

Legislative Council,

Wednesday, 19th December, 1934.

	PAGE
Motion : Sitting days and hours	2154
Question : Charities consultations agents, commission, and auditors	2156
Bills : Financial Emergency Tax Assessment Act Amendment, Assembly's further message ...	2157
Cremation Act Amendment, 1R.	2163
Financial Emergency Tax, Assembly's message ...	2163
Lotteries (Control) Amendment, 2R., Com.	2163
Administration Act (Estate and Succession Duties) Amendment, Assembly's message ...	2184
Farmers' Debts Adjustment, 2R.	2184
Public Dental Hospital Land, 2R., etc.	2190
Geraldton Sailors and Soldiers' Memorial In- stitute Enabling, 2R., etc.	2190

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

MOTION—SITTING DAYS AND HOURS.

THE CHIEF SECRETARY (Hon. J. M. Drew—Central) [4.34]: I move, without notice—

That the Council shall meet for the despatch of business to-morrow (Thursday), at 2.30 p.m., and, in addition, on Friday next at 2.30 p.m.

While at one stage it did not seem possible that we should be able to conclude our business this week, owing to the progress that has been made during the last few days in particular, I am now rather hopeful that we shall be able to do so. At any rate, all the more important Bills require consideration and determination this week. Even looking at it from that point of view, it is necessary that we increase the hours of sitting. I hope hon. members will agree to the motion.

HON. C. F. BAXTER (East) [4.35]: While I shall not oppose the motion, I draw attention to the fact that on the Notice Paper there is still a list of 23 items, and at least three more Bills are to be received from the Legislative Assembly. During the long period I have been associated with this Chamber, I cannot remember a previous session when there has been so much congestion disclosed by the Notice Paper. In view of that list, I do not see how it is possible for us to dispose of the Bills within the next two days, seeing that some important problems will have to be discussed. To my mind it points to the session extending into the new year. We must realise

that we owe a duty to the public and we can honour our obligations to them only by giving adequate time to the consideration of each measure. My long experience has shown that if we meet at 2.30 p.m. we cannot continue our work into the early hours of the next morning and still retain possession of our full faculties. I do not think even a super-man could do it. It imposes a tremendous strain on the representatives of the Government in this Chamber. No one knows that better than I do. An over-zealous desire to do justice to the task and to do it well carries Ministers through, but it is neither good for them nor for the legislation handled. Since the Standing Orders have been suspended, we must have received at least 12 new Bills from another place. That experience is new to me. I cannot remember anything of the sort happening before. We were marking time until the last three weeks, and now a flood of legislation has descended upon us. There are several Bills that must be re-enacted, and the fact that the Acts lapse at the end of the year was known. Preparations could have been made to enable us to deal with the re-enacting measures at an earlier stage. All Governments have been culpable in this respect, and more justice should be extended to this House and to Ministers representing the Government here. Greater consideration should be extended to us in the manner of handling the business. The practice for many years has been bad, for there has always been a tremendous rush at the end of the session. There has hardly been one session when Bills have not been hurried through with inadequate consideration, in consequence of which amending Bills have had to be introduced in the succeeding session. In the meantime injustice has been done to those to whom the legislation has applied. While I will do everything possible to assist the Chief Secretary to carry out his onerous duties—they have been more onerous this session than usual—at the same time, I do not see how it is possible to do justice to the legislation before us unless we merely deal with the more important measures that have to be passed this week, and allow the other Bills to stand over to be dealt with during a short session in the new year—unless, of course, the Government are prepared to jettison many of the Bills now on the Notice Paper.

HON. L. B. BOLTON (Metropolitan) [4.40]: I do not intend to oppose the motion, but as one of the younger members of the Chamber I desire to enter a most emphatic protest against the practice of rushing through, at the latter end of the session, the mass of business we are asked to undertake. If these Bills are worthy of a place on the Notice Paper they are entitled to receive the consideration the public expect us to give them. To-day Parliament is regarded almost as a farce, particularly during the closing stages of the session. Each year I have been in Parliament the same thing has happened. I emphatically protest against legislation being rushed through or removed from the Notice Paper without being given the attention warranted.

HON. J. NICHOLSON (Metropolitan) [4.41]: With other members, I am anxious to assist the Leader of the House and the Government to deal with legislation that has been placed before us, but I join with previous speakers in the protestations they have uttered regarding the undue rush of legislation and the accumulation of Bills at the tail end of the session. The Leader of the House must be particularly optimistic if he thinks we can complete consideration of the list of Bills on the Notice Paper, which include some important and controversial measures, with satisfaction to every one, and do that work within the next two days. I impress upon members the seriousness of the position in view of the long list of Bills before us, and on no account should we allow ourselves to be hurried in our consideration of them. There is one way only in which we can deal effectively with legislation, and that is by getting the measures much earlier in the session than has been our experience.

Hon. T. Moore: You have had some of the measures before you for a good while.

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: If some of the Bills had been before us much earlier, they could have been dealt with properly and consideration given to them that is essential in a House of review. It is necessary to bear in mind that, despite the stage of the session and the magnitude of the list of Bills yet to be dealt with, we have a duty to perform to the State and to the public. Let us do our duty and, if necessary, however distasteful it may be to

some members, meet again in the new year. If members do not give full consideration to the Bills before them, the public will have just reason for feeling offended with this House.

HON. R. G. MOORE (North-East) [4.43]: I suggest that we get on with the business!

Members: Hear, hear!

HON. J. M. MACFARLANE (Metropolitan-Suburban) [4.44]: I feel that I should enter my protest against the disposition to rush important Bills through in the course of the next two days, as the Chief Secretary suggests.

Hon. G. Fraser: This protest is merely a hardy annual.

Hon. J. M. MACFARLANE: There will be very little difficulty about continuing the session early in January.

Hon. W. J. Mann: No difficulty at all when you live a hundred yards from Parliament House!

Hon. T. Moore: Hear, hear!

Hon. J. M. MACFARLANE: But if members desire to run away from their jobs, that is their business.

Hon. T. Moore: It is all very well for metropolitan members.

Hon. J. M. MACFARLANE: Irrespective of whether I lived in Busselton or some other distant centre, my views would be the same. There are Bills on the Notice Paper the details of which we cannot grasp in the time at our disposal. I protest strongly regarding this attempt to rush Bills through, unless the Minister is prepared to deal with the important measures and let the others stand over for consideration next session. I refuse to be rushed in my consideration of the Bills I have in mind, for the measures will require very close attention.

HON. J. J. HOLMES (North) [4.45]: If we sit at an earlier hour to-morrow and on Friday and do not complete the business, there will still be Saturday and Monday left. We have the legislation before us and we have the information at our fingers' ends, and there is no need to talk of rushing the business through. I consider there is ample time in which to deal with the important legislation. Some of the Bills, I

think, will be dealt with in a short and shiny way.

Hon. C. F. Baxter: That will make a difference.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: But there is plenty of time to give attention to the important Bills. In other sessions the congestion that has occurred towards the end has, in my opinion, been due chiefly to members of this House moving adjournments from time to time, but the exact opposite has occurred this session. There is some reason for the congestion. The ill-health of the Premier held matters up. Still it is the fault of the Government that the accumulation has occurred this year. However, if we work and do not talk too much, there is ample time to deal with the important legislation as it should be dealt with, and to treat the unimportant measures as they should be treated.

HON. H. SEDDON (North-East) [4.47]: I support the motion. When a couple of weeks ago, the Chief Secretary moved for the suspension of the Standing Orders to expedite business, he said that we could give legislation the same close attention that it received at the beginning of a session. I have faith in the Leader of the House that ample time will be allowed us in which to consider the business on the notice paper.

Hon. J. Cornell: We are not bound to finish before Christmas.

Hon. H. SEDDON: We should give the Leader of the House the support to which he is entitled, and we can do that while giving the legislation the same consideration that Bills receive at any stage of the session.

THE CHIEF SECRETARY (Hon. J. M. Drew—Central—in reply) [4.48]: In moving the motion I said my objective was to get through important legislation which it is necessary to pass this week. I have been assured that it is possible to finish our business this week. I have been so informed by country members, and the main objection to the motion has come from members living in the metropolitan area.

Hon. A. Thomson: Some country members have not spoken.

THE CHIEF SECRETARY: No Bill has been rushed through so far. We dealt

with a most important measure last night and gave it very serious consideration. That measure occupied the attention of another place for some weeks. The Bills on the notice paper have been before us for several days, and every member is acquainted with their contents and is prepared to discuss them. Some of those Bills, if they are to go on the statute-book, must be finalised this week or by Monday next at the latest.

Hon. G. W. Miles: If you limited speeches to ten minutes, you would get through.

Hon. A. Thomson: That would not be rushing the business!

THE CHIEF SECRETARY: If members avoided all repetition we would make greater progress. However, I was well satisfied with the progress made last night.

THE PRESIDENT: The motion was moved without notice having been given. Therefore it is necessary that it be passed by an absolute majority.

Question put.

THE PRESIDENT: There being no dissentient voice and there being an absolute majority present, I declare the question passed.

Question thus passed.

QUESTION—CHARITIES CONSULTATIONS.

Agents, Commission and Auditors.

Hon. E. H. H. HALL asked the Chief Secretary: 1, How many authorised agents have been appointed to sell tickets in the W.A. Charities Consultations? 2, What have been the largest and smallest individual amounts paid to agents as commission in any one consultation? 3, Is it a fact that the Lotteries Commission appoint their own auditors? 4, If not, by whom is the appointment made?

THE CHIEF SECRETARY replied: 1, During the period the Commission have been in operation, 1,905 agents have been appointed. 2, £450 10s. has been paid to one agent. This agent advertises extensively and his activities extend throughout Western Australia and the Eastern States. The smallest amount of commission paid was threepence. 3, The auditors have been appointed in conformity with Section 15B of the Lotteries (Control) Act.

BILL—FINANCIAL EMERGENCY TAX ASSESSMENT ACT AMENDMENT.

Assembly's further Message.

Order of the day read for the consideration of the Assembly's message that the amendments made by the Council to Clause 2 were in direct contravention of Subsection 3 of Section 46 of the Constitution Act, 1921, wherein it was enacted that the Council may not amend any Bill so as to increase any proposed charge or burden on the people and it was outside the powers of the Assembly to consider the amendments; therefore the Assembly requested the Council again to consider the Bill.

President's Ruling.

The PRESIDENT: Some members last night did not appreciate the effect of what I said on the opinion expressed in the message. I shall repeat what I said in order that there may be no misunderstanding—

I do not agree with the opinion expressed in the message. To my mind the amendment referred to is within the constitutional powers of the Legislative Council.

There are two matters dealt with in the message. On the second question it is not for me, but for the Committee, to say how it should be dealt with. I pointed out last night that if my ruling were not dissented from, it would stand. Strictly speaking, if any member wished to take exception to my ruling he should have moved a motion of dissent last night, but as there was a slight misunderstanding on the point, I am prepared to accept a motion of dissent now. As no member indicates intention to dissent from my ruling, I will leave the Chair and the message will be considered in Committee.

In Committee.

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

The CHAIRMAN: Before asking the Minister in charge of the Bill to address himself to the Committee. I desire members to bear in mind what has happened. The position is unprecedented so far as the Minister in charge of the Bill is concerned. My view is that the Committee may treat the Bill as an ordinary Bill—one which they may amend and which, in

fact, they did amend in the ordinary way. The amendment made to the tax Bill was treated differently. This Bill was returned from another place notifying disagreement to one amendment, but agreement to two amendments subject to further amendments. The Committee refused to accept the further amendments and informed another place accordingly. Up to that point the usage and custom regarding this type of Bill was adhered to and everything was quite in order. Then the Assembly took the point that under Section 46 of the Constitution it was illegal for this Chamber to amend the Bill. The President has answered the constitutional question as to the right of the Council to amend that type of Bill, and his ruling not having been dissented from, stands. Therefore we have two direct conflicting opinions. Another place declares that we have no right to make the amendments; the President says we have. That opens up at this stage the constitutional aspect. The other aspect presenting itself is the last portion of the message—"The Legislative Assembly, therefore, request the Legislative Council to again consider the Bill." I ask members to turn to the Standing Orders and read No. 225. It says—

In a case where the Assembly agrees to amendments made by the Council with further amendments thereon—

That is the case here.

—the Council may agree to the Assembly's amendments on its own amendments with or without amendment disagree thereto, and insist on its own amendments.

The Standing Order only provides that in the event of a disagreement the Council can request a conference or order the Bill to be laid aside. I cannot recall an instance similar to that we are dealing with now, and I am given to understand that if we agree to a further consideration of the Bill it will amount to stultification on our part. The position the Minister in charge of the Bill is in is that he can move some motion, in effect a message to another place, but I cannot say that it will come within the four corners of the Standing Orders. Setting up a hypothetical case, were the Minister to move that the Council's amendment be no longer insisted upon, the position would really be that the Committee would be stul-

tifying itself. At this stage the proper motion put before the Committee I should say would be that another place be informed of the President's ruling. I am entirely in the hands of the Committee.

The HONORARY MINISTER: I have listened to your statement of the position, Mr. Chairman, and it would appear there is only one part of the message we can consider. The first part dealing with the constitutional aspect having been determined, it leaves the second part, which is a request from the Legislative Assembly, that we reconsider the Bill. With all due deference to the statement made by you, Mr. Chairman, I submit that it is quite possible for us to agree with the ruling given by the President, and at the same time reconsider the Bill and determine not to insist on our amendment. Because we agree with the President's ruling, that does not necessarily mean that we cannot reconsider the Bill. The Bill, as members are aware, is of the utmost importance; it is a vital measure from the Government's point of view. It represents a large sum of money, at least half a million, and if by any action of this Chamber it should mean that the Bill were lost here, it would, of course, place the Government in a most embarrassing position. Notwithstanding the views of many members on this subject, I feel that very few members are desirous of going to that extreme. Being in charge of the Bill, my duty is to accept the message from another place, and as the representative of the Government in this Chamber, to move that the Council no longer insists on its amendment. Of course the Committee can please itself in what way it deals with my motion. It would be quite within the power of the Committee to move an amendment on that motion, if any member felt so disposed, and more particularly in view of the statement made by the Chairman of Committees that in his opinion there are only two alternatives open, one being to ask for a conference—

The CHAIRMAN: I hardly said that.

The HONORARY MINISTER: You quoted the Standing Order, Mr. Chairman, on the point.

The CHAIRMAN: What I said was that had the Committee desired, it could have requested a conference, instead of deciding

to disagree to the amendment of the Legislative Assembly.

The HONORARY MINISTER: I hope you will allow me to develop the point I was about to make. The Chairman quoted the Standing Order reading—

Disagree thereto and insist on its own amendments which the Assembly has amended.

At that stage I think the Chairman said that there would be only two courses open to the Committee, because we had reached an unprecedented position. According to the Standing Orders, those are the two alternatives that present themselves. If that is the position and I submit the motion that I have outlined, and the Committee do not agree with the motion, it is quite within the power of the Committee to move an amendment, which would have the effect of at least, shall I say, giving us breathing time in order to consider a little further the position we have arrived at. I have already said that this is a vital Bill from the Government's point of view, and I do not think we need spend too much time in elaborating that fact. It is absolutely essential that the Bill be passed because it is part and parcel of the financial policy of the Government. In other words, the Bill is an effort to implement the financial policy of the Government, and if by any action of this Chamber the Bill is lost, the Government will be embarrassed to an extent that I do not think any member is desirous of seeing brought about. The position being unprecedented, we are faced with several difficulties. One is the procedure to be adopted, and I shall move shortly the motion I have outlined. It seems to me that if the Chairman is prepared to accept a motion of the kind I have suggested, it should be possible for the Committee to agree to a message being sent to another place which will cover the points in dispute. Unfortunately, we have nothing to guide us, and so far as I can see the only course open to me, as Minister in charge of the Bill, is to move—

That the Council no longer insists on its amendments.

Members may not agree with the Bill in its entirety, but they must realise the importance of the measure from the Government's point of view.

