

what happened after the last war. The question is: Will it happen again after this one? Many people think it will, and they do not go behind anybody's back to say so, even in wartime. It might encourage people during the war to put forth their greatest effort in connection with the war by promising them a new world after it, but there are people in very high positions who attach very little significance to that attitude of mind and who come right out in the open, telling us quite clearly and plainly what they think will be the position after the war. One of these gentlemen is named Sir Ernest Benn, and I am sure members of this House have had a pamphlet addressed to them from him and his group of individualists, entitled, "Hard Times Ahead."

Mr. McDonald: He belongs to the dismal brigade.

Mr. F. C. L. SMITH: It is very difficult to say at this stage whether he does or not.

Mr. McDonald: I think he does.

Mr. F. C. L. SMITH: One thing is certain: that he belongs to a group of individualists, people who think there ought to be freedom for the individual to exploit the rest of the community, to build up industry and enterprise out of the huge profits that they can make from the community if they have absolute freedom from interference or regimentation on the part of a Government. Those are the type of people that Sir Ernest Benn represents—and he is not particularly dismal, either, when all is said and done; because he does not make blind assertions in his pamphlet without producing some argument and some evidence to support his contention. Anyhow, his pamphlet shows that the vision of a future world seen by so many through rose-coloured glasses is not shared by all, and the statement that I quoted from Mr. Menzies' remarks indicates quite plainly that it is not shared by him. The Atlantic Charter sets out that there has to be the fullest collaboration between all nations in the economic field with the object of securing for all improved labour standards, economic advancement and social security. How can we live up to that ideal in our present condition of divided authority and with the restricted powers that the central authority now has in connection with the very matters that are implied in that statement in the Atlantic Charter?

How can we reasonably hope in our existing condition of divided authority, to have

an experience very different from the experience that followed the last war? If all the powers retained and at present exercised by the States in peace-time are still retained by them, I say that they will be used by each of the respective States towards maintaining its existing advantages and maintaining the existing economic inequalities between those States. So far as this State is concerned, it can gain nothing from the retention of powers that are shared equally by all States or from the granting of privileges that are shared equally by all States. I look upon this campaign that has already begun in the Eastern States for the retention of State rights as a campaign for the restoration and retention of profit-making privileges secured in most of the States by reactionary Legislative Councils. If the Atlantic Charter is going to mean anything to this country, its expressed intentions and implications will have to be carried out by a national plan, and the national plan will have to be Commonwealth-wide in its character and not the product of a conference between States at which the representatives will wrangle like delegates at a Paris peace conference and achieve nothing, do nothing—or do very little—to further the objectives which are so freely desired while the war is on but which will become secondary, without a national plan, when at last peace reigns once more in international affairs.

Progress reported.

House adjourned at 10.45 p.m.

Legislative Council,

Wednesday, 22nd September, 1943.

	PAGE
Question: Farmers' Debts Adjustment Act, as to receivers and funds	642
Bills: Electoral (War Time), 2R.	642
Coul Mine Workers (Pensions), 2R.	646
Town Planning and Development Act Amendment, 2R.	650
Lotteries (Control) Act Amendment, 2R. Com., report	651
Companies, Com.	666

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

QUESTION—FARMERS' DEBTS ADJUSTMENT ACT.

As to Receivers and Funds.

Hon. E. H. H. HALL asked the Chief Secretary: 1, How many persons are at present holding appointments as receivers under the Farmers' Debts Adjustment Act? 2, How many are officers of the Agricultural Bank? 3, How many are not officers of the Agricultural Bank? 4, What are the total funds handled by all receivers up to the 30th June, 1943?

The CHIEF SECRETARY replied: 1, Three. 2, None. 3, Three. 4, Information not available.

BILL—ELECTORAL (WAR TIME).

Second Reading.

Debate resumed from the previous day.

