading, with a view to improving the Bill in Committee. In fact, subject to the reservations I have mentioned, I shall vote for the second reading.

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

*House adjourned at 10.3 p.m.*

## Legislative Assembly.

*Thursday, 24th November, 1938*

	PAGE
Questions: Railways, regrading .....	2437
Military training, concessions to Government employees .....	2437
Hotel licenses, distribution and after-hours trading .....	2438
Bills: Bookmakers, 2n. defeated .....	2441
Workers' Homes Act Amendment, returned .....	2491
Annual Estimates, 1938-39: Votes discussed .....	2488
State Batteries .....	2438

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

### QUESTION—RAILWAYS, REGRAIDING.

Mr. HILL asked the Minister for Railways: 1, What expenditure has been incurred on regrading the railways of the State during the last 10 years? 2, How much has been spent on the Great Southern Railway south of Narrogn?

The MINISTER FOR RAILWAYS replied: 1, £375,788. 2, £10,698.

### QUESTION—MILITARY TRAINING.

*Concessions to Government Employees.*

Mr. McLARTY asked the Premier: 1, Does the Government encourage its employees to join the militia? 2, Is leave granted to Government employees to enable them to join military encampments? 3, If so, does the leave granted interfere with the annual leave of such employees?

The PREMIER replied: 1, Yes. 2, Yes. 3, The matter is dealt with under Public Service Regulation 9. Leave may be deducted from recreation leave at the option of the employee. Otherwise leave is granted without pay, and any difference between the military pay and the ordinary pay is borne by the State Government. Senior cadets and voluntary cadet trainees (Section 127 of the Defence Act, 1903-1918) are granted leave on full pay. For wages employees, the difference in wages of junior workers only, including apprentices, is paid. Adult workers are required to take leave without pay.