Hon. T. Moore: And from the State's point of view.

The HONORARY MINISTER: Yes. There is nothing more I can add. We must endeavour to use a little more, shall I say, common sense, though I do not suggest we have not been doing so, but in view of the fact that we have no precedent to guide us, the suggestion I have made seems to be a common sense one.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: On a joint of order. I should like to know if the House can accept that motion, in view of the fact that we have had the President's ruling on the subject.

Hon. H. SEDDON: In view of the President's ruling I cannot conceive of anything that would more fittingly convey the feelings of the House regarding the message we have received. I hope, therefore, that the House will not agree to the motion moved by the Honorary Minister, but will be prepared to initiate a motion more in accord with the expressed wish of the House regarding the Bill.

Hon. C. F. BAXTER: As I view it, the President's ruling finalises the whole matter. The Honorary Minister knows we have done our best to place the measures on the statute book, not to destroy them. If anything should happen to the two Bills, the blame will not rest on this Chamber, for we have done our utmost to get them on the statute book.

The CHAIRMAN: I should like members to restrict their remarks to the question of procedure.

Hon. C. F. BAXTER: I cannot see how it is possible for the House to accept the motion moved by the Honorary Minister.

Hon. R. G. MOORE: When first we were discussing the measure, I supported the Government in the amendments put forward, but I am surprised at the message from the Assembly regarding our amendment. They say they cannot deal with the amendment because, under the Constitution, it is out of order. Yet in the previous week the Bill was amended by us in exactly the same way, and the Assembly then dealt with that amendment, and moved an amendment on our amendment. So it seems to me if the Assembly will not deal with our amendment this week on the score that it is out of order, it must have been out of order last week, for in both instances

the amendment was the same. I am all for the amendment, and I wish to see it stand.

The CHAIRMAN: There are two ways out of the difficulty: One is that an amendment be sent to the Assembly to this effect—

The Council does not concur in the opinion expressed by the Assembly in Message No. 64, and is therefore unable to accede to the request of the Assembly.

Then, if another place should see fit to ask for a conference, it can be granted. But I suggest that these additional words be added to our message to the Assembly, in order to show that the Council is prepared to be reasonable—

But the Legislative Council requests a conference on the whole subject.

If another place agrees to our request for a conference, it does not follow that our managers are bound to fall in with the views of those from another place. However, this would be a way out of a very awkward situation. If what I have proposed is acceptable to the Honorary Minister, I suggest that he moves the motion.

Hon. C. F. BAXTER: I agree with the first part of the Chairman's proposal, but I could not agree to the second, because it is for another place to request a conference. I have never yet known this House ask for a conference, and I do not think we should set a precedent. In my opinion, the first part of the Chairman's proposal is all that is necessary, and if the Honorary Minister does not move it, I will.

The CHAIRMAN: Almost invariably, deadlocks result in conferences.

Hon. C. F. BAXTER: I do not object to a conference.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: We are on very dangerous ground, for we are trying to take two hurdles at one time. The proper mode of procedure, I think, will be to send a message to the Assembly to the effect that this House is perfectly within its rights in making the amendment. Then let us send back the Bill. But to ask for a conference at this stage will only complicate the issue. Let us take one hurdle at a time.

The CHAIRMAN: If the whole of my proposal were agreeable to the Committee, the proper form would be for the Minister to move it; but seemingly it is not agreeable to the Committee.

The HONORARY MINISTER: We are all agreed that we have reached a stage which this Council has never reached before. Standing Order 225 seems to me to have a direct bearing on the position we should take up. It reads as follows:—

In case where the Assembly (II) agrees to amendments made by the Council with further amendments thereon—

That is the position we have reached. The Standing Order continues—

the Council may (4) request a conference, or (5) order the Bill to be laid aside.

Hon. J. J. Holmes: The stage we have reached is that the Assembly say we cannot make the amendment.

The HONORARY MINISTER: The constitutional aspect is not in dispute. There has been no motion to disagree with the President's ruling, which therefore stands. It is now a question of procedure, and of how to get out of the deadlock. If we read the Standing Orders as I suggest, and take into consideration what it is possible for the Council to do, we are left with several alternatives. We have gone through the first and second stages, and have now reached the third stage. We have the right to request a conference, or to order that the Bill be laid aside. The latter course I do not want to see adopted. I favour the Chairman's suggestion that we should notify the Assembly that we do not agree with its interpretation of the constitutional position, and request a conference to consider the whole subject. That would solve the problem for the time being. If a conference is held we shall probably find a way out. We want as little delay as possible in clearing up the situation. I move—

That the following message be sent to the Legislative Assembly:—"In reply to message No. 64 the Legislative Council does not concur in the opinion expressed by the Legislative Assembly in message No. 64 and is therefore unable to accede to the request of the Legislative Assembly, but the Legislative Council requests a conference on the Bill."

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: If we ask for a conference the Assembly will be entitled to say it has already told us we have no right to make these amendments. We shall thus put ourselves in a false position.

The CHAIRMAN: This Chamber will have exhausted every avenue for reconciliation.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: The only answer to make at this stage is that we are within our rights in doing what we have done. Let the request for a conference come from another place. This is undoubtedly an attempt to undermine the constitution of this Chamber.

Hon. H. SEDDON: It would be premature to ask for a conference just now. The opinion of the Committee would be better expressed if a message were sent as follows, "In view of the President's ruling, which expresses the opinion of this House, on message No. 64 from the Legislative Assembly, the Legislative Council informs the Legislative Assembly that it is unable to accede to the request of the Legislative Assembly."

The CHAIRMAN: The President's ruling is on record as being undisputed. The reply suggested is that the Council does not concur in the view taken by the Assembly. This would confirm the opinion expressed by the President.

Hon. C. F. BAXTER: We should not request a conference at this stage. That is the prerogative of another place.

The CHAIRMAN: When the original amendments came back with alternative amendments it was within the province of the Committee to ask for a conference. The Committee disagreed with the alternative amendments and sent them back to the Assembly, which thereupon broke new ground and asked us to reconsider the Bill. I am the last member of this Chamber to jeopardise any rights it may enjoy.

Hon. C. F. BAXTER: The Assembly says we have acted unconstitutionally, and we deny that. All we need to do is send a message stating we are within our rights and cannot consider the Bill. I move an amendment—

That the words "but the Legislative Council requests a conference on the Bill" be struck out of the message to the Assembly.

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: A request for a conference from this Chamber would complicate the situation between the two Houses. No one wants to invade the rights of another place, but we do not want another place to invade our rights. There is a great disparity between the message which

first came from the Assembly and the last message from that House. The proposal for a conference would have been appropriate had it been made on receipt of the first message, which stated that the Assembly agreed to amendments Nos. 1 and 2 subject to further amendments in which the Assembly desired the concurrence of the Council. No constitutional question was raised then. We returned a message insisting on our amendments, and in reply to that we have received a message which, under our Standing Orders, does not justify us in asking for a conference. It is a message dealing entirely with the constitutional aspect.

The CHAIRMAN: Not at all! It is only a matter of opinion.

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: Standing Order 225, which has been quoted, refers to the powers, rights, and relations which arise when amendments are made or disagreed to; then, in various events, various things can be done. But this message is not a matter similar to that contained in message No. 47, the first message dealing with the Bill. At this stage it is a wise suggestion to delete the words asking for a conference. The discussion will probably do good; at least it will show another place that our attitude is not adopted with any hostility, but merely for the purpose of maintaining that Constitutional position which we claim is ours, and which another place is entitled to recognise. One wants to be fair in these matters. If ultimately there is to be a suggestion of a conference, let it come from another place.

The HONORARY MINISTER: This is a highly serious matter, but I am anxious to expedite proceedings in order that finality may be reached as early as possible. Mr. Nicholson made a statement to which weight is attached by other members—that when the Bill was amended by the Council in the first place, the Assembly did not raise the Constitutional issue. May I suggest that another place was looking at the matter in a reasonable light. I stated previously that the Government desired to go further than the Bill provided in order that basic-wage earners all over the State might be protected. When the Bill in its amended form reached the Assembly, the Government took the opportunity to try to insert in the Bill their amended proposal. This showed that they did not wish to

raise the Constitutional issue if without doing so they could secure what was desired. Consequently the Bill came back here in an amended form. Too much importance need not be attached to the argument that on one occasion the Assembly did not raise the Constitutional issue, but did raise it on the second occasion. Why depart from the merits or demerits of the Constitutional aspect? It matters not at what stage a measure may be found to be unconstitutional, if it is unconstitutional. The matter to be determined is the Constitutional point which for the time being we have decided to regard as settled so far as we are concerned.

Hon. J. Nicholson: If we did something unconstitutional, it would be void right from the commencement.

The HONORARY MINISTER: Mr. Baxter asked the Committee to adhere to precedent. He said this House had never asked for a conference. In 1924 there was a case in which the position was almost similar. It arose in connection with a Land Tax and Income Tax Bill. On that occasion Mr. Lovekin moved that a message should be sent in reply to a message from the Assembly requesting a conference on that Bill and that the then Colonial Secretary, the Hon. H. Stewart, and the mover should be appointed managers for the Council. Discussion took place, and eventually the Colonial Secretary then in charge of the House said—

I did not rise because I had not the opportunity of rising.

Later the Colonial Secretary said—

I move as I originally intended to move, "That a message be sent to the Legislative Assembly in reply to its message No. 60 requesting a conference on the Land Tax and Income Tax Bill, and that the Hon. J. Ewing, Hon. A. Lovekin, and the Colonial Secretary be appointed managers for the Council."

So there is one precedent. I believe there are one or two precedents of a similar character, although perhaps not dealing with the same type of Bill. I therefore submit that the motion does not suggest anything likely to undermine our standing in matters of this nature. May I say to Mr. Holmes that I do not think there is any desire on the part of another place deliberately to undermine the rights of this Chamber, as the hon. member put it. I feel that

my motion represents a better way out of the difficulty. There is little to guide us as to the best course to be adopted. However, if the motion is carried, it will expedite matters and bring finality much more quickly. What we should aim at, especially if it can be done without in any way compromising this Chamber, is to get a decision as early as possible. I therefore hope the motion will be carried.

Hon. E. H. ANGELO: I am prepared to vote for the motion on the lines suggested by you, Mr. Chairman. That is to say, I am prepared to vote for the first portion, but not for the second portion.

Hon. C. F. Baxter: I have moved to strike out the second portion.

Hon. E. H. ANGELO: Further, I would be prepared to vote for the addition of such words as, "but the Legislative Council is prepared to meet the Legislative Assembly in conference to discuss the amendments made, if the Legislative Assembly so desires." Let us throw the onus on the Assembly. In doing so we would show that we are prepared to meet the Assembly and discuss the question, but only so far as the amendments are concerned, not as regards the Constitutional aspect. I agree with the Chairman that we ought to offer some suggestion instead of simply cutting the painter.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: I do not want to delay the business of the Chamber; but, assuming we get to the conference, where shall we be? Shall we discuss the constitutional aspect?

The CHAIRMAN: No; the Bill.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: There is nothing else in dispute. One point is that the Assembly claims we have no right to make the amendments, while we claim that we have. That is the point we have to establish before we talk about any conference.

The CHAIRMAN: The question before the Chair is the entire motion moved by the Honorary Minister. An amendment has been moved to strike out the reference to the Legislative Council requesting a conference on the Bill. It goes without saying that the Committee unanimously agree to the first part of the motion, but do not agree to the second part. Assuming that another place asks for a conference, would this Chamber grant it? If this Chamber should agree to a conference asked for by another place, how is it logical to say that

nothing will be given away? By refusing to ask for a conference—

Hon. J. J. Holmes: We are not refusing to ask for a conference.

The CHAIRMAN: By deleting certain words of the motion, this Chamber may land itself in the realm of suspicion. Another place may ask, "What is the use of going further? The Council will not even hold a conference." Hon. members will give absolutely nothing away by asking for a conference.

Hon. R. G. MOORE: I support the motion, which I consider gives nothing away at all. At the outset of this sitting I understood that the idea was to try to get through the business as expeditiously as possible. Probably the final outcome of the Bill will be a conference between the two Houses.

Hon. J. J. Holmes: Let the other place ask for it. Another place has disputed our right to make the amendments.

Hon. R. G. MOORE: The motion asks us to suggest a conference on the Bill in order that some arrangement may be reached, in the same way as was done last session. To suggest a conference appears to me as a gesture of goodwill from this Chamber, as an indication that we are not in any way antagonistic to the measure. So that business may be expedited, I hope the Chamber will carry the motion, which distinctly declares that we have a right to amend the Bill.

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

Ayes	17
Noes	10
Majority for					7

AYES.

Hon. E. H. Angelo	Hon. G. W. Miles
Hon. C. F. Baxter	Hon. J. Nicholson
Hon. L. B. Bolton	Hon. H. V. Piesse
Hon. L. Craig	Hon. A. Thomson
Hon. J. T. Franklin	Hon. H. Tuckey
Hon. V. Hamersley	Hon. C. H. Wittenoom
Hon. J. J. Holmes	Hon. H. J. Yelland
Hon. J. M. Macfarlane	Hon. H. Seddon
Hon. W. J. Mann	(Teller.)

NOES.

Hon. A. M. Clydesdale	Hon. E. H. H. Hall
Hon. J. M. Drew	Hon. W. H. Kitson
Hon. C. G. Elliott	Hon. T. Moore
Hon. G. Fraser	Hon. H. S. W. Parker
Hon. E. H. Gray	Hon. R. G. Moore
	(Teller.)

Amendment thus passed.

Question, as amended, agreed to.

Resolution reported and the report adopted.

BILL—CREMATION ACT AMENDMENT.

Received from the Assembly and, on motion by Hon. J. Nicholson, read a first time.

BILL—FINANCIAL EMERGENCY TAX.

Assembly's Message.

Message from the Assembly notifying that it had made the amendment requested by the Council now considered.

In Committee.

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

The CHAIRMAN: The Legislative Assembly having agreed to the amendment made by this House, it remains for the Committee to agree to the Title to complete the consideration of the Bill.

Hon. C. F. BAXTER: I hope the Honorary Minister will withhold dealing with the Title for the time being. The assessment Bill has caused considerable difficulty and if we were to complete the consideration of the taxing Bill a peculiar position might arise. I do not desire to move an adverse motion and therefore I ask the Honorary Minister to hold up the taxing Bill for the time being.

The CHAIRMAN: What would be achieved by holding it up? We have agreed to the Bill, with the exception of the Title.

Hon. J. J. Holmes: We can hold up a Bill at any stage.

The HONORARY MINISTER: I am prepared to meet the wishes of the Committee, although I do not see that anything will be gained if we do hold the Bill up. I thought it would be better to finish with the Bill and so help to clear the Notice Paper. I shall agree to progress being reported until to-morrow.

Progress reported.

Sitting suspended from 6.15 to 7.30 p.m.

BILL—LOTTERIES (CONTROL) AMENDMENT.

Second Reading.