HON. E. M. HEENAN (North-East) [4.37]: This is a war-time measure, and it has the laudable intention of providing means whereby members of the Fighting Forces will be able to exercise a vote at the forthcoming State election. Every member of the House will agree with me when I say it is our duty to provide the machinery by which the members of the Armed Forces will be able to exercise the great prerogative of recording their votes. This measure stipulates that qualified members of the Forces shall be entitled to vote for the districts in which they resided immediately prior to enlistment. All members of the Navy, the Army and the Air Force will be so entitled. The measure is restricted in its operations to that portion of the South-West Pacific zone as may be proclaimed from time to time. The effect of that will be that members of the Forces who happen to be in England, America, Canada or such other places will, unfortunately, be precluded from voting. I assume that the great delay that would be involved in taking votes from those men does not warrant their being included. We must agree that the reason is quite sound.

Hon. J. Cornell: You will find when the vote is taken that thousands of men will have left Western Australia and are outside of that area.

Hon. E. M. HEENAN: I do not know anything about that. The measure is very similar to the provisions that operated in the recent Federal elections. One vital difference is that this Bill proposes to extend

the franchise to all qualified members of the Forces who are on active service. This means that all members of the Forces, irrespective of age, will be entitled to vote provided they are on active service. In the recent Federal elections, only those members of the Forces of the age of 18 and outside the three-mile limit were entitled to vote. I see no reason why this House should not pass the Bill as it stands. It is a war-time measure, and we should not deprive the members of the Forces who happen to be within Australia of privileges which we are going to give to members of the Forces who happen to be in New Guinea.

Hon. C. F. Baxter: Have you studied the Bill at all?

Hon. E. M. HEENAN: Yes. Has the hon. member any further question?

Hon. C. F. Baxter: That is a peculiar statement for a legal man to make.

Hon. E. M. HEENAN: Several objections have been raised to the Bill. Mr. Baxter evidently thinks it so involved as to necessitate its being referred to a Select Committee. I hope that not many members will agree with his proposal. In suggesting that course, I do not think Mr. Baxter was very sincere.

Hon. C. F. Baxter: You have no right to say that. Mr. President, I ask the hon. member to withdraw that statement.

The PRESIDENT: The hon. member will withdraw.

Hon. E. M. HEENAN: I withdraw. It was a misunderstanding—

The PRESIDENT: Do I understand that the hon. member unreservedly withdraws the statement?

Hon. E. M. HEENAN: Yes. I intended to convey my opinion that every member of this House will regard the measure as a simple one, and will not find any valid reason for occupying time by submitting it to a Select Committee. There is room for a difference of opinion on the question of the age of 18. Some members seem to think that the statement, "A young man who is old enough to fight is old enough to vote" is a catch-cry devoid of merit or virtue. I differ from that opinion.

Hon. H. S. W. Parker: Would you give a vote also to the aborigines in the A.I.F.?

Hon. E. M. HEENAN: I cannot see any analogy between giving a vote to an aboriginal and to a white Australian. They are

two different classes of people. That argument is without merit.

Hon. J. Cornell: Both of them can be soldiers.

Hon. E. M. HEENAN: We do not give aborigines a vote in normal times.

Hon. G. B. Wood: In normal times we do not give a vote to children, either.

Hon. J. Cornell: The hon. member is on bad ground.

The PRESIDENT: Order!

Hon. E. M. HEENAN: I subscribe to the view that if a young man or woman is accepted as being of adequate age to fight—

Hon. G. B. Wood: Do the women fight?

Hon. E. M. HEENAN: —he or she is entitled to exercise the prerogative of voting on the question of who shall govern them. When a young man enlists, he assumes the obligations of manhood. One speaker contended that these young men know nothing about politics and little of anything else. I think it was Mr. Wood who made that statement. Few members will agree with him. A young man on enlisting assumes the obligations of manhood, and I consider he is quite entitled to vote. I cannot see any argument against reducing the general age, and I believe the time will come when we shall get away from the age of 21 and make it 18. In these days a young man is better educated and better able to fulfil the obligations of manhood at the age of 18 than one of that age was 40 or 50 years ago.