THE HONORARY MINISTER (Hon. W. H. Kitson—West) [7.30] in moving the second reading said: This is one of the measures which it will be necessary to deal with before the end of the year. The statute which this Bill seeks to amend was originally enacted in 1932, at which time it was considered that as legislation of this kind was purely experimental, it was highly desirable to limit the operation of the Act to one year. Consequently the Act was given duration to the 31st December, 1933. After having had experience of the Act from the 20th February of that year, Parliament decided that the Act should be extended for a further period of one year, namely to the end of 1934. Now we bring forward this measure which provides for making the Act permanent. There are several reasons for the desire to make the Act permanent. First of all, it has been shown that the Lotteries Commission have accomplished much good work. They took over the control of lotteries at a time when everyone was satisfied that control legislation was necessary. Previously sweeps and art unions had developed to such an extent and in such a way that almost every representative person was prepared to admit that it was time some control was exercised. To-day we claim that as a result of the activities of the Commission the regulation and control of lotteries has been of such a nature that very few people are prepared to forego such control. The patronage of the various lotteries conducted by the Commission has increased until to-day almost every lottery conducted by the Commission is over-subscribed. We have passed the experimental stage, and we can take it for granted that the public are not only satisfied with the way in which the Commission have conducted their work, but are prepared to accept their activities as a permanent feature of everyday life. All forms of gambling in this State and in other countries are more or less controlled, and it is to the credit of the Commission that in the control of lotteries in this State no organisation which had previously benefited from lotteries conducted on its own account can say that it has in any way suffered by what the Commission have done. In every

case, I think, those organisations that may have claimed the right to conduct lotteries on their own behalf have received more. Such organisations as the Ugly Men's Association, the Returned Soldiers' Association, the School for the Blind, and others of a similar kind, used to conduct consultations. Now they receive support from the Lotteries Commission without themselves being called upon to do the work. In other words, they are practically assured of an income from that source larger than the income they received previously from their own efforts. Let me speak briefly of the activities of the Commission since their inception. For 18 months previous to the operation of the Act lotteries in this State were controlled by an honorary committee, and as a result of their efforts during that period the sum of £36,431 was made available for distribution. When the committee were superseded by the Commission, during the first 11 months, namely from the 20th February, 1933, to the 31st December, 1933, the profit amounted to £52,325. That amount has been increased to approximately £85,000 for the present year, showing conclusively that the public have every confidence in the Commission as now constituted. Previous to the Commission taking control of lotteries, the average expenses of promoters of lotteries and sweeps was anything from 25 per cent. upwards.

Hon. E. H. Gray: Mostly upwards.

The HONORARY MINISTER: Yes, sometimes up to 50 per cent. The Act provides that the Commission shall not be entitled to use more than 25 per cent. of the subscriptions for expenses. Although they have had power to utilise up to 25 per cent., it speaks well for the Commission that their percentage of expenses amounted to only 15.9 in 1933 and 15.5 to date this year. Included in the percentage of expenses is the commission paid to the various agents throughout the country. Commission is paid at a standard rate of 10 per cent. which, I understand, is the amount that has always been paid to agents for lotteries and sweeps, by whomever promoted. Therefore the Commission have been so successful in the conduct of their lotteries that their actual expenses have been approximately only 5.9 per cent., a very good record indeed and one which, I be-

lieve, will compare with the expenses of any lottery in any other country in the world.

Hon. E. H. H. Hall: I suppose they will be able to improve on that.

The HONORARY MINISTER: I think the Commission will be only too pleased to reduce that percentage if reduction is at all possible.

Hon. H. S. W. Parker: The 5.9 per cent. does not include the commission paid to agents.

The HONORARY MINISTER: No, it is in addition to the 10 per cent. paid to agents. I have had an opportunity for years to gain knowledge of the expenses of various promoters of sweeps and art unions, and none has been able to approach the figures I have mentioned.

Hon. J. Nicholson: The percentage would naturally be greater in a small lottery, just as the expense of running a small concern would be greater relatively than the expense of running a large concern.

The HONORARY MINISTER: Not necessarily so in a lottery.

Hon. E. H. Angelo: Advertising would be a considerable item.

The HONORARY MINISTER: The smaller the lottery, the smaller the advertising. I have been associated with art unions for which the advertising expenses were a mere bagatelle. That, however, is beside the point. The receipts handled by the Commission since the inception of the Act have been—for the 11 months of 1933, £124,709; for the present year to date, £187,797, 15s.; and it is anticipated that No. 22 consultation which will close on the 29th December, will amount to £20,938, making a total of approximately £208,000 for the year 1934. Those are big figures.

Hon. A. Thomson: How many consultations have been held?

The HONORARY MINISTER: Thirteen. I mention the amount subscribed because the Bill not only provides that the Lotteries Act shall be a permanent measure but because it provides that the chairman of the Commission shall be appointed for a period of five years, and that the total fees which the Lotteries commissioners might draw during the year shall be increased from £1,000 to £1,750. Great responsibility falls upon the chairman of the Commission, and we can congratulate ourselves on the fact that we have had one such as the present chairman to carry out the work.

Hon. J. Cornell: And the present secretary.

The HONORARY MINISTER: Yes, I believe he is carrying out his work quite satisfactorily, but in this case the same responsibility does not rest upon the secretary as on the chairman. We might go further and say that the staff also have done their work very well. The present chairman, as members know, has a very fine reputation over a long period of years in connection with many charitable efforts, and I would say there are few men in this State who are qualified to control an organisation such as this with as much efficiency as displayed by the present chairman.

Hon. C. F. Baxter: Is it necessary to have a board?

The HONORARY MINISTER: It has been considered advisable in the past to have a board, and the idea is contained in the Bill. When we take into consideration the large amount of money handled by the Commission it is only right that we should say that we will take every possible precaution to see that there shall be no room for anyone throwing doubt upon any of the operations of the Lotteries Commission. Having a board of four we probably ensure that the confidence of the public will be maintained. I suggest that while we have an excellent chairman there are many problems which will come forward for determination about which even he would desire to have advice in addition to his own personal knowledge. And in view of the manner in which the Lotteries Commission have carried out their duties, it seems to me there is no need to make a change.

Hon. J. Cornell: Has the Minister ever directed the board to reverse a decision?

The HONORARY MINISTER: Not that I know of.

Hon. J. J. Holmes: I do not know that he can.

The HONORARY MINISTER: The Act provides, as far as distribution of funds is concerned, that the board shall determine on the allocation of the moneys to be distributed. When the Bill reached this Chamber it provided that the Minister should have that power. Again I remind the members that we also decided that balance sheets should be presented to Parliament after each lottery, and that has been done. For this year the fees payable to

the commission, namely, £1,000, will mean .801 of the money subscribed. Next year even with the increase that is proposed, the cost will be approximately seven per cent. on the anticipated turnover of a quarter of a million pounds. I do not know of any business with a turnover of a quarter of a million of money where the executive expenses are so low.

Hon. J. J. Holmes: Do you call this a business?

Hon. A. Thomson: A monopoly.

The HONORARY MINISTER: Whether it is a business or a monopoly it is a method of raising money which the people of the State apparently are prepared to support.

Hon. J. Cornell: They are also prepared to support shop betting.

The HONORARY MINISTER: I suppose so. The Bill provides for three matters. The first is that the Act shall be a permanent measure, the second is that the chairman shall be appointed for a period of five years, and the third that the remuneration of the members of the commission shall be increased in the aggregate from £1,000 to £1,750, of which total the chairman will receive £1,000. In view of the facts that I have submitted and in view of the necessity for a continuous policy by the commission—and their experience shows there is need for it; also that there is a considerable margin over and above ordinary charitable requirements—there is every necessity for not only having a chairman appointed for a given number of years, but also for a continuation of the Act for an indefinite period. There are many things the commission desire to do. They desire to do more with regard to the hospitals of the State. The margin available to them is such that in their opinion, by carrying out the present policy, they will be able to assist in a number of other material directions. One subject has been mentioned by the commission itself, and that is the establishment of a community hospital. It is estimated that such a hospital will entail an expenditure of at least £100,000, and it is said by the commission that so long as the present policy is continued, the members of it feel sure they will be able to provide the necessary money for that purpose. There are other questions of a somewhat similar character that they desire to deal with, but there again it becomes a matter of policy, and if by mak-

ing the Act permanent instead of having it as a measure to be extended from year to year, it will be possible for the members of the commission to carry out their desires. Consequently we should not hesitate to agree to the proposal. When the chairman states that certain things can be done we can accept his word that they will be done if he is given the opportunity to do them. Regarding the other members of the commission, they have worked with the present chairman for the last 12 or 18 months, and I see no reason why they should not continue in their respective positions.

Hon. J. Cornell: Can you inform the House why the other members of the commission were dropped last year?

The HONORARY MINISTER: I cannot. According to the Bill now presented, we are not only ensuring that the institutions that have received support will continue to enjoy it, but we are also making certain that other good deeds will be done in the future. I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

HON. H. S. W. PARKER (Metropolitan-Suburban) [7.55]: The object of the Lotteries Act when first introduced was to prevent the carrying on of illegal lotteries that had been conducted, many of them in a very doubtful way. It was also to prevent large sums of money going out of the State to the lotteries in Tasmania, New South Wales and Queensland. Up to the time of the passing of the Lotteries Act, the Commissioner of Police had been acting illegally in permitting lotteries to be carried on. Perhaps he did not actually permit them to be carried on, but it amounted to this, "If you conduct a lottery none of my officers will prosecute." The Commissioner of Police never had authority to permit lotteries to be carried on, but it was done in that way. The business grew to such an extent that it was decided to appoint a committee to advise the Minister of the manner in which certain persons or institutions might be permitted to run lotteries. From that grew the Lotteries Bill. The object was not in any shape or form to encourage gambling, but it was to harness to an extent the gambling spirit that is in all of us, and to prevent money going out of the State. We find that something

quite different has happened. The object now and the expressed intention, if I understood the Minister correctly, is to make the lotteries more successful than they have been in the past. In other words, it is proposed to exploit to the full the gambling spirit of the people, and to secure for the purposes of the charities as much as the public will put up. But the gambling spirit, the desire to participate in the lotteries, instead of being diminished or controlled, is growing rapidly; the evil it was intended to prevent has grown tenfold. There is not an arcade in the city nor a tobacconist's shop, and some say not even an hotel, where one cannot get lottery tickets placed before him. The daily Press, the screen, placards, hoardings, are all advertising "£500 for 8d." Within the next 12 months I venture to say we shall be reading advertisements "£62 10s. for a penny." There is every encouragement given to boys and girls to put their 8d. into the lottery in order to get £500. It is engendering the gambling spirit, which we should not commercialise. Of course everybody gambles; we cannot help it, because it is our nature. I admit I enjoy gambling and am prepared to put in half a crown with a view to receiving about 1s. 6d. back. Actually I have not got that yet, nor anything like it. When I put in a half crown I am looking for the £2,000, as many others do. There have been occasions when I have forgotten to take a ticket, but it is soon impressed on me when I go into a tobacconist's to buy a packet of cigarettes. It seems impossible to escape it. Occasionally I have been very pleased to find a lottery has been drawn and I have forgotten to get a ticket. But that has been rarely, when I have had to send out for my cigarettes instead of buying them myself. I submit we should not encourage the gambling spirit. Now we are asked to authorise the payment of £1,750 instead of £1,000 for what might be termed overhead management. There can be only one reason for it, which is to extend the spirit of lottery participation, to endeavour to get more money out of people and to make the lotteries, from the point of view of the financing of charities, even more successful. I submit that all that we should do is to give back that percentage of the money subscribed which will cause the people to put their money into our local lotteries,

instead of into foreign lotteries. I agree there are always people ready to complain about various things, but certainly there seems to be a number of complaints that too large a percentage is taken out of the money subscribed, whether it be for charity or for overhead expenses I am not concerned. The result is the people are gradually drifting back to foreign sweeps. I agree that the Act has to be continued, that unfortunately it is necessary to have State lotteries. I am in favour of a State lottery, but only on the basis that it is to keep money from going outside Western Australia, and that the profits are reasonable and are distributed amongst the charities. I am not in favour of State lotteries when it comes to commercialising them in the way in which apparently it is intended. As for the conduct of the lotteries, I think it is remarkably good. There has not been a breath of scandal in respect of the Commission, the management or the staff. We have had scandals in the Eastern States regarding big sweeps, but we have never heard of it here, which speaks remarkably well for the management. I have no fault to find with the management, except that they are commercialising, and perhaps they are making too much of a success of, the gambling spirit of the people and are building too much on that. If we do permit the Bill to go through as printed we are going to make the lotteries even more successful; and before long we shall find advertised, not only £62 10s. for a penny, but probably £200 or £300 for a penny, and we shall have canvassers going around with the tickets. One thing the original Lotteries Bill was intended to prevent was the objectionable practice of people all along the street sitting before little tables and calling out "Buy a lottery ticket." That is all creeping back. The agents do not now call out, but all the tables are there again in arcades and alcoves in the business centre of the city, and presently we shall have canvassers going around from door to door. Then when a Bill is brought down to deal with lotteries we shall have a big outcry from vested interests, and shall be inundated with landlords and others asking us not to permit this amendment or that amendment because it will interfere with vested interests. And there will be an outcry that we are putting people out of work.

We have to prevent the encouragement of the gambling spirit, and we have to prevent vested interests growing up, and we have to keep lotteries as originally intended, namely to prevent money going out of Western Australia and to prevent people from being offered lottery tickets at every turn in the street. I am not suggesting that we hide the gambling, but I say we must not foist it in front of people wherever they are found. The Honorary Minister said that one object, a very laudable one, was to erect a community hospital. If the proceeds of the lotteries are to go for that purpose, surely the main function of the Commission has gone; because that main function is the allotment of the profits to various charities, and organisations which call themselves charities and come along for donations. Many deserving charities require money which the Lotteries Commission are unable to give them, for they cannot give all the money they are asked for. It is a difficult and unpleasant job, but if this money is to go to the cost of a community hospital there will be very little left to distribute amongst the existing charities. So in that way a great deal of the function of the Commission will have gone. We must have a board of some sort. I am in favour of a managing director as a full-time servant, and a secretary and a proper office staff; but I should like to see a board composed of public men, as for instance, the Lord Mayor of Perth, the Mayor of Fremantle and other mayors, and perhaps chairmen of road boards and, say, the chairman of the Children's Hospital. A board of that nature should be set up, not by name, Jones or Smith, but by the public offices held. We would then have the money which is not to go to a community hospital distributed in a proper way. The managing director, who naturally would be anxious to make a success of things, would have the brake put on him by the members of the board. I think those gentlemen appointed to the board should be remunerated by so much per sitting, not to exceed so much per annum. In that way the evil which is creeping in would be stopped. For the reasons I have given, I propose to vote for the second reading and to support such amendments in Committee as may meet with my approval.

HON. E. H. H. HALL (Central) [8.12]: I realise that the way in which Mr. Parker has expressed his views does not leave much occasion for me to prolong the debate. However, I should like to follow up his suggestion for the appointment of a board or committee. I have in mind an honorary committee which some years ago was appointed by the Government of the day to advise the Minister as to the best way in which to spend certain money bequeathed to the Geraldton Hospital. This committee was brought into being at the request of the late Chief Justice. The Mayor of Geraldton was appointed chairman, and the Government of the day decided how the members of the committee should be elected. The committee is elected annually. The Mayor of Geraldton for the time being is chairman, the Friendly Societies have two representatives, and the A.L.P. has one representative, while at an annual meeting of the citizens of Geraldton two citizens also are elected to the committee. The Geraldton or northern branch of the British Medical Association also elects a representative. There is thus a committee of five or seven members acting in an honorary capacity, and advising the Minister of the best means of spending the money on behalf of the patients. True, the bequest involves only about £230 a year. I am glad Mr. Parker advanced his suggestion. In Perth there are many public-spirited men and women acting on the committees of various philanthropic institutions. Any of them might be expected to take a seat upon a lotteries committee. They would think it an honour to act in that capacity, and would gladly do so without remuneration. This business is being pushed too much under the notice of the public. Too much money is being spent on advertising and on commissions. Many people have for some time past spoken about the large sums that are being earned by some of the agents for the Lotteries Commission. Apparently the largest sum paid to any one agent for commissions is £450. We are told that person spent a lot in advertising. I am opposed to all that advertising by the agents as well as by the Commission. I also agree with the remarks that have been made about vested interests. I have been approached by two or three people with the request that I should endeavour to have them appointed agents for the Commission,

but I declined to do so. Owners of property in the city have also been asked to push the claims of people who required agencies. Surely, in the name of sweet charity, we can get people who will hold the confidence of the community to act in an honorary capacity on such a committee as has been suggested, and who would consider it an honour to do so. I have no complaint to make regarding the manner in which the funds are allocated. The Geraldton Hospital, the X-ray plant, and the refrigerator fund have had their fair share. I think every section in the State has been fairly treated. I have no complaints of a personal nature to make, but I think it would instil the necessary confidence in the undertaking if men and women could be appointed to act in an honorary capacity on a lotteries committee. I will support the second reading of the Bill, but hope it will not pass the Committee in its present form.

HON. H. V. PIESSE (South-East) [8.20]: For the past two sessions a Bill to continue this Act has come before us. The manner in which the lotteries have been controlled and the business conducted suggests that the Act should be continued for a longer period. In Committee I shall move for an extension for a period of two years and nine months. This would terminate the Act in September, 1937. In that month it would be necessary to pass a continuation Bill. At the end of the session we have a big rush, but if that Bill is brought on earlier in the session, it may receive more consideration than there is time in which to consider this Bill. The matter is an important one. We all recall the days of crossword puzzles and the manner in which sales of coupons were made in the streets. During this week I visited Colin street. In the gateway of a large private house I saw a man sitting at a table selling lottery tickets. I pulled up and bought a ticket. I dare say many other people patronised this elderly man for the same purpose. Every opportunity is given to encourage the spirit of gambling. I like a small gamble myself and have bought many lottery tickets. When in New South Wales the other day I was waiting at a street corner opposite an empty shop in which tickets were being sold. I bought a ticket and collected £10. That encouraged me on my return to invest a little more money in

our own lotteries. If the Bill has done no other good, it has retained within the State a large amount of money that would have gone out of it. The control of the lotteries has been excellent. I have on many occasions come in contact with the Commission. In the secretary they have an excellent man who has had a lifelong experience of work for charities. His control leaves little to be desired. In the chairman we have a man above reproach. He has an intimate knowledge of charities and has worked for them for many years. His work for the Ugly Men's Association is well known. His experience is unique, and his judgment is good. We wanted an X-ray plant in our district. I happened to be conversing with the chairman of the Commission, who said, "Whereas within Australia people were paying £350 for these plants, through buying a large number we have been able to acquire them for £300, and this has saved the Commission £1,000."

Hon. J. Cornell: Could not any other concern with money have done the same thing?

Hon. H. V. PIESSE: Yes, but the chairman must receive credit for his business acumen. A man often buys what he wants without thinking of going to the best market for it. The chairman of the Commission is to be commended for his business-like methods in effecting this and other savings on behalf of charitable institutions. The Commission consists of the chairman and three colleagues. It is not always convenient to get together members of an honorary committee, and if a committee were appointed the smooth running of this business might be interfered with. I agree we have plenty of people in the community capable of allocating these funds. Mr. Parker's suggestion that the appointments to the committee should go with positions rather than with individuals is a good one, but, if the suggestion of the committee were adopted, we might lose some of the present cohesion that is evident in the work. It would not be possible to call an honorary committee together as often as was required. When in Committee I shall move to reduce the amount set down from £1,750 to £1,400. The chairman should not receive more than £800 a year and his colleagues not more than £200 a year each. If the Bill is passed I am sure the Commission will continue to do good work for charity.

Hon. J. Cornell: Has the hon. member any assurance that the present chairman will be re-appointed?

Hon. H. V. PIESSE: The Honorary Minister practically intimated that the present chairman would receive the appointment. He has been well trained for the position. A great deal of the success of the lotteries can be attributed to the excellent work performed by the chairman. I support the second reading.

HON. E. H. ANGELO (North) [8.28]: I agree that the Lotteries Commission has been conducted in a satisfactory manner, and clear of all suspicion. Its activities have prevented a lot of money from leaving the State. They have given employment to men who are acting as agents, and have helped those on the bread line to increase their income. These things are on the credit side. We have to consider what is on the other side. Mr. Parker has said that the gambling spirit has been encouraged. This applies not only amongst men but unfortunately amongst women also. These lottery tickets have acted detrimentally in the case of children. I was speaking to a small storekeeper in a suburb the other day. He told me his business was going down. I expressed surprise and indicated that this should not be so as the depression was said to be lifting. He laid the blame at the door of the lotteries, and said his business was going down because of the number of people who spent their money in the purchase of tickets. He told me—and though some members may not believe this, I assure them that I have obtained corroboration of the statement—that a lot of the money given to wives by their husbands to buy necessities, and perhaps little luxuries such as fruit for the children, was now diverted to the purchase of lottery tickets. We cannot get away from the fact that a quarter of a million of money is being put into consultations annually. Somebody has to suffer because of that. Recently I was talking to a lottery ticket seller in one of the arcades, and he told me that numerous women buy a lottery ticket every time they come to the city to shop. Who loses by it? Can the women afford it? From what I gather, they cannot. The money has been given by the husband to buy requirements for the family, and the family have to go without. I do not say

the evil has grown to great dimensions, but it may grow in the same ratio as the sale of lottery tickets. Therefore, whilst I shall vote for the second reading, I do hope that the principal Act will be kept an annual measure, so that we may watch that the evils connected with the system do not outweigh the benefits. The Honorary Minister to-day told us of the splendid work the Lotteries Commission have achieved on an annual basis. The measure so far has been re-enacted from year to year. If splendid work is being done under an annual measure, why ask for a permanent Act? Why not continue the present system? I am indeed anxious to be enabled to watch the operations of the Lotteries Commission year by year, in order to ensure that the evils shall not at some time or other outweigh the benefits.

HON. C. H. WITTENOOM (South-East) [8.34]: I support the second reading. I am quite in favour of the continuance of the lotteries, because I consider that so far they have done a great deal of good. If not good in themselves, they have been the means of preventing much harm. I agree with what Mr. Parker said as to the lotteries having prevented the sale of tickets in the street and other things entirely illegal. Experience tells us that nothing we can do will prevent gambling in some form or other. I am convinced that this controlled gambling is the least harmful form of gambling. There are many other gambles which give investors of 2s. 6d. or 5s. far better returns when they are fortunate enough to win. The odds in Tattersall's are considerably greater than those in our local charities sweeps. People investing in our sweeps are well aware that a large percentage of the half-crown paid for a lottery ticket goes to the benefit of the State and towards humanitarian ends. I shall have to offer opposition to some clauses in Committee. I do not entirely like the Bill, though I am not opposed to the continuance of the consultations. I regret that the measure has been brought down so late. Considerable interest has been taken by the public in the passage of the Bill through Parliament, and one does not like to think that it has to be forced through, as on the present occasion. The time has arrived when we can safely extend the period of the Act beyond one year,

the extension granted hitherto. The experimental stage admittedly is over. Good has resulted from the sweeps, inasmuch as at least one form of gambling is under control and supervision. I favour the continuance of the Act beyond one year, though until the Committee stage is reached I am not prepared to state the exact term I favour. The cost of running the lotteries has been £1,000 a year. The spade work has now been done, and the experimental work has been capably carried out by the chairman and his fellow Commissioners. To the credit of the chairman and his staff it must be said that their efforts have been successful in every direction. There has never been a whisper of suspicion as to dishonesty or anything that should not occur. The Commission's administration has been well spoken of everywhere. No complaints whatever have been made regarding the distribution of profits. It has been stated here before that the expenses of our lotteries are the lowest of all the lotteries conducted in Australia. The sale of tickets has cost as little as 6 per cent., a remarkably low figure. I am wholly in favour of terming the person who is to control the lotteries in future a Commissioner. I do not like the term "manager" suggested by Mr. Parker, and the lotteries should not be run by, say, a Treasury official. The use of the term "Commissioner" will keep up the status of the new body. Much experience has been gained during the last three years. The expenses of the board are now to be increased to £1,750 per annum. Surely there is no need to increase the expenses; rather should they be decreased. I recognise the chairman's responsibilities, and I hope the future chairman will be the present chairman, who has had great experience of conducting lotteries. Like Mr. Piesse, I know of no one who could occupy the position better than the present chairman has done. I shall not support a salary of £1,000 for him, but am inclined to agree with Mr. Piesse that the amount should be £750 or £800. As to the remainder of the board, while prepared to support something in the form of a board I am totally against the retaining of three additional Commissioners at salaries of £250 a year each. The expenses should be kept within the £1,000 mark. In Committee I shall support a board with an experienced

chairman, who I hope will be the present chairman.

HON. J. M. MACFARLANE (Metropolitan-Suburban) [8.42]: Three years ago, when Parliament first considered this question, I supported the measure because I believed it was better to regulate the gambling evil than to let it run untrammelled. At that time conditions in our midst with regard to gambling were scandalous. Another vicious factor sprang up in the shape of the cross-word puzzle, which created something like vested interests. Great difficulty was experienced in suppressing that particular evil. I supported the original Lotteries Bill, not with the idea of exploiting the gambling spirit of the community, but rather to check and regulate it, since it cannot be wholly suppressed. I also supported the Bill because annual renewal would enable us to watch the trend of events. The experience of the last two years is within the knowledge of hon. members. We were wise in restricting the measure to 12 months' duration. Mr. Parker has rightly pointed out that conditions are now fast getting back to what they were three years ago. So much is evident from the manner in which tobaccoists and others are endeavouring to popularise gambling and increase the returns from it. In fact, a vested interest is being created from that aspect. Therefore let us restrict the operation of the Act to another year. Let it not be said that permanency is being assured to vested interests in this respect. The principal Act can easily be extended from year to year. Possibly a revulsion of feeling will come, and the public will not put into future consultations the money they are putting into the present consultations. I am satisfied that the commission of 10 per cent. paid to sellers of tickets is too high. The Minister stated that that is the usual percentage paid in such circumstances throughout Australia, and I believe that such a payment tends to create a vested interest.

The Honorary Minister: We could not sell tickets unless that commission were paid.

Hon. J. M. MACFARLANE: And for that very reason, I contend the percentage should be reduced.

Hon. E. H. Angelo: You reduce the rate, and the tickets will not be sold.

Hon. J. M. MACFARLANE: I would be in favour of that.

Hon. H. V. Piesse: You want to continue the Act without the sale of any tickets!

Hon. J. M. MACFARLANE: The payment of a commission of 10 per cent. means that men of energy are exploiting the position and are spending money to popularise their activities. If the Act were to be made permanent, I am afraid that, instead of spending the moderate amount of money that has been spent in the past three years, the commissioners would increase the amount by added advertising to further popularise the sweeps. The Commission should review the position to ascertain whether the task of selling tickets is not becoming too popular, particularly in view of what Mr. Piesse has indicated with regard to happenings in West Perth. I understood the intention was that tickets should be sold in business places, and certainly not in gateways to private houses. If that sort of thing were to continue, the situation could easily get out of hand, and it would seem to indicate that the commissioners have become a little lax in the issuing of licenses.

The Honorary Minister: You have no evidence at all that the commissioners have any knowledge of the practice?

Hon. J. M. MACFARLANE: Possibly that is so, and I am inclined to think it is so, but they should be told of it so they can suppress the practice. We understood that tickets were to be sold at half-a-crown, but now they are available so that people can buy quarter-shares.

The Honorary Minister: That is not done by the Commission.

Member: That is done by agents.

Hon. J. M. MACFARLANE: At any rate, the shopkeepers and agents are selling quarter-shares, and the commissioners should review that position. I feel that the extension of the Act for one year at a time is quite long enough. I have been told, as other members have heard too, that the gentleman who is at present chairman of the Lotteries Commission desires to retain that post and give up his Parliamentary work. I recognise the enthusiasm that that gentleman has infused into his work. I acknowledge his organising ability, and the community are indebted to him for the

great work he has carried out. I am satisfied in view of his enthusiasm, his great work and the interest he has displayed, the chairman of the Commission will be just as sure of his re-appointment from year to year as he would be if he were appointed for the full term of five years. As to the increased payment proposed, now that the work is properly organised, I think the number of commissioners could be reduced to two—the chairman and another commissioner. They would be able to deal with the most important part of their work, which is to consider requests from charitable bodies, and undertake the rather unpleasant duty of refusing assistance where deemed advisable.

Hon. H. V. Piesse: The chairman would have a casting vote, which would make him supreme.

Hon. J. M. MACFARLANE: I shall support the second reading of the Bill, but I will not agree to the extension of its provisions for the period desired by the Government, nor shall I agree to the increased remuneration to be paid to the commissioners. If the Honorary Minister were to agree to the amendment of the Bill along the lines I have suggested, perhaps the present chairman would be satisfied with his outlook and retain his position. If not, he has his present good job, and while the loss to the community of his services as chairman of the Commission might be great, I do not think the work of the Commission would fall to the ground if the chairman were to confine himself to Parliamentary duties.

HON. J. J. HOLMES (North) [8.52]: One could say a great deal on the Bill but for the fact that we have more or less agreed to be brief.

The Honorary Minister: I was just wondering if we had!

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: At any rate, I shall be as brief as the Honorary Minister was. I do not propose to discuss the chairman of the Commission other than to say he has done his job remarkably well. When this House has finished with the Bill, the remuneration may not be sufficient to induce him to carry on. He has been in a fortunate position for some years past. Owing to the action of this House he has been able to draw his

Parliamentary salary and also his fees from the Lotteries Commission. However, we are not discussing the chairman, but the Bill. I think the Government have been ill-advised in introducing the measure at this stage of the session, particularly in view of the fact that the whole problem was fought out last year. The Government desired to extend the life of the Act to three years, but members of this Chamber, in their wisdom, renewed the Act for one year only.

The Honorary Minister: When should we have introduced the Bill?

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: Earlier in the session. The Government knew that the Act had to be renewed, and last year we indicated to the Government that we would grant extensions of the Act only from year to year. It has to be remembered that since then, one-third of the members of the House have been to the country and have been returned almost without exception.

Hon. A. Thomson: With a mandate?

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: I think we can say they were returned with a mandate to this extent that their return indicated that, in the opinion of their constituents, they acted properly in extending the Act for one year only. We have heard references to the provision of £100,000 for a community hospital. If that amount is to be derived from the proceeds of the consultations for the provision of a community hospital, what will become of the charities and hospitals outback where facilities are sadly required?

Hon. E. H. Gray: They will not be neglected.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: Apparently the Government have reached a stage where they can take money from anywhere anyhow. Strange to say, that information has reached London, because I received a letter from a very important citizen of this State who is by no means a wowser. I am not a wowser either, although I have not yet bought a lottery ticket, which is more than most members can say. The gentleman I refer to held an important position in this State and now has a most important position in London. He wrote to me saying that history was repeating itself in this State in that 200 years ago one statesman of the Empire said that "the Government, having exhausted the virtues of the people, were now endeavouring to live upon their vices." I think I can say that that

statesman who lived 200 years ago was not very far out in his estimate, and the gentleman who sent me that quotation from London indicated that he was much concerned about the manner in which money can be obtained in Western Australia anywhere, anyhow, and from anyone. We have heard a lot about the good work the members of the Commission have done in the distribution of money among the various charities. There is a lot that can be said on the other side with regard to the harm done to the community—even to four ladies at a bridge table who put in 7½d. each in order to provide 2s. 6d. with which to buy a lottery ticket!

Hon. A. Thomson: They would possibly lose more than that at bridge.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: I could talk about the disadvantages of the Bill, but I shall support the second reading of the measure for one reason only. I shall support it in order that during the Committee stage we may strike out all but the Title and include a clause extending the operations of the Act from 1934 to 1935. We have heard a lot about the manner in which the sweeps have been conducted. One of the reasons for that satisfactory position and for the sweeps being conducted wholesomely and cleanly is that everyone associated with them knows that this House has the whip over them and that if they do not carry out their job properly, there will be no extension of the Act.

HON. A. THOMSON (South-East) [9.0]: If one may judge from the various speeches that have been delivered, all that will remain of the Bill when this Chamber has finished with it will be authority to continue the existing Act for another 12 months. Let us be practical. We have heard of the enormous amount of money being expended in advertising the lotteries, and we have been told that a large number of people are selling lottery tickets and creating vested interests. The rate of commission paid is 10 per cent. and I think it would be wise for the Commission to give the sole right of selling tickets to a limited number of agents. When Parliament legalised lotteries, the selling of tickets in doorways was prohibited under a penalty of £10, and yet it continues.

Member: What about starting-price bookmakers?

Hon. A. THOMSON: We all know that there are certain public places where one can meet bookmakers on Saturday afternoon.