Hon. J. Cornell: He would not have had a vote at all 40 or 50 years ago.

Hon. E. M. HEENAN: I join with Mr. Cornell in regretting that members of the merchant navy service are not included. In a measure of this sort, however, provision cannot be made for everybody, and I do not think any great harm will be done by omitting those men. I do not suppose there would be many of them, and certainly it would be very difficult to locate them and take their votes.

Hon. A. Thomson: Where is provision made to include members of the Navy?

Hon. E. M. HEENAN: In the definition clause—"member of the Forces" means a person who is or has been a member of the Defence Force of the Commonwealth and who is or has been on active service during the present war. That covers members of the Army, Navy and Air Force.

Hon. J. Cornell: Provided they are in the South Western Pacific zone.

Hon. E. M. HEENAN: Yes.

Hon. J. Cornell: Men outside of that zone are not included.

Hon. E. M. HEENAN: I regret that we cannot give a vote to the boys who are in England and the United States of America, but I understand it would take four or five months to do so. That would involve almost insurmountable difficulties. I have pleasure in supporting the second reading.

HON. W. J. MANN (South-West): I listened with a great deal of interest to the varying views expressed by members on this Bill, but am unable to understand how some of them can reconcile their statements. For instance, we were told that any member of the Forces—man or woman—who has reached the age of 18 years has assumed the duties of adult citizenship and for that reason should be accorded a vote at the forthcoming election. I shall not labour that point nor shall I question it, but I say it is wrong to suggest that a person who is in Australia, or within the A.I.F. zone to the north of Australia, should be recognised as an adult citizen while people engaged in the merchant service should not be so recognised. I understand that the main reason advanced why people outside the area mentioned are not included is that too much time would be entailed in securing their votes and having them counted. There is another means of solving this problem. I understand New Zealand has extended the franchise to all the members of its Forces over the age of 18 years, irrespective of where they are situated. Surely, this State can do what New Zealand has done. I point out also that the month when in the ordinary course of events the election for another place will take place is March next, and consequently there is ample time between now and March to collect and count the votes of those entitled to vote, no matter where they may be situated. In my opinion, a good case has not been made out for this circumscribed vote.

Another point, raised by Mr. Cornell, with regard to the nominal roll is an excellent idea and I think it would considerably simplify the proceedings. I am not going to argue statements concerning a girl typist who has just turned the age of 18 years being looked upon as serving in the fighting line or in the battle area; that is

beside the question. But those working in munition factories or in essential Government departments should have this privilege extended to them. Take the Railway Department. Young men are working there, I understand, 12-hour shifts and have been doing so for many a long day. Are they not engaged in an essential service and doing work of the highest value?

Hon. J. Cornell: They are doing work more essential than that done by many persons in uniform.

Hon. W. J. MANN: The Department of Supply and Shipping comes to my mind. Young men and young women are engaged by the Commonwealth Government in that department and are doing war work, but they are not to be considered in this matter. The whole measure bristles with peculiar features that are anomalous. The idea that a Select Committee should be appointed is a good one. Such a committee might very well assist the Government to a great extent by making recommendations to improve the machinery for taking these votes. I would be the last to suggest that young men in the battle areas who are facing death almost daily should be denied the right to vote, should they desire it. I recall that some two years ago we had before us two Bills to prolong the life of Parliament, but I have no recollection of hearing on those occasions that the franchise should be extended to the people to whom it is now proposed to give it in the event of those Bills being defeated. In saying this, I am not speaking of this Chamber but of another place. I suggest that this move has been brought about by the action of the Commonwealth Government in introducing legislation on similar lines. We can well afford to proceed slowly in this matter. All members who have spoken agree that it is vital for those who are fighting for the common good to have every possible facility extended to them. They should be recognised as citizens worthy of every consideration. I shall vote for the second reading and shall also support the motion for a Select Committee, if it is moved.