Hon. H. S. W. Parker: And on Saturday night.

Hon. A. THOMSON: So I understand, but I do not patronize the bookmakers. We are told that there are tobacconists who, when one buys a packet of cigarettes from them, produce a book of lottery tickets. It is not many years since 50 per cent. of the hairdressers exhibited over their doors the sign, "I communicate with Hobart." There was no difficulty in sending money to Hobart.

Hon. J. Cornell: And they send still.

Hon. A. THOMSON: Yes. The Golden Casket lottery in Queensland is advertised in the same way. No doubt other members have received a circular, as I have, drawing attention to a Golden Casket lottery for £10,000. We should discourage the advertising of lotteries on picture screens. At least a dozen people used to advertise in the newspapers that they communicated with Hobart. There was a certain place in Barrack-street which one could enter at any time and pay for a lottery ticket to be forwarded from Hobart.

Hon. J. J. Holmes: You can do that today.

Hon. A. THOMSON: Yes. The man who was chiefly responsible for the introduction of lotteries legislation in this State was the man who was appointed chairman of the Commission. I supported the legislation because I felt that Parliamentary control was necessary. During this year a sum of £208,000 has been subscribed for lotteries.

Hon. J. Cornell: That amount could be doubled if they went after business.

Hon. A. THOMSON: The number of lotteries to be conducted annually is limited by the Act, and unless the Act be amended, a larger number cannot be conducted.

Hon. J. M. Macfarlane: What about the community hospital?

Hon. A. THOMSON: I intend to refer to that. As a country resident, I admit that much benefit has accrued to country hospitals from the lotteries, and I would regret on that account to see the lotteries abolished. Mr. Angelo said there were ladies who used money for lottery tickets that should be devoted to the purchase of groceries. That

sort of thing has existed at all times. If the hon. member went to the trots on Saturday night, he would find that the majority of those crowding to get place-tote tickets were ladies.

Hon. E. H. Angelo: That is all gambling.

Hon. A. THOMSON: But reducing the number of lotteries would not reduce the gambling spirit. We should congratulate ourselves on the fact mentioned by Mr. Parker that no breath of scandal has been raised against the Lotteries Commission. That is more than can be said for some of the other lotteries and some of the newspaper competitions, judging by prosecutions launched in the police court. I take strong exception to the proposal that a large sum of money from the lotteries should be earmarked to provide a community hospital in Perth.

Hon. E. H. H. Hall: I think that was suggested by the chairman.

Hon. A. THOMSON: In the metropolitan area there has been considerable discussion about the shortage of hospital accommodation. If country people want a hospital, they must provide half the funds through the local authority or through a local committee, and I fail to see why much-needed hospital requirements in the metropolitan area should not be provided by the local authorities, on the same basis as applies in country districts.

Hon. L. B. Bolton: A lot of the city hospital accommodation is for country people.

Hon. A. THOMSON: And city people also use country hospitals. If I wanted to go into the Perth Hospital, would I be admitted.

Hon. L. B. Bolton: No.

Hon. A. THOMSON: If I were admitted, I would not stay long. Apparently the Government will secure no more than a continuance of the existing Act. As regards the proposed honorary committee, I consider that the Lord Mayor of Perth is already overburdened with his duties. The extra expense proposed to be incurred for commissioners amounts to less than one penny on every pound subscribed and that phase would not influence me against the Bill. I shall support the second reading, feeling sure that sanction will be given only for the continuance of the Act for another year.

HON. H. SEDDON (North-East) [9.9]: Although it is evident from the tone of the debate that the Bill will be passed, I see no reason to depart from the attitude I have adopted in previous years. Certain credit has been given to the Commission for having cleaned up the very undesirable state of affairs that existed prior to their appointment. That credit is merited. While a certain amount of credit may be given to the Commission, I must make some remarks with regard to the intervention of Ministers. I should like the Honorary Minister to explain why the Government changed the personnel of the Commission, retaining only the chairman. If the work of the Commission was satisfactory, credit was due to the other Commissioners as much as it was due to the chairman. If the work was unsatisfactory, the blame should be apportioned to the chairman as much as to his colleagues.

The Honorary Minister: To whom are you referring?

Hon. H. SEDDON: To Mr. Mann and the other members of the Commission, who were retired by the present Government. Why were they retired and others appointed in their places? There is a section in the Act providing for Ministerial intervention, and that intervention should be explained, seeing that the Government are now asking us to give them authority to make the measure permanent. The House would be well advised not to accede to the desires of the Government. It has been suggested that the Act should be limited to one more year, so that Parliament may retain a certain amount of control over the whole business. It is a wise suggestion. The Commission have the power to allow a certain number of sweeps to be conducted apart from the State lottery every year for charitable purposes. Amongst these it has been the custom to allow the Coolgardie Union to conduct a sweep, the proceeds of which are devoted to its worn out members. This year permission to hold that sweep was refused, although it was first of all given.

Hon. E. H. Gray: Scores of other organisations have been refused also.

Hon. H. SEDDON: The position is set out on the file that is on the Table of the House. A letter was received by the secretary of the union stating that approval had been given for the holding of the sweep as usual, but a telegram was afterwards re-

ceived cancelling the permit. It is evident from a perusal of the file that this was due to Ministerial interference. The Honorary Minister should explain why that permission was refused, seeing that there was no change in the methods employed for the conduct of the sweep, and no change in the objects for which it was usually conducted. These two illustrations are conclusive evidence of the necessity for control of the Act being retained by Parliament, so that we may see that every attempt is made to keep the undertaking up to the mark. A considerable responsibility is cast upon the chairman of the Commission in respect of the distribution of the funds. I give him every credit for carrying out his duties to the satisfaction of the general community. I hope in Committee every clause of the Bill will be deleted with the exception of Clause 3, and that should be amended to provide for an extension of 12 months only. That will give Parliament an opportunity to look more closely into the matter, and to consider amendments to the Act with regard to Ministerial interference and possibly with regard also to limiting the number of objects to which the proceeds of the lotteries go. I should like also to refer to an amendment made to the Act last year by this House, provide that balance sheets of every sweep conducted by the Commission be placed on the Table of the House. During the year a revelation was made before an Eastern States commission that the Lotteries Commission held the sum of £28,000, representing the accumulation of various lotteries. Up to that time I do not think anyone knew that so much money was in hand. The tabling of balance sheets of these lotteries will give the House an opportunity to ascertain exactly how much money is in hand from time to time. I hope in Committee the amendments I have referred to will be made, and that Parliament will retain control of the Act for another 12 months.

HON. L. B. BOLTON (Metropolitan) [9.17]: I appreciate what this Commission has meant for our hospitals and charitable institutions, for during the last two years they have had at their backs the proceeds of these sweeps. Whilst I support the second reading, I do not feel disposed to extend the Act for more than 12 months. It would be unsafe to go beyond that period.

I am also opposed to increasing the payments to the Commissioners. I rather agree with the suggestion of Mr. Parker, that the chairman should control the Commission with the assistance of an honorary committee. It is an excellent idea. When the Bill was first before the House, I opposed the appointment of three or four commissioners. If one man who had experience of charitable matters, such as the present chairman has, were appointed, he should be well paid for his services. Even the amount provided in the Bill would not be too much for such a man. With the assistance of an honorary committee, an organisation could be got together that would probably give more satisfaction in the allocation of the funds than has been given in the past. I am opposed to the sale of tickets in quarter or half shares. I have always been opposed to that. It should be within the power of the Commission to prevent the cutting up of tickets. They are usually bought in quarters by persons who can ill-afford to lose money. The gambling spirit is instilled into every Australian. We must gamble.

The Honorary Minister: And it is instilled into the pommies, too.

HON. L. B. BOLTON: Knowing that people will gamble, we should regulate gambling to the advantage of our hospitals and charities. I am strongly opposed to the sale of tickets in quarter or half shares. Those who hold permits to sell tickets should have their permits closely looked into. I object to having pushed under my nose in the streets of Perth tickets for the charity sweeps. One cannot even enter the lift in some city offices without being importuned to buy these tickets. I consider that the method of sale adopted by the Lotteries Commission is not the best, and I earnestly suggest reconsideration of the question of licensing sellers. Especially do I consider that the sale of part tickets should cease, since by it women of small means are induced to gamble 8d. or 1s. 2d. when they can ill afford to do so. Moreover, the part tickets encourage girls and youths to gamble. I support the second reading, reserving the right to agree later to an extension of 12 months or some other term.

HON. J. CORNELL (South) [9.21]: It is a foregone conclusion that the second reading of the Bill will be carried. As I shall not have an opportunity of speaking in

Committee, I venture to offer a few remarks now on the question of lotteries in general and this Bill in particular. I stand now where I stood when the original measure was introduced. Never a wower, always a sport, I am against legalised gambling. The Lotteries Commission are about to defeat the end which they set out to achieve, the end of minimising the nuisance of street sale of tickets, especially in small shares, and also minimising the number of lotteries or art unions held within a year. One can buy an 8d. portion of a ticket anywhere. In that respect the advance made by the Commission is nil. There is another aspect. The Act declares that lotteries shall be limited to 13 in 12 months, but that provision has been defeated by the expedient of accepting over-subscriptions. The effect of receiving over-subscriptions is to remove any limit to the acceptance of subscriptions. If only six lotteries were run annually by the Commission and allowed to remain open for two months, the object of minimisation would thus be defeated. I do not mete out special praise to the Lotteries Commission for the amount of money there has been put into the consultations. So far as I see, the Commission's business is to rake in all the money they can. The job of the agent who gets 10 per cent. of the price of every ticket sold by him is to sell as many tickets as possible. When 100,000 subscriptions have been received for a consultation of 100,000 tickets, no more subscriptions should be accepted; but the Commission take all the money that comes along. Apparently the Commission's job is to raise magnificent sums of money. Though the matter cannot be dealt with in this Bill, I submit that the principle of one body getting the money in and that body paying it out in absolutely unsound. One institution should raise the funds, and another institution should distribute them. If lotteries are to be continued, such departments as the Medical and Health and the Charities should be the distributing agencies. The expenditure of £6,000 on the Ugly Men's Wokalup Farm is not expenditure on charity. By no stretch of imagination can I regard that farm as a charitable institution, though it is a laudable enterprise. Moneys have been given by the Lotteries Commis-

sion to other similar organisations and institutions of various kinds throughout the State. It looks as if the charitable work conducted for years by properly constituted departments is to be jettisoned—handed over to a Commission responsible practically to no-one. Whilst I extend a measure of commendation to the present chairman of the Lotteries Commission, I do not subscribe to the view that that gentleman is a genius in the world of charity. I venture to say that the Mayor of Fremantle and Mr. Harry Mann have done as much in the field of charity as the present chairman of the Lotteries Commission has done. They have a record that will bear examination equally with the record of the present chairman. That gentleman may have qualifications, but they are no greater than the qualifications of the other two gentlemen. Another phase of the lotteries business to which I take exception is that in what should be an ordered community it is ludicrous that while Cliff Derby is fined £50 because an individual has walked into his shop and put half-a-crown on a horse, other individuals can lawfully walk into the shop of a lottery ticket seller to buy 2s. 6d. tickets which represent an actual value of about 10d. If it is logical to minimise lotteries by legalisation, I see no fundamental difference between the man who has a horse-racing bet in a shop and the man who buys a lottery ticket in a shop. I know that the chairman of the Lotteries Commission is dead against the legalisation of shop betting. I shall return to a consideration of the qualifications of the chairman and his co-commissioners, for, in common with Mr. Seddon, I view the position with suspicion. What makes me fearful of giving up Parliament's annual control over the legislation is what has happened in the past. We know that when the chairman of the Lotteries Commission unwittingly accepted the position, Parliament stepped in and protected him from the consequences that followed. Then there was a change of Government and when the first opportunity presented itself for the appointment of commissioners, the Government did not re-appoint the three commissioners who had carried out so much work in an honorary capacity and laid the groundwork that made the establishment of the Lotteries Commission possible. On

the other hand, they saw fit to appoint the present chairman, but did not re-appoint Mr. Gibson, Mr. H. Mann, who has done as much for the charities as the present chairman, nor yet Mr. Hearty.

Hon. C. F. Baxter: They did not belong to the Labour Party.

Hon. E. H. Gray: How do you know?

Hon. C. F. Baxter: I do know.

Hon. J. CORNELL: Twelve months ago it was the express wish of this House that the members of the Commission should be re-appointed and we sent a message to the Legislative Assembly to that effect. Those men had carried on when the work was not lawful, as it is now, but when legislation was passed to make the activity lawful, those gentlemen were appointed as commissioners. Then came the change of Government and the only commissioner who was re-appointed was the man with Labour leanings. Personally, I cannot see that the present chairman and those associated with him now have any better qualifications than those they displaced. That is one reason why I am suspicious regarding the extension of the Act. Particularly is that so when we realise that men who for 15 or 20 years have worked in the interests of charities in an honorary capacity were not re-appointed, but total strangers were chosen for their positions. I am also suspicious from the standpoint touched upon by Mr. Seddon. For instance, there was the refusal of the Lotteries Commission to allow the Coolgardie Federated Miners' Union, after conducting sweeps for 11 years, to continue to do so.

Hon. E. H. Gray: The lumpers were also refused permission.

Hon. J. CORNELL: I understand that the file shows that in 1933 the Coolgardie Federated Miners' Union applied to the original Commission for permission to conduct a small sweep on the Kalgoorlie Cup, as they had done for so many years previously. They secured the permission and complied with the necessary conditions even to the extent of accounting for £2 10s. that had not been claimed. An application was made to the new Commission to continue the sweep next year. The Commission advised the union, after the Commissioner of Police had granted his sanction, to this effect on the 5th June, 1934:—

As promised, your application was placed before the Commission at their last meeting,

and I have pleasure to inform you that your application for permission to conduct a raffle, 10,000 tickets at 1s., to be conducted on the Kalgoorlie Cup, to be run on the 5th September, 1934, in aid of the distress fund, has been approved. I would point out to you the necessity of adhering strictly to the conditions of your application and conforming to the provisions of the Lotteries (Control) Act. A statement must be submitted to this office, together with the names of the prize winners, when the effort is finalised.

That letter was signed by the secretary. On the following day a telegram was received by the secretary of the Coolgardie Miners' Union, Mr. W. Goulden, as follows:—

Approval your sweep forwarded in error. Letter following. R. K. Buscombe, Lotteries Commission.

On the next day the secretary of the union received the following letter from the secretary of the Lotteries Commission:—

I wish to confirm our telegram of yesterday's date, namely, "Approval your sweep forwarded in error. Letter following. R. K. Buscombe, Lotteries Commission." Owing to the absence through sickness of our chief clerk, our letter of the 5th inst. notifying you that your application to conduct a lottery on the Kalgoorlie Cup had been approved was forwarded to you in error, as the statutory approval had not been obtained. Your application, therefore, has not been approved.

Hon. E. H. Gray: There are hundreds of organisations that received the same letter.

Hon. J. CORNELL: They did not receive the same letter.

Hon. E. H. Gray: Well, practically the same type of letter.

Hon. J. CORNELL: No, not even practically the same type of letter. I assert that no other organisation in the State received a letter granting permission, followed by a telegram saying that the letter had been forwarded in error, and then a letter saying that the permission to conduct the sweep had not been granted.

Hon. E. H. Gray: The explanation may have been quite correct.

Hon. H. Seddon: But it may not have been right.

Hon. J. CORNELL: There are phases of the file that I could comment on, but I shall not do so. There are other instances I could mention. All I desire to say is that the actual position was that after the Commission decided to give that organisation permission to run the sweep, it was the Min-

ister who stepped in and the Commission bowed to the will of the Minister.

The Honorary Minister: You infer that, but have you any proof?

Hon. J. CORNELL: Well, that is my opinion.

The Honorary Minister: You say you will not quote further from the file and then you draw your inference. Members may infer that what you suggest arises from what appears in the file.

Hon. J. CORNELL: Of course it is not in the file, nor is it ever likely to find a place there. They are too cute for that. Does the Minister know the origin of the Coolgardie Federated Miners' Union?

The Honorary Minister: I know a little about it.

Hon. J. CORNELL: Do you know it has been described by your party as a seab union? However, the Commission put that out of its mind and did the right thing. The Commission bowed to the decision of the higher authority, although that did not affect the organisation.

The Honorary Minister: What claim has the organisation?

Hon. J. CORNELL: None at all. There have been two potent happenings, and one wonders whether they will recur if we lose control. I understand that as a result of the decision in this case the Commission have refused to grant permission to any union to run a sweep. Consistently they could only follow the direction that a trades union was a trades union registered. It had had permission to run a sweep for years before, but that could not go on. There are other features. It has been said that Parliament had better not agree to the proposed thousand a year for the chairman.

The Honorary Minister: Why?

Hon. J. CORNELL: The Minister knows that a statement has been circulated in the Press to the effect that if Parliament agrees to a certain thing, a certain decision will be made. I think that was very injudicious.

The Honorary Minister: We are not responsible for what appears in the Press.

Hon. J. CORNELL: No, but I regret that it should have been published. All the major operations of the work are done in the office under the direction of a man who has had as much experience as any of the commissioners, and who is doing his job well. I cannot see any necessity for going beyond

the present payment. The Commission should restrict the turnover, not increase it, and that does not require any outstanding ability. I will not oppose the second reading, but I have made up my mind that in the interests of all concerned the wisest course will be to leave things as they are.

HON. W. J. MANN (South-West [9.45]): I propose to support the second reading, for I realise that the Commission are fulfilling a public requirement. If we had not the State lottery, there would be almost as much money going out of the State for lottery tickets as now flows through the coffers of the Commission. There is in progress right through Australia a wave of mild gambling and in this State we are suffering less than is any other State where lotteries are run. In Queensland the most alluring prospectuses are being circulated. There, prizes are offered of from 10s. to £25,000 and there are something like 12,000 prizes in each sweep. In New South Wales good prizes are offered, and so too in Tasmania. Unless we continue our lottery the money going to the Commission will leave the State, and we shall be powerless to prevent it. I want to pay a tribute to the good work done by those first appointed to conduct the lotteries, and who were subsequently sent about their business without any explanation whatever. Then I would pay a tribute to the work of their successors. The Bill provides that the chairman shall be paid £1,000 per annum. I do not feel prepared to support that amount, not because I think it altogether too great, but because I think it is out of proportion to the amount paid to many civil servants doing equally responsible work and who have had to spend almost a lifetime getting into the grade where they could earn that money. Regarding the other three commissioners—I do not know any of them—I have been trying to ascertain what their duties are. I cannot understand how they can find work enough to fill in their time. This business is not on all fours with an ordinary commercial business. There is no purchasing to be done; there is no sales campaign to undertake; there is none of the worry or trouble that is associated with an ordinary business. I understand that most of the agents go to the office, tender the cash, less the commission, and are handed the tickets to sell. There are no book entries; it is purely a cash business.

The Honorary Minister: There must be entries.

Hon. W. J. MANN: There would be no booking. If the Commission are selling tickets on tick, it is time we closed the show up. I am inclined to infer from the remark of the Minister that they are doing so. Outside of the chairman's work, there is precious little that the other commissioners could do except to confer as to the allocation of the surplus. Mr. Parker's suggestion to co-opt certain persons to advise the Commission was a sensible one, though I do not know how far it would be practicable. There may be some difficulty in the way of getting service from the gentlemen required at the right time. Still, it seems quite unnecessary to have three additional commissioners merely to say how the money should be allocated. That should be a very simple matter that could be handled in another way. In view of the salaries paid to men holding responsible positions in the Civil Service, an amount of £750 or £800 a year should be ample for the chairman. I am not quibbling about the amount; I realise that the sum spent in salaries is very small as compared with the turnover. I think it was Mr. Piesse who suggested £800 a year. If the chairman received £800, I consider that he would be well paid, and the general public, who are prepared to take in prizes only about 45 per cent. of the money subscribed, would feel that they were getting a little better deal. If members believe that other commissioners are necessary, two should be ample. I should like the Honorary Minister to tell us whether the other commissioners are part-time men or whether they devote the whole of their time to the work.

Member: They are all part-time.

Hon. W. J. MANN: The chairman would be required to give the whole of his time, and if he did the job properly, I do not think he would have much spare time. I do not like the idea of selling half or quarter shares in tickets, but at the same time the unfortunate individual who can afford only 5s. is as much entitled to have his little gamble as is the man who can afford to buy a whole ticket. If a man wishes to buy a half share in a ticket, why deprive him of the privilege? In the 10s. sweep I mentioned, I think in Tasmania, half tickets can be purchased. One may send a postal note for 5s. and secure a half share in a

ticket. I feel some anxiety about the method adopted to dispose of tickets. I understand that many people who have been given recognition as agents are farming-out tickets. I was told that a man in the country—he was about the last man whom I would have suspected of making money out of lotteries in this way—was getting tickets and handing them to other people, and splitting the commission with them. That man is in a good way of business, and I was surprised at his action. That sort of business should not be perpetuated. Probably the Commission know nothing about it, but it is one of the things they could investigate. After listening to some of the remarks in this Chamber, one would be inclined to say definitely that the right course to adopt would be to renew this legislation year by year. I do not think it is quite necessary to do that. At the same time, I believe the House should not grant too long a duration. I consider that five years is too long, and I would suggest a period of three years. That should be ample. If a man was not prepared to take the position of chairman at £800 a year under a three years' tenure, he would be at liberty to refuse, and I could imagine a few people being injured in the scramble to get the job, so many would be scurrying after it. I shall support the second reading, and look forward with interest to the Committee stage.

HON. R. G. MOORE (North-East) [9.59]: I have spoken on similar legislation on each occasion when it has been presented to us, and have opposed it, and I see no reason to change my attitude now. It has been stated that we cannot altogether suppress the tendency amongst Australians to indulge in gambling. I do not know that gambling is peculiar to Australians. The same spirit is found amongst all peoples. It is recognised by all countries that gambling is an evil. The Government have three courses open to them in dealing with it. One is to take no notice of it, the other is to do all in their power to minimise it, and the third is to encourage it, which is what they are doing in Western Australia. When the Bill came before us a second time the Minister in charge told us how popular the lotteries had become, and how increasingly easy it was to sell the tickets. This evening he told us it had become more popular still, and that it was

still easier to sell the tickets. The care of the sick and indigent of the State should be a charge upon the people of the State. They should not be dependent upon the exploitation of the gambling spirit for the maintenance of these institutions. It would be an easy matter for the Government to get all the money they want for these purposes, but it is easier still to get it through the lotteries. Because it is easier they are prepared, as people in other walks of life are prepared, to take the line of least resistance. The Commission are exploiting the gambling instincts of the people by flaunting their advertisements before them on every occasion. Thousands of pounds are spent in this State on lottery tickets that would not be spent if the sweeps were not being conducted in this way. Every day we see advertisements telling people how much they can win for a small outlay. Persons get into the habit every pay day of putting so much into these lotteries. It is very easy to acquire a habit, but very difficult to get away from it. Now and again someone wins a substantial prize, and that encourages other people to go on buying tickets in the hope that their turn will come next.

Hon. J. M. Macfarlane: It cost a man in New Zealand only £5 when he won £12,000.

Hon. R. G. MOORE: The position is economically unsound. Lotteries produce no wealth, but only take money from the pockets of the people. Last year, I think it was, the people subscribed £70,000, so that the charities might receive £30,000. The Government could easily have obtained a greater sum than £30,000, and it would have cost the people less to raise that money. Because it is easy to get money in this way, and because other countries indulge in the same thing, is no reason why we should do it here. I was rather amused to listen to the remarks of some members. They are strongly in favour of lotteries for the raising of money for charities, but they say, "Do not advertise them too much, or people may buy too many tickets. It is a good thing, but do not go too far with it." Every time this Bill comes down we are told that the sale of tickets is increasing, and we are now told that the lotteries are so popular that the Act should be made a permanent one. From the very beginning I opposed this legislation. I consider it is wrong in principle, and is economically unsound. It means encouraging something the Government are in

duty bound to suppress. I have heard farmers talk about rabbits. They say the only good rabbit is a dead rabbit. The only good lottery Bill is a dead lottery Bill. I will do my best to kill this Bill every time it comes before the House. I will oppose the second reading, and in Committee I will oppose every clause.

THE HONORARY MINISTER (Hon. W. H. Kitson—West—in reply) [10.5]: There are two points I should like to reply to. The first is the question that if the Commission intend to provide money for a community hospital, what is going to happen to the other charities? I thought it was made clear that the Commission has been able to provide ample funds for all legitimate charities, and that in addition there had been a margin which could be used for the purpose I have mentioned. Every legitimate organisation which has been accustomed to receive revenue from sources of this kind has, to say the least of it, benefited by the operations of the Commission. Another point raised was as to the selling of tickets. Some members suggested that we were drifting back to the conditions which existed prior to the appointment of a commission. I have never seen any signs of a reversion to those conditions, and I doubt whether any member can point to any instance that closely approximates the conditions that existed two or three years ago.

Hon. J. M. Macfarlane: The trend of things is working that way.

THE HONORARY MINISTER: We cannot help it if agents advertise the fact that they have tickets to sell. When agents are appointed they must adopt the best means to dispose of their wares. The results last year showed that the people of Western Australia have confidence in the Commission to the extent that lottery after lottery was subscribed in full. Whilst that confidence exists we need not complain much about the way the Commission are handling the business. Both Mr. Seddon and Mr. Cornell wanted to know how it was that a certain organisation had been refused permission to run a sweep after such permission had been granted.

Hon. H. Seddon: A permission which had been granted for ten years.

The HONORARY MINISTER: I do not know. I do know that other organisations were refused permission to conduct similar sweeps. Possibly someone anticipated a decision by the Commission that was not given. The same position applies in the case of scores of organisations. It has occurred in the case of organisations with which I am connected, but I have not complained about it. I do not propose to spend any more time on this stage of the Bill. Let us get into Committee and decide what we are going to do with the measure.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

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

Clause 1—agreed to.

Clause 2—Amendment of Section 3 of the principal Act:

Hon. H. SEDDON: I hope the Committee will delete the clause, and thus restore the position that existed last year, the principal Act being extended for 12 months, which is most desirable.

Hon. H. V. PIESSE: I move an amendment—

That in subparagraph (i) of paragraph (e) the word "five" be struck out.

I propose to substitute three years for five.

Hon. E. H. ANGELO: There is a danger in the amendment. In another place an amendment was moved to strike out "five" and the Committee agreed to retain the word. Later, an amendment to extend the principal Act for one year was disallowed because a term of five years had been agreed to in the case of the chairman of the Lotteries Commission.

The CHAIRMAN: We do not do things like that here. The Committee can agree to any amendment in the clause, and then, when the main question is put, "That the clause as amended stand part of the Bill," the whole clause can be voted out.

Hon. L. B. BOLTON: If a three-years amendment is carried now, will it not be necessary to extend the principal Act for three years?

The CHAIRMAN: No.

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

Ayes	21
Noes	5

Majority for 16

AYES.

Hon. E. H. Angelo	Hon. G. W. Miles
Hon. C. F. Baxter	Hon. R. G. Moore
Hon. L. B. Bolton	Hon. T. Moore
Hon. J. M. Drew	Hon. J. Nicholson
Hon. J. T. Franklin	Hon. H. S. W. Parker
Hon. G. Fraser	Hon. H. V. Piesse
Hon. E. H. Gray	Hon. A. Thomson
Hon. V. Hamersley	Hon. C. H. Wittenoom
Hon. W. H. Kitson	Hon. H. J. Yelland
Hon. J. M. Macfarlane	Hon. C. G. Elliott
Hon. W. J. Mann	(Teller.)

NOES.

Hon. L. Craig	Hon. H. Tuckey
Hon. J. J. Holmes	Hon. E. H. H. Hall
Hon. H. Seddon	(Teller.)

Amendment thus passed.

Hon. H. V. PIESSE: I move an amendment—

That the word "three" be inserted in lieu of the word struck out.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: I move an amendment on the amendment—

That the word "one" be inserted in lieu of the word struck out.

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

Ayes	16
Noes	10

Majority for 6

AYES.

Hon. E. H. Angelo	Hon. R. G. Moore
Hon. C. F. Baxter	Hon. J. Nicholson
Hon. L. B. Bolton	Hon. H. V. Piesse
Hon. J. T. Franklin	Hon. H. Seddon
Hon. E. H. H. Hall	Hon. A. Thomson
Hon. V. Hamersley	Hon. C. H. Wittenoom
Hon. J. J. Holmes	Hon. H. J. Yelland
Hon. J. M. Macfarlane	Hon. G. W. Miles
	(Teller.)

NOES.

Hon. L. Craig	Hon. W. H. Kitson
Hon. J. M. Drew	Hon. T. Moore
Hon. C. G. Elliott	Hon. H. V. Piesse
Hon. G. Fraser	Hon. H. Tuckey
Hon. E. H. Gray	Hon. W. J. Mann
	(Teller.)

Amendment on amendment thus passed.

The CHAIRMAN: The Committee appear to have wandered somewhat from the narrow path. The Act provides that the chairman shall be appointed for one year; the Bill proposed that he should hold office for five years and the Committee have decided

that he shall hold office for one year. The Act says that the other members of the Commission shall hold office for one year, whereas the Bill provides that they shall retire in rotation, one at the end of one year, another at the expiration of two years, and the remaining member at the end of three years.

Hon. W. J. MANN: Before we reach that stage, would I be in order in moving to amend Sub-paragraph (ii) by striking out "three" and inserting "two" in lieu? I think that two members in addition to the chairman, instead of three as at present, would be ample.

The CHAIRMAN: The hon. member will have to amend the principal Act. If, as it appears, the Bill will be limited to one year's duration, the more sensible way would be to strike out Clause 2 altogether. If members wish to limit the Act to one year, I suggest they vote against Clause 2.

Hon. H. J. YELLAND: If we limit the Act to one year it will be necessary to take out paragraph (a), but to take out the whole of Clause 2 seems impracticable, for already it has been amended, and further amendments are intended.

The CHAIRMAN: I suggest that the Committee delete sub-paragraph (ii).

Hon. H. SEDDON: I appeal to the Committee to delete the whole of Clause 2.

Hon. H. V. PIESSE: I oppose the deletion of Clause 2. I previously said I would move an amendment to provide a salary of £800 for the chairman and of £200 for each of the other three Commissioners. I would be willing to agree to delete paragraph (a).

Hon. V. HAMERSLEY: I move an amendment—

That Subparagraph (ii) be struck out.

The CHAIRMAN: Does the hon. member wish to strike out the whole of Sub-paragraph (ii)?

Hon. V. HAMERSLEY: Yes.

Amendment put and passed

Hon. H. V. PIESSE: I move an amendment—

That in line 4 of the proviso to paragraph (b), "seven hundred and fifty pounds" be struck out, with a view to inserting "four hundred pounds."

I consider that £800 is quite sufficient for the chairman, and I think £200 for each of the other three Commissioners is a reasonable amount. This will make a total of £1,400.

Amendment (to strike out the words) put and passed.

Hon. G. W. Miles: If the words are not inserted the aggregate fees will be £1,000?

The CHAIRMAN: Yes.

Amendment (to insert "four hundred pounds") put and a division taken with the following result:—

Ayes	12
Noes	16
					—
Majority against	3
					—

AYES.

Hon. C. F. Baxter	Hon. V. Hamersley
Hon. J. M. Drew	Hon. W. H. Kitson
Hon. C. G. Elliott	Hon. W. J. Mann
Hon. J. T. Franklin	Hon. T. Moore
Hon. G. Fraser	Hon. H. V. Piesse
Hon. E. H. Gray	Hon. L. B. Bolton

(Teller.)

NOES.