HON. H. L. ROCHE (South-East): I gather from the remarks of some members that they regard this as quite a simple measure, although I must confess that to me it presents a very difficult problem. This

piece of legislation should be so drafted as to extend the vote to members of the Forces and at the same time maintain the secrecy of the ballot, if the election is to be conducted as it should be. I am sure every member of this Chamber has the best will possible towards the men to whom the franchise is proposed to be extended; we all want to do something to assist them. Were it otherwise, Mr. Cornell's devastating criticism of this Bill, as well as the problems which he instanced will have to be faced, would have effectually disposed of and killed the Bill stone-dead. The difficulties that amongst others present themselves to my mind are how the returning officers, whoever they may be, are going to distinguish between the soldiers who come along to vote, as to whether they are qualified to record a vote, and whether they are even Western Australians. I understand that many of our units are very much mixed up with the personnel from various other States. I know of one Western Australian unit that was very much below strength, and was provided with reinforcements from Queensland and New South Wales, but it is generally regarded as a Western Australian unit. How would the officer presiding decide which of those men were qualified to vote? The men would not have their attestation papers with them. They would have to be provided with a form of nominal roll, which could not be up-to-date if the unit was in an area where active fighting operations were going on, owing to casualties, evacuations and other reasons.

We might have the position where some soldier would prevail upon cobbbers of his from New South Wales or Queensland to go with him and cast their votes also. I do not see anything to prevent that. No responsibility appears to be put upon these officers. The Commonwealth Government is prepared to assist, but what supervision would there be, what obligation would there be on the officers to see that the election in those areas was properly conducted? If in all these circumstances the election in those areas was not properly conducted, or the methods adopted were unsatisfactory, I cannot see the Defence Department taking any disciplinary action against the officers concerned, if they belong to units that are in actual fighting operations. More especially is that likely to be so because this is to be an election for the State Parliament, and

the Commonwealth Government is, so far as I know, made up of gentlemen who would prefer to see State Parliaments altogether eliminated. The Bill does not provide adequate safeguards against this sort of thing. Mr. Baxter's proposal for the appointment of a Select Committee, so that the measure may be gone into exhaustively and provision made to deal with dangers of that kind and other kinds which have been mentioned, is appropriate.

Hon. J. Cornell: There is another contingency, namely the diversion of troops from here to Ceylon and India.

Hon. H. L. ROCHE: Anyone who had experience of soldiering in the last war will know how little interest is taken by the majority of the men concerned in this sort of thing, and how loath the commanding officers are to have their training or active operations interfered with by such a thing as an election. It must be obvious to them that the greatest difficulty will be experienced in having an election conducted in the case of servicemen on anything like proper lines. I am not clear as to who the returning officers will be or what their number will be. Will they be appointed for each battalion to which reinforcements have been sent from Western Australia? In some battalions a few Western Australian soldiers have been enrolled, and in others there are a great many from this State. Several of the divisional and corps units, such as the artillery and Army Service Corps, are made up of men from all parts of Australia.

Hon. J. Cornell: From every State.

Hon. H. L. ROCHE: Western Australians will be found in most or all of them to a greater or lesser degree. What provision will be made for the appointment of returning officers and for some control and supervision? So far as the Bill goes, I see very little provision for that sort of thing. Unless a Select Committee is appointed to produce a Bill that will be much more effective than this one, the election as regards many of the services involved will be farcical, even if it does not degenerate into something even worse. There may be some people interested enough to endeavour to achieve results which would not be possible under the Electoral Act. This is a different proposition from the Federal elections, for one reason in particular, namely, that the Commonwealth Government is in charge of the Army, all the officers are called upon

automatically to carry out instructions, and disciplinary action can be taken where there is any dereliction of duty. It would, therefore, be the duty of such officers to conduct the elections as laid down by their superiors.

In a State election we cannot hope to achieve that ideal, though I understand the Commonwealth Government is prepared to assist to some extent. That Government, however, is averse to taking such action as it found necessary in connection with the elections on the 21st August. With respect to conferring the vote upon all and sundry in the Forces, upon people under the age of 21, that proposal meets with my opposition. I am averse to any reduction in age that will qualify people to vote at an election, even as civilians. Under the National Security Regulations all members of the Military Forces in Australia are deemed to be on active service. I refer to the regulation published in the Commonwealth "Gazette" on the 15th April, 1942. As this Bill purports to give a vote to all people below the age of 21 who are on active service, it means that it will apply to everyone who is on military service in Australia. In fact, the measure is so far-reaching in that respect that one wonders what it will not embrace. It will apply to members of the V.D.C. who are under the age of 21, because they form a portion of the Military Forces of the Commonwealth. In that organisation there are lads who have never left home or given up their jobs, though they have devoted some time to preparations for the defence of the country if it is invaded. Then there are the girls, who also will be included.

There are numbers of young fellows in sedentary occupations who are in uniform, but who possibly in some instances, because they are medically unfit for front-line service, will never see active fighting. They are nothing else but civilians in uniform on the Government payroll, and will never see an angry man if the war lasts for 20 years. I see no reason why the franchise should be extended to such people when it is not extended to others in essential occupations. Perhaps one of the knottiest problems before us in connection with this question is how to provide for men under 21 who are actually overseas and serving in a theatre of war. There cannot be many of them, because the Minister for the Army

has given an assurance that lads of 18 or 19 would not be sent away for front-line service. There will, however, be some who have put their ages forward and some who probably got away before that decision was arrived at. Rather than have the Bill in its present form giving a vote to all these people, I shall be prepared to face the prospect, little as I would like to do it, of deleting all provisions concerning people under the age of 21. I would, however, prefer that all those who are serving overseas in any theatre of war should be given the vote, regardless of age.

The more I consider this measure, the more I feel that it justifies reference to a Select Committee. I have difficulty in seeing, because of the manner in which it is framed, that any general control can be exercised, or how the problems I have enumerated and those which have been referred to by various speakers can be overcome; how, in the circumstances, the loss of a ballot-box can be avoided or the tampering with a ballot-box can be safe-guarded against. There is also the position in which this Parliament may find itself regarding the regulations that will have to be made. True, this House can disallow regulations, but when it does so and they are re-introduced, it is possible we will not have time to disallow them again before Parliament is dissolved preparatory to an election. I think it is in the best interests of all concerned that we should give very material consideration to these proposals, and I see no better way to do so than to refer the Bill to a Select Committee.

HON. F. E. GIBSON (Metropolitan-Suburban): I should like briefly to define my attitude on this measure. I intend to support the second reading in the hope that radical amendments may be made in Committee. Every effort should be put forth to enable those men and women who are fighting our battles in combat areas to record their votes. I have, however, an objection to giving the vote to everyone who happens to be in uniform and over the age of 18. It has been suggested that if a person is old enough to fight he is old enough to vote, and to a certain extent I would subscribe to that principle, if one could define fighting in the ordinary way, as we know it. I admit that many of the terms used in the measure are difficult to under-

stand. I always imagined that active service was one where people were engaged in the fighting line. I cannot imagine that a girl who is wearing a uniform and pouring out afternoon tea in a mess in Albany can be regarded as being on active service or engaged in fighting.

I should like to make some comparison with that organisation with which most of us are associated, namely, the A.R.P. That body came into existence at the outbreak of war, and when Japan entered into the conflict its activities were 'greatly extended. Many hundreds of young men and women in the metropolitan area have given hours of their time in a voluntary capacity to prepare themselves to undertake work that will be essential should the enemy ever attack our shores. Fortunately that has not happened to us. These young people who are under 21 years of age are not in uniform. They wear a badge. They are not paid for their services. If a girl who, although in uniform, may merely be doing a bit of typing or working in the Air Force offices is entitled to a vote, then these A.R.P. workers are entitled to a much greater extent to exercise the franchise.