Hon. E. H. Angelo	Hon. H. S. W. Parker
Hon. J. Cornell	Hon. H. Seddon
Hon. L. Craig	Hon. A. Thomson
Hon. J. J. Holmes	Hon. H. Tuckey
Hon. J. M. Macfarlane	Hon. C. H. Wittenoom
Hon. G. W. Miles	Hon. H. J. Yelland
Hon. R. G. Moore	Hon. E. H. H. Hall
Hon. J. Nicholson	

(Teller.)

Amendment thus negatived.

Hon. H. V. PIESSE: I move an amendment—

That in line 6 of the proviso "one thousand" be struck out with a view to inserting the words "eight hundred."

If the present Chairman is re-appointed and the job is a full-time one, £800 is little enough. Although the amount of £200 that will remain for the other Commissioners is small, I propose to test the feeling of the Committee on it.

The CHAIRMAN: Are members aware of what they have done?

Members: Yes.

The CHAIRMAN: Why carry the farce any further?

Hon. G. W. Miles: It is a waste of time.

Hon. J. J. Holmes: We are waiting for the clause to be put.

Amendment (to strike out words) put and passed.

Hon. H. V. PIESSE: I move an amendment—

That "eight hundred" be inserted in lieu of the words struck out.

The HONORARY MINISTER: The desire of the Government is that the chairman devote the whole of his time to the work, and it is desirable to fix a salary commensurate with the work to be performed. A salary of £800 is not too much for a full-time chairman, and I think that if the present chairman be re-appointed he will earn £800 or £1,000.

Hon. L. CRAIG: I strongly support the amendment. Of the £1,000, a sum of £800 is not too much for the chairman, and £200 is quite sufficient for the other commissioners. It will provide them with fees for sitting if necessary.

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

Ayes	16
Noes	11

Majority for .. 5

AYES.

Hon. C. F. Baxter	Hon. W. H. Kitson
Hon. L. B. Bolton	Hon. W. J. Mann
Hon. L. Craig	Hon. T. Moore
Hon. J. M. Drew	Hon. H. V. Piesse
Hon. C. G. Elliott	Hon. H. Tuckey
Hon. J. T. Franklin	Hon. C. H. Wittenoom
Hon. G. Fraser	Hon. H. J. Yelland
Hon. E. H. Gray	Hon. V. Hamersley

(Teller.)

NOES.

Hon. E. H. Angelo	Hon. R. G. Moore
Hon. J. Cornell	Hon. J. Nicholson
Hon. E. H. H. Hall	Hon. H. S. W. Parker
Hon. J. J. Holmes	Hon. A. Thomson
Hon. J. M. Macfarlane	Hon. H. Seddon
Hon. G. W. Miles	

(Teller.)

The CHAIRMAN: I cast my vote with the noes.

Amendment thus passed.

Hon. H. V. PIESSE: I move an amendment—

That in paragraph (b) the words "and fifty" in line 23 and the word "each" in line 24 be struck out.

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

Ayes	15
Noes	11

Majority for .. 4

AYES.

Hon. C. F. Baxter	Hon. W. H. Kitson
Hon. L. B. Bolton	Hon. W. J. Mann
Hon. L. Craig	Hon. T. Moore
Hon. J. M. Drew	Hon. H. V. Piesse
Hon. C. G. Elliott	Hon. H. Tuckey
Hon. J. T. Franklin	Hon. C. H. Wittenoom
Hon. G. Fraser	Hon. H. J. Yelland
Hon. E. H. Gray	(Teller.)

NOES.

Hon. E. H. Angelo	Hon. R. G. Moore
Hon. E. H. H. Hall	Hon. J. Nicholson
Hon. V. Hamersley	Hon. H. S. W. Parker
Hon. J. J. Holmes	Hon. H. Seddon
Hon. J. M. Macfarlane	Hon. A. Thomson
Hon. G. W. Miles	(Teller.)

Amendment thus passed.

Clause, as amended, put, and a division called for.

The CHAIRMAN: Before the tellers proceed to tell, though there is no necessity for me to vote for the defeat of the clause, I give my vote with the noes, to make sure.

Division taken with the following result:—

Ayes	13
Noes	14

Majority against .. 1

AYES.

Hon. L. B. Bolton	Hon. W. J. Mann
Hon. L. Craig	Hon. T. Moore
Hon. J. M. Drew	Hon. H. V. Piesse
Hon. C. G. Elliott	Hon. H. Tuckey
Hon. G. Fraser	Hon. C. H. Wittenoom
Hon. E. H. Gray	Hon. J. T. Franklin
Hon. W. H. Kitson	(Teller.)

NOES.

Hon. E. H. Angelo	Hon. R. G. Moore
Hon. C. F. Baxter	Hon. J. Nicholson
Hon. J. Cornell	Hon. H. S. W. Parker
Hon. E. H. H. Hall	Hon. H. Seddon
Hon. J. J. Holmes	Hon. A. Thomson
Hon. J. M. Macfarlane	Hon. H. J. Yelland
Hon. G. W. Miles	Hon. V. Hamersley

(Teller.)

Clause thus negatived.

Clause 3—Repeal of Section 21 of principal Act:

Hon. H. SEDDON: I move an amendment—

That all the words of the clause after "hereby" be struck out, and the following inserted in lieu:—"amended by deleting the word 'thirty-four,' in lines 2 and 3, and inserting the word 'thirty-five.'"

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

New clause:

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: Following upon the action taken last year, we should in-

clude a citation clause. I move an amendment—

That a new clause, to stand as Clause 4, be inserted as follows:—"The principal Act as amended by this Act may be cited as the Lotteries (Control) Act, 1932-34."

New clause put and passed.

Title—agreed to.

Bill reported with amendments, and the report adopted.

BILL—ADMINISTRATION ACT (ESTATE AND SUCCESSION DUTIES) AMENDMENT.

Assembly's Message.

Message from the Assembly received and read notifying that it had agreed to amendments Nos. 1 to 11, 13, 16, 17, 18, 20 to 50, 52, 53 and 55, made by the Council, had disagreed to amendments Nos. 12, 14, 15, 19 and 54 for the reasons set forth in the schedule annexed, and had agreed to amendment No. 51, subject to a further amendment shown in the schedule, in which further amendment the Assembly desired the concurrence of the Council.

BILL—FARMERS' DEBTS ADJUSTMENT AMENDMENT.

Second Reading.

THE CHIEF SECRETARY (Hon. J. M. Drew—Central) [11.16] in moving the second reading said: The purpose of the Bill is to amend the Farmers' Debts Adjustment Act in such a manner as to implement certain recommendations of the recent Royal Commission on the Agricultural Bank. It is intended that this shall be a logical sequence to those sections of the Agricultural Bank Bill which authorise the adjustment of debts due to the Bank, inasmuch as it provides for the consideration of proposals to write down, suspend, or otherwise adjust the debts of farmers to creditors other than the Agricultural Bank, subject to the consent of 80 per cent. of the creditors in value and provided that the first mortgagee is one of the consenting creditors. When we take into consideration the position of the wheat industry, and the vicissitudes it has experienced during the last four years, we are bound to admit that the response of credi-

tors to the spirit of the Act has been most satisfactory. Operations under the Farmers' Debts Adjustment Act in its original form commenced in January, 1931. Thus the first season in which farmers' affairs were administered under the Act was the 1931-32 season. Annual reports for 1931-32, 1932-33 and 1933-34 have been presented, and for the information of the House, inclusive statistics, which members will find of interest to them, are as follow:—

Arrangements made to carry on—1,919.

Stay Orders lapsed after first or second season—170.

Unsuccessful meetings—310.

Included in lapsed Stay Orders were 33 farmers who were able to make their own arrangements; 35 did not desire to carry on, and the balance were unable to obtain finance.

Total Crops under Act proper—

Wheat 831,127 acres.

Other 51,176 acres.

Fallowed 466,111 acres.

Under Section 13B (direct Bills of Sale arrangement)—

Area cropped 198,540 acres by 376 farmers.

Total advances in cash or kind (Act proper) £325,569.

Total advances under Section 13B £198,353.

Repayments of advances and credit (exclusive of this current season) totalled £580,738.

Total distribution to interest, hire purchase machinery, rents, rates, etc. (also exclusive of the current season) totalled £112,456.

Although the market price of wheat has been exceptionally low during the last four years, this State has, fortunately, enjoyed the benefit of normal seasons. The indications for this year, however, presage not only low prices, but also a reduced harvest, due to the ravages of rust, weeds in the crops and the absence of late rains. It will be necessary for creditors to take stock of their position and to consider seriously the necessity for giving either temporary or permanent relief from debts which are obviously beyond the capacity of the land to pay. This Bill makes provision to enable full and definite information of a farmer's affairs to be placed before creditors for their examination and decision. It gives the farmer an opportunity to submit a scheme for the writing down or suspension or alternately for both writing down and suspension of his debts and

liabilities. Practical recognition of producers' difficulties is necessary to give them encouragement to continue the production on which the country depends, but it is neither fair nor equitable that the Government should carry the whole burden of any relief that may be given. Other creditors must also be prepared to shoulder their share of the burden. They reaped the benefit when primary production was in a flourishing condition and it is to their interest to help to rehabilitate the industry now.

Claimants for the wheat bounty last year totalled 11,473, of whom 5,670 were Agricultural Bank clients, and 5,803 clients of Associated Banks and other institutions. The recent Royal Commission estimated farmers' debts at over £34,000,000, and it may be that they are higher, as an estimate in 1931 by another Royal Commission put them at approximately £32,000,000 exclusive of stock accounts, private mortgages, and tradespeople other than country storekeepers. Also, the accumulation of interest since 1931 must be very heavy. Examination of these figures will surely indicate the necessity to ease the dead weight which presses so heavily on the farming industry.

The principal proposals embodied in this Bill are, briefly, that a farmer, whether at present under the Act or not, may apply for a stay order, and submit a scheme for the writing down or suspension of his liabilities, for the consideration of his creditors. If the proposals submitted are considered by the Director to be impracticable, they may, with the consent of the farmer, be modified in any way calculated to render the scheme more acceptable to the parties concerned. The commissioners of the Agricultural Bank, after they have arrived at a decision, conditional or otherwise, in respect of the debts due to the Agricultural Bank, may request the Director to submit a scheme of adjustment to other creditors concerned; and if the scheme as submitted is approved by a majority of at least four-fifths of the creditors in value, including the first mortgagee, the scheme shall be made effective, but no resolution affecting the security of a first mortgagee shall be of any effect unless the consent of the first mortgagee has been obtained. It is provided, however, that the creditors may by resolution debar the mortgagee from having recourse against the unsecured assets for the payment of the mortgage debt, but

a secured creditor will, of course, have the right to vote against such a resolution. The Director is empowered to adjourn any meeting if he considers that the meeting is not representative of the majority of creditors.

In the event of a farmer making application for the writing down or suspension of his debts, the appointment of a receiver is optional; but upon sanction being given to any scheme for the furnishing of seasonal credits by creditors, a receiver shall be appointed.

Resolutions passed in accordance with the Act shall be binding on the farmer and his creditors, subject to the right of any party concerned to appeal to a judge of the Supreme Court on the grounds that the resolution is manifestly unjust. If such an appeal be upheld, the judge may order that another meeting of the farmer's creditors be convened by the Director. It is provided that Sections 3 to 13 of the Bills of Sale Act shall not apply to a security given pursuant to any resolution passed at a meeting of the farmer and his creditors. This provision is intended to prevent caveats being lodged against any bill of sale or lien which it is necessary to register as a result of the meeting. The security as at present would be registered on presentation of a certified copy of the minutes of the meeting.

Provision is also made to enable the Director, with the consent of the Minister or of the commissioners of the Agricultural Bank, to utilise the services of any departmental officer, or of the Agricultural Bank, to obtain information necessary to the preparation of proposed schemes of arrangement under this Act. Provision is made to ensure that, in the event of a mortgage debt which is also secured by a guarantee, being written down, the liability of the guarantor shall be written down or suspended, proportionately. The period of suspension of any liability shall not be taken into account for the purpose of any Statute or limitations. Provision is made for the Act, in its amended form, to be continued until March 31st, 1938. I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

HON. H. V. PIESSE (South-East) [11.30]: When I was speaking on the measure of last year, I introduced several amendments which were accepted by the

House. This legislation has been very helpful to the farmers who were on the border line in the matter of financing and running their properties and has stayed the hands of creditors in many instances. Had the Bill not been passed, hundreds of farmers would certainly have been forced to come under the Bankruptcy Act. Speaking for my district, the department, with its director, has given satisfaction in the administration of the Act. Federal legislation has been introduced to assist the rehabilitation of the farmers, and if the Agricultural Bank Bill becomes law there is bound to be a rush of farmers to come under this measure. The Minister for Lands, according to a telegram from the Eastern States, said he did not intend to introduce new legislation to deal with the rehabilitation of farmers under the scheme of Federal assistance. Evidently he considered that the provisions of this Bill would be adequate to deal with this State's share of the £12,000,000 advance. It will be most difficult to bring in a law to write off farmers' debts generally, as I cannot see how the law of mortgage and security can be interfered with unless the mortgagees are prepared voluntarily to write-down their own advances. Particularly is this so when one realises that even banks are not advancing their own money, that many trust estates have advanced money on mortgage to trustee companies, and that private executors have advanced trust funds for the purpose. The Chief Secretary stated that a first mortgage could not be interfered with.

Hon. J. Nicholson: It could be.

Hon. H. V. PIESSE: I take it that the debts of second and third mortgagees would come in as unsecured debts.

Hon. G. W. Miles: Do you think they should?

Hon. H. V. PIESSE: No; I consider that the law of mortgage should hold good, and that when it comes to a general writing-down, a meeting of creditors should make the decision and every case should be treated on its merits. The Minister stated that the idea was to give the farmers an opportunity to have their debts written down, and he added that the merchants would have to come in and assist. I have had many instances of compositions and schemes of arrangement, and I have yet to find any business man—particularly in the country—who has traded with the farmers and is not

out to meet them when they are in need of writing-down and help them to carry on.

Hon. H. Seddon: Do you think the merchants should write down also?

Hon. H. V. PIESSE: The merchant has obligations to his financiers, but I cannot see how it is possible to introduce legislation to write down everybody's debts. With the drop in the price of primary commodities, however, the farmer has had the worst of the innings.

Hon. H. Seddon: We have to stick to the farmer.