I am prepared to admit that the Government might be agreeable to giving the young A.R.P. workers the right to vote, but I am opposed to that because they are not doing work in a war zone. I trust something can be done to enable men and women who are doing the actual fighting for us to record their votes. As to the difficulties associated with implementing such a scheme, I leave that phase to the electoral officers, for I do not know much about it. I am sincerely hopeful that every effort will be made to give the vote to those who should be entitled to exercise the franchise, but to restrict the privilege to them and not to extend it to others whom I do not regard as entitled to the concession.

On motion by Hon. A. Thomson, debate adjourned.

BILL—COAL MINE WORKERS (PENSIONS).

Second Reading.

THE CHIEF SECRETARY [5.18] in moving the second reading said: Members will recognise in this Bill proposals which were submitted during last session providing for the compulsory retirement on a pen-

sion of coalminers at 60 years of age, and for the retirement on a pension of those coalminers who, in certain circumstances, become incapacitated whilst employed in the coalmining industry. The provisions of the Bill are substantially the same as those of its predecessor, but certain alterations have been made which it is hoped will now make the legislation acceptable to Parliament. It will be recalled that many of the principles of the previous Bill were approved by this House, but that it was finally lost because of the failure of managers of both Houses to agree on two proposals, namely, the inclusion of surface workers in the pensions scheme, and the financial arrangements by which the contributions were to be made by coalmining companies. Before that stage had been reached, much argument had ensued on the merits and demerits of the two proposals to which I refer, and members will recall the prolonged debates on the relevant clauses when the Bill was in Committee. However, the appointed managers could not come to any agreement, and the Bill was dropped.

In the intervening period between this and last session, the Government has had an opportunity further to consider the proposal of granting pension benefits to compulsorily retired coalminers. All the arguments for and against the previous Bill have had careful consideration, with the result that it has been decided to bring another measure forward. The Government makes no apology for so doing. It has long been convinced that there is every justification for the claim of the Colliery miners for a pensions scheme; the more so when it is borne in mind that coalminers in other States are already participating in the benefits of such a scheme. New South Wales, Queensland and Victoria have recognised the principle of the compulsory retirement of coalminers and the payment of a pension by the passing of the necessary legislation.

Having in mind that the previous measure was before members only five months ago, I do not propose at this stage to deal with all the clauses in the Bill, but to cover only its most important phases. The measure has been divided into five parts, and in the event of its provisions becoming law, Parts 1 and 5 dealing with the preliminary contents and miscellaneous

provisions will come into operation immediately. Parts 2, 3 and 4 deal with the compulsory retirement of mine workers at 60 years of age and the pensions payable; the establishment of a pensions tribunal to administer the fund and generally manage the whole pensions scheme, and the establishment of a fund to be known as the Coal Mine Workers' Pensions Fund, and the contributions to it. These portions will come into force by proclamation.

The definition of "mine worker" as contained in the previous Bill has been retained in this measure. In the definition it is provided that a "mine worker" means—

(a) a person who is employed (whether underground or above ground) in or about a coal mine in the State by the owner of the mine;

(b) a person who was at any time after the thirty-first day of December, 1937, engaged in the coal industry in this State;

(c) a person who has at any time after the 31st day of December, 1937, and before the commencement of this Act become permanently incapacitated by injury by an accident which happened to him while he was employed in or about a coal mine in this State and which entitled him to compensation in accordance with the provisions of the Workers' Compensation Act, 1912-41;

(d) a person who is employed by the owner of a coal mine in this State and who in the course of such employment is principally engaged in the transport of coal from the mine to the point of delivery by the owner; and for the purposes of this paragraph "point of delivery" means the place at which coal is delivered by the owner of the mine to a railway for transportation;

(e) a check weigher or miner's check inspector;

(f) a workmen's inspector appointed under the provisions of the Coal Mines Regulation Act, 1902-40;

(a) an elected official of an industrial or trade union of employees, or of an association of employees registered as an organisation under the Commonwealth Conciliation and Arbitration Act, 1904-34, or under the State Industrial Arbitration Act, 1912-41.

It will be noted that surface workers are included in the definition. It is considered that the surface worker is as essential to the carrying on of the coal mining industry as are those working underground. Furthermore, the big majority of surface workers have worked for considerable periods underground prior to being placed in employment on the surface. Many surface workers have been transferred from underground to the surface

because of increasing age or other reasons, such as injuries rendering men unfit for further work underground. To differentiate between workers in the industry by providing pensions for one section and excluding others is unfair as well as undesirable. Embarrassment would be inherent in any such proposal. In any case, the pensions scheme will be on a contributory basis, and any man covered by it will be required to make a contribution to the fund from which the pensions scheme is to be financed.

All those covered by the definition of "mine worker" are essential in the production of coal and should therefore share in the proposals for a pension scheme. In respect to a union official, about which the query was previously raised as to the reason for his inclusion in such a Bill, similar provisions exist in the pension schemes approved of by statutes in New South Wales, Queensland and Victoria. Such an official's contribution to the scheme, as is provided for in this Bill, is on a basis different from that applying to the other contributions. He will contribute at the same rate as a mine worker, but the balance of the contribution will be paid by the union.

Under the provisions of the Bill the employment of a mine worker over the age of 60 years is prohibited. It is provided that mine workers over that age must be retired, and those who are over age at the time the Act comes into force must cease activities within three months of its commencement. Persons over the age of 60 who are not employed in a mine at the commencement of the Act cannot obtain employment in a mine thereafter. The tribunal to be set up under the Bill has power to suspend the operations of the relevant clause in this connection. In other words, it would have the right to say that mine workers over the age of 60 can continue in the industry or be engaged for the first time in it.

The compulsory provision in the Bill for the retirement of men at 60 years of age will not be put into effect during the war. Members will readily appreciate that it has been very difficult during the war, and particularly in recent months, to produce sufficient coal at Collie to enable the essential requirements of the State to be fully met. This has been largely due to the fact that

most of the younger men from the Collie mines enlisted in one or other of the Fighting Services in the early period of the war. Coal production today is, therefore, dependent upon the efforts of the older men, some of whom are over 60 years of age. Some are over 70. It would therefore be unwise compulsorily to retire men over that age until the younger men have returned from the war and are again available for employment in the industry.

This Bill, by providing for the compulsory retirement on pension of miners upon reaching 60 years of age, will beyond question ensure certain employment in the industry for the young men when they come back from the war. It sets out that the pensions tribunal shall consist of three members. One will be nominated by the Government and will be the chairman. The second member will be appointed on the nomination of the mine workers, and the third on the nomination of the coalmine owners. As soon as practicable after its appointment, the tribunal will be required to estimate the amount of income needed to finance the pensions scheme from year to year. This will mean estimating the amount of income needed to finance the pensions scheme from year to year. This will mean estimating the amount required to meet current pension payments, administration costs, and—most important of all—the establishment and maintenance of a reserve fund to be known as the "Coal Mine Workers' Pensions Fund," which is to be kept at the Treasury. The tribunal will also have the responsibility of deciding what contributions are to be paid to the fund by the various contributing parties—namely the Government, the mineowners and the workers.

The Bill provides that the Government's contribution shall be equal to one quarter of the total amount required for the first year, or the sum of £2,000, whichever is the smaller amount. In the succeeding years the Government will be required to pay one quarter of the total amount, with a maximum of £2,500 in the second year, £3,000 in the third year, £3,500 in the fourth year, £4,000 in the fifth year, and £4,500 in the sixth year and all succeeding years, whilst the companies will be called upon to find two-thirds of the balance required, and the workers will have to contribute one-third of that balance.

By the previous Bill the companies were to be called upon to meet out of their own profits 50 per cent. of their total contribution to the scheme; the balance of their contribution was to be passed on by increasing the price of coal. The companies were also enabled to finance contributions to the fund from profits out of dividends which might be due to preference shareholders, and no maximum was set regarding the proportion of the companies' contribution to be met from profits. This Bill alters that principle to the extent of providing a maximum of 2d. per ton to be paid by the companies from their own profits. That will be the limit they will be called upon to pay from profits. Furthermore, this Bill does not compel the companies to obtain their payment from profits from any particular source or direction. The companies have absolute discretion in this regard.