Hon. H. V. PIESSE: Business men, particularly those in the country, have stuck to the farmer. It is true that during the last two years a majority of the farmers have been required to pay cash for their goods, but they have received advances from the Agricultural Bank, the Associated Banks and other mortgagees. The Agricultural Bank has released money that has enabled many farmers to carry on during the period of low prices. I claim that a board will have to be appointed to investigate the affairs of farmers who apply for relief under the Federal scheme. It is stated that assistance will be given only to those farmers who are not beyond redemption. The money is to be loaned free of interest to the Western Australian Government, who in turn will advance it to the farmers free of interest. The advances will have to be made over a long period of years because, unless our primary products increase in price, there will be very little hope of redemption for many years. The money that is repaid by the farmers will be available for use again and again, but it will be free of all interest charges, as the Federal Government have decided to make the interest a charge on Federal revenue. The plan, as recommended by the Commission, seems to be well thought out and most encouraging to those farmers who are in financial difficulties. I feel sure that the creditors of many farmers will be prepared to accept a reasonable amount in full settlement and wipe off the debts due by individual farmers on one condition, namely that a cash settlement is made when a composition is arrived at. It is not reasonable to expect any business man to write off a farmer's debts and have the money still owing without a composition in cash being agreed upon. It must not be forgotten that the trader,

in turn, owes a considerable amount of money, and unless he can obtain funds with which to carry on his business, he also will be in a very difficult position. I cannot see how legislation can be enforced for the reduction of all farmers' debts, including mortgages, unless the same Act could be availed of by all the people in the State who owe money. That, of course, would be impossible. I consider that it would be purely a matter of voluntary procedure after meetings of creditors had been called and after they had had an opportunity to discuss the individual cases. Perhaps the mortgagees, after gaining information, might be willing to write down their mortgages. A number of traders in Western Australia, from the smallest to the largest, have heavy responsibilities to their financiers, and in turn the farmers owe them for goods supplied, machinery, etc., for the carrying on of their properties and the maintenance of their families. Therefore it is of vital importance that creditors should support every farmer who is worthy of assistance in order that he might eventually recover his position and thus be able to meet a proportion of his debts. Only by the rehabilitation of the industry will they receive any money. If the farmers left the land, the value of the farms would be below the amount of the mortgages owing on them. The position of many farmers in the South-East Province is that if all their outside debts were written off, they could not raise the necessary money to finance and carry on their properties, because of the large amount owing under mortgage. Therefore I consider that when the Federal money is advanced, it should be made available under two distinct headings, (1) a rehabilitation fund for the payment of debts reduced according to meetings of creditors; (2) a carrying-on fund to provide necessities for farmers by way of purchase of plant and horses for the working of their farms. A fortnight ago I attended a meeting of about 70 settlers of the Nyabing and Pingrup districts who desired to place their views regarding the wheat bonus and rehabilitation proposals before members for the province. The farmers in those districts had had a severe time through excessive rain in the early part of the season and many of the crops are practically a failure. I was informed that many of the farmers could not farm in

a proper manner as they did not have the horse power or machinery in good order. Many could afford to use only 50 per cent. of the required superphosphate. They were short of food and of the necessities for putting in and taking off their crops. We were told that five bushels would be the average for the district this year. Much of the farming business in that area is conducted under less favourable conditions than in many other districts. This district has been developed rather later than others. The land is not perhaps of the same quality as it is elsewhere. The farmers have had to contend with the fact that for the last five years they have not only had low prices for their wheat, but their returns have been low. Quite a lot of the low returns are due to the absence of good farming plant, good teams of horses, and to the fact that they have not been able to cultivate their land in a husbandlike manner.

Hon. J. J. Holmes: According to you they have not got the land.

Hon. H. V. PIESSE: It is not like the Gnowangerup and Dumbleyung country, where yields of between 30 and 40 bushels to the acre are obtained. The country in the Nyabing and Pingrup districts is not as good as that. It is divided into greater areas and is mostly used for mixed farming purposes. If these people could be furnished with the necessary plant, horses, etc., it would make a big difference in the production from their properties. There were 60 men at the meeting, and all were worried about their crops. They referred to the fact that the district represented by you, Sir, and Mr. Moore had suffered from a bad attack of rust, but that for four or five years the district had had reasonably good returns although values had been low. In the Nyabing district, owing to the absence of the requisite plant, the returns had been very low. They wanted to know about the £56,000 set aside for farmers who were eligible to come under the further disabilities grant. This applies to necessitous cases. They think they should come into the same class as the Geraldton men and those who have suffered from rust in their crops. Any case where the average does not exceed ten bushels to the acre should be a case for assistance from this grant. The Chief Secretary said that 5,670 mixed farmers other than group settlers were under the Agricul-

tural Bank and that 5,803 were under associated banks or other mortgagees. The rate of interest paid by these farmers should be kept as low as possible. I am sure the mortgagees would give favourable consideration to low rates of interest, provided the interest payments were made regularly. This is purely a Bill for the writing down of debts. The first thing we have to consider is the advisability of a stay order being issued. After a conference with the farmers, all the creditors should be called together to consider the composition which would be placed before them by the debtor. The composition arrived at could then be placed before the board, which would take the necessary evidence and recommend the amount of composition to be paid for the approval of the Minister. The necessary moneys would then be advanced by the Agricultural Bank.

Hon. H. Seddon: How long would that take?

Hon. H. V. PIESSE: That would be a matter for implementation by the administrators of the Act. I think the Minister for Lands said that the work would be carried out by the farmers' debts department.

The Chief Secretary: I understand so.

Hon. H. V. PIESSE: With regard to the carrying on fund, I read in the Press four or five days ago a message from Melbourne stating that the Federal Government would not agree to a carrying-on fund for the assistance of farmers, but that they would only agree to money being found for the reduction of debts and the making of compositions with the creditors. If that fund could be made available, I take it the Agricultural Bank would handle it. It would be of great help to the farming industry.

Hon. V. Hamersley: Will there be enough to go round?

Hon. H. V. PIESSE: There may be more than the £56,000 available for necessitous cases. If the average production of wheat in Australia is reduced, more money will be available for the rehabilitation fund. As Mr. Holmes said, it is not a very large sum to devote to this purpose. On the other hand, the man whose average is 12 bushels to the acre will receive 6s. per acre on the acreage bonus basis, and a wheat bonus as well. In many instances that will pay the wages for those who have had to employ labour during the past year. Under the Federal Bankruptcy

Act, any man can apply to come under a scheme of arrangement. When a meeting of creditors is held a composition can be suggested. Provided the man can raise sufficient cash to pay this composition of so much in the pound, he is at once freed of his debts, on the payment being made, and registration takes place in the court accordingly.

Hon. G. W. Miles: Do you say that a man receiving 12 bushels to the acre would get 6s. per acre?

Hon. H. V. PIESSE: A man whose yield is 12 bushels to the acre will receive 3s. an acre bonus on the wheat at 3d. a bushel, and also 3s. per acre from the acreage fund, making a total of 6s. per acre. One man in my district gets 26 bushels to the acre, and he will receive 3d. a bushel, plus 3s. per acre.

Hon. G. W. Miles: That is spoon-feeding the farmers.

Hon. H. V. PIESSE: There are only a few instances like that.

Hon. J. J. Holmes: What about the man who gets nothing at all?

Hon. H. V. PIESSE: There is one man who is worse off than that. He is endeavouring to grow wool in the western portion of my district. He perhaps cannot afford to use super and thus obtain the 15s. rebate. He may not have many acres of land cleared. He will get no wheat bonus or acreage bonus. Then there is the question of hay crops that were seeded before June of last year. Growers of hay will not receive the wheat bonus or the rebate on the super, nor can they claim under the acreage bonus. It is not like getting 3d. a bushel on wheat when a man is growing hay. How will those people fare? I have been asked many questions by farmers as to the payment of the superphosphate bonus. In the Press it has been stated that for any superphosphate used for hay, grazing, and topdressing after the 30th June, 1934, till the 31st July, 1935, a rebate of 15s. per ton will be available on application. There seems to be much doubt as to how this bonus will operate. Numbers of farmers topdressed their country before the 30th June, 1934, to catch the early rains. In the Great Southern, Kojonup and Mt. Barker districts, and in fact in all districts that grow subterranean clover, topdressing is done as often as three times in a season. The Government should do their utmost to ensure that

all superphosphate utilised for feed that is to be fed after the 30th June, should come under the bonus.

Hon. T. Moore: That money is paid directly by the Commonwealth, and this State has nothing to do with it.

Hon. H. V. PIESSE: No; but we can offer the suggestion. Now as regards amendments proposed in the principal Act. Under Section 4 the creditors are given the right to exclude a non-farming asset from the operations of a stay order. At a meeting of farmers held at Nyabing on the 9th of this month I was asked whether in the event of a farmer owning a motor truck or motor car, and a stay order being granted in his case, it would be possible for the creditors to give consent for the repossession of the vehicle, as it might be considered not to be a necessary adjunct for the working of the farm. If such were the case, it would be most unfair to the farmer, because outback settlers must have the necessary means of communication and transport, as in many instances a telephone is not available. I observe that another place has passed an amendment making the provision more workable. As regards Section 6, Subsection 7, do the Government intend, in dealing with Agricultural Bank clients, to allow their mortgage to be written down in the same proportion as the claims of unsecured creditors? If so, it will be a fine thing for the farmer.

Hon. G. W. Miles: What about the taxpayer?

Hon. H. V. PIESSE: The taxpayer will have to foot the bill eventually.

Hon. J. Nicholson: But how is this provision going to affect the credit of the farmer?

Hon. H. V. PIESSE: If the first mortgagee writes off 50 per cent. of his value, the farmer will not have to worry about credit, because he will be freed of his debts to that extent. Suppose a farmer's debts were written down by 50 per cent., and he owed the Agricultural Bank £2,500 and other creditors £500. He would have £1,250 written off in the first case, and £350 in the second.

Hon. G. W. Miles: Do you expect to realise those figures?

Hon. H. V. PIESSE: It just depends. A four-fifths majority of the creditors, including the first mortgagee, have the power

to dictate to the unsecured creditors what the writing down shall be. In the case I have instanced, the first mortgagee at once increases his security.

Hon. J. Nicholson: Who is going to advance money to the farmer under such conditions? It is madness, absolute madness. The farmer's credit will be destroyed.

Hon. H. V. PIESSE: The clause needs grave consideration.

Hon. J. Nicholson: Consideration? Good gracious!

The PRESIDENT: Order! I must ask hon. members to allow the hon. member to proceed with his speech.

Hon. H. V. PIESSE: Hon. members appear to be seized of the seriousness of the position. However, the Government have set out to do their best to rehabilitate the farming community, regardless perhaps of other creditors. I am an advocate for the rehabilitation of the farmers. I have always advocated it. Still, I urge that every claim should be treated on its merits, and that the unsecured creditor should have a say. I do not think the whole responsibility should be on the first mortgagee. Mr. Nicholson was arguing that if the mortgagee closed down his credit, the farmer would be ruined. In my opinion, the four-fifths majority is to the advantage of the mortgagee. It is the unsecured creditors who will have to worry about the four-fifths majority agreeing, instead of a simple majority.

Hon. J. Nicholson: I am looking at the whole position, both secured and unsecured creditors; and I think the suggestion is foolish.

Hon. H. V. PIESSE: We could not possibly expect a private mortgagee, or a trust company, or a bank to write down 10s. in the pound, especially in the case of trust money. It must not be forgotten that banks advance not their own money but money that has been loaned to them. Trust companies advance money placed in their hands for investment, frequently on behalf of widows and orphans. In the past the average trustee with money to invest has always considered that broad acres were the finest security that it was possible to get. There is no doubt that if there were to be inflation, the land would represent the soundest security in which any man could invest his money. I do not consider even where the mortgagee has the right to suggest what

writing down shall be undertaken, he will propose writing down anything owed to him. It could not be expected otherwise. That is why I expected Mr. Nicholson to bring his legal mind to bear on the measure and advise the House as to the exact position.

Hon. J. J. Holmes: I have been trying to find out whether you are in favour of the Bill.

Hon. H. V. PIESSE: I am in favour of writing down the debts of the farmers. I have proved that by assisting many men in my district with compositions ranging from 5s. to 10s. in the pound, and when those compositions have been honoured, the whole of their debts have been written off.

Hon. H. Seddon: That was before this legislation was passed?

Hon. H. V. PIESSE: Yes. The writing down was done voluntarily by the men to whom the money was owed. I intend to support the second reading of the Bill, reserving my right to deal with Subclause 7 of Clause 6, about which I would like more information.

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

BILL—PUBLIC DENTAL HOSPITAL LAND.

Second Reading.

Debate resumed from the 6th December.

HON. W. J. MANN (South-West) [12.4]: When I moved the adjournment of the debate I had some misgivings as to whether the block of land suggested for purchase was suitable. The Honorary Minister showed me the litho. of the block and I had a look at it. I perused the measure to satisfy myself that it was not mandatory upon the hospital authorities to purchase any particular block. The Bill will provide authority for the disposal of the block granted to the board, and will enable them to spend money on the purchase of a suitable block wherever it may be obtained. To-day I ascertained from Mr. Henderson, one of the Dental Hospital officials, that another block was under offer, and that it was most suitable. It is splendidly situated in close proximity to the Perth Hospital with a frontage of 100 feet, and the price asked for it is extremely reasonable, being below that of

the block previously under consideration. In contemplating the establishment of such an institution, which will remain for generations, it is necessary that the site chosen for the building shall be readily accessible to those, the more unfortunate section of the community, who will have to use it. In those circumstances, the site should not be at any distance from the centre of the city. I commend the Bill to the House.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee, etc.

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

Read a third time and *passed*.

BILL—GERALDTON SAILORS AND SOLDIERS' MEMORIAL INSTITUTE ENABLING.

Second Reading.

THE CHIEF SECRETARY (Hon. J. M. Drew—Central) [12.10] in moving the second reading said: This Bill has been asked for by the trustees of the Geraldton Sailors and Soldiers' Memorial Institute. Its object is to give powers of mortgage to that body over a grant of land which was made to them by the Government some time ago. The League wished to raise money for the purposes of erecting a hall on the land and when the trustees approached the bank for a loan on the security of the grant the bank's solicitors refused to approve unless powers of mortgaging were given, and these powers were absent from the conditions of the grant. The same body have land and buildings which they purchased many years ago with funds collected from the public and with the proceeds of entertainments regularly held. In 1929 the power to mortgage this land was given by Parliament. It was recognised at this stage that, while the site was an excellent one for business purposes, the buildings which had been erected in the early days were not suitable for a memorial hall, and the Government were approached successfully for a grant of a new site. Some money has been raised on the security of the old site, but not sufficient to erect a suitable memorial hall. If this Bill is

passed, the Geraldton branch of the R.S.L. will have no difficulty in raising the money necessary to erect a hall worthy of themselves and of the town. The Bill goes further than giving powers of mortgager in regard to the land which is the subject of the Bill, it provides similar powers in relation to any other land which the trustees may hereafter acquire. It will be noticed, however, that any lease, mortgage or sale—all of which are covered by the Bill—is made subject to the approval of the Governor-in-Council. I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee, etc.

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

Read a third time and *passed*.

House adjourned at 12.17 a.m. (Thursday).

Legislative Assembly,

Wednesday, 19th December, 1934.

	PAGE
Motion: Bulk handling sites, departmental committee's notes of evidence	2191
Return: Lotteries Commission, charitable organisations assisted	2197
Question: Wheatgrowers, Federal payment to Western Australia	2197
Bills: Cremation Act Amendment, 2A., etc.	2197
Administration Act (Estate and Succession Duties) Amendment, Council's amendments	2203
Dairy Products Marketing Regulation, Com.	2203
Financial Emergency Tax Assessment Act Amendment, Council's further message	2208
Mine Workers' Relief Act Amendment, Council's amendment	2208
Electoral Act Amendment (No. 1), Council's message	2209
Constitution Acts Amendment, Council's message	2209
Discharge of Orders	2209

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

[81]

MOTION—BULK HANDLING SITES.

Departmental Committee's Notes of Evidence.

HON. C. G. LATHAM (York) [4.33]: I move—

That there be laid on the Table of the House a copy of the notes of evidence taken by the departmental committee on bulk handling sites which was the subject of papers tabled pursuant to a motion moved by the member for Fremantle (Mr. J. B. Sleeman) on Wednesday, the 5th December, 1934.

When the departmental committee's report was asked for I pointed out to the Government that it was wrong to discuss the matter, which was then the subject of a libel action before the court. It appeared to me that this was staged to ensure that the information contained in the report would reach the jury. It might be said that the evidence is privileged; then so also should be the report. The Minister was anxious to make the information available, for he had the report in his pocket. We should know who gave the evidence, and whether the report is a fair one. The committee, in referring to conditions operating during the present season, stated:—

The unsatisfactory transport position has been largely, if not entirely, due to two factors—the unusual marketing conditions under which the normal seasonal sales were very greatly restricted, and the absence of adequate storage facilities at the Port.

Yet the company offered to lend the Harbour Trust or the Government £150,000 to £200,000 with which to equip the Port with a plant conforming to official requirements. The only condition attached was that the lenders were to have some form of security over the structure until it was paid for. This offer was not accepted, nor could any definite permission be obtained for the use of bulk facilities on the wharf. The company in desperation decided to rely upon using equipment on board vessels, and storage at Leighton, and proceeded accordingly. After the company had gone to considerable expenditure, the Harbour Trust agreed to the company converting a second gantry, one gantry, converted at the cost of the bulk handling company, having been in use the previous season. Nevertheless the Port equipment is not what the company desired, but what it was forced to adopt to overcome