Special provisions are contained in the Bill for the calculation of periods of employment. Any mine worker who is absent from the State or from his employment upon war service, as defined in the Commonwealth Defence Act, or upon any kind of work in connection with the present war, shall be deemed to have been continuously resident in the State and to have been employed in or about a coal mine during the period of his absence, and during such absence a mine worker will not be required to contribute to the fund. Award holidays, annual leave, sickness or accident do not break the continuity of residence or employment. Even short absences from the State do not affect the workers' rights in this connection as long as the total period of absences does not exceed one-tenth of the total period of residence.

Dealing with pensions, the Bill provides that a mine worker in employment when the relevant part of the Act commences or when he becomes 60 years of age, whichever is the later, or who is not employed when the part commences but was so employed during the 12 months prior thereto and worked for at least 60 days as a mine worker, is entitled upon retirement to a pension of £2 per week, provided, of course, that the residential and working qualifications as set out in the Bill are complied with. The maximum rate of pensions to be paid per week to any retired miners will be £2.

There is a proposal in the Bill which provides for a pension of £2 per week in the

case of mine workers permanently incapacitated. A rate of 30s. per week is provided for certain other classes of workers. A pension rate is provided for a wife of 25s. per week, and one of 8s. 6d. per week for every dependent child under 16 years of age. The maximum amount claimable by any one pensioner on behalf of himself, his wife and children is fixed at £4 10s. 6d. per week. In the event of the retired miner dying, the pension of his widow will be 30s. a week. Provisions are contained in the Bill which in operation will reduce the amount of pension any one family can receive from the fund. For instance, income received by a family by way of old age or invalid pension, child endowment, widows' pension, or from workers' compensation sources, or from other sources specifically set out in the Bill, is to be deductible from the amount of pension to be received from the fund.

It will be recalled that when the previous Bill was in this Chamber, provision was made by way of an amendment to give the tribunal power to reduce pensions payable from the fund for the purpose of enabling each pensioner, when eligible, to draw the full amount of either the old age or the invalid pension. The same provision exists in this Bill. Provision has also been made whereby this State can enter into reciprocal arrangements with other States where similar pension schemes are in operation. It will be agreed, I hope, that these reciprocal arrangements are desirable in the interests of workers in a particular industry.

The Bill contains many other provisions, most of which are of a machinery character. They deal with questions such as the examination of accounts each year and their presentation to Parliament, and the actuarial investigations which will have to be carried out at least once in every three years by the Government Actuary, who is moreover given discretionary power to make more frequent actuarial investigations if he considers them to be necessary.

Those remarks, I think, cover the main provisions in the Bill. Members should have a good knowledge of its proposals, which, as I stated at the outset, are substantially the same as those of the Bill submitted last session. If any further information is desired, then I will be only too pleased to supply it when the Bill is in Committee. I commend the measure to the House, in the hope that this State will make a substan-

tial step forward in social welfare this year by providing a pensions scheme for the coalminers, so bringing this State into line with Queensland, New South Wales and Victoria, in which States pension schemes are now operating. I hope members will agree that Western Australian coalminers in regard to pensions are to be treated in the same way as coalminers in all other parts of Australia.

Hon. H. S. W. Parker: Treated differently from everybody else, from all other workers!

The CHIEF SECRETARY: No. There are other workers than coalminers receiving pensions. The essential point of difference between this Bill and the previous measure is that the contribution of the mine-owners will not exceed 2d. per ton, and that any additional contribution required will be met by an increase in the price of coal. I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

On motion by Hon. W. J. Mann, debate adjourned.

BILL—TOWN PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT ACT AMENDMENT.

Second Reading.

THE HONORARY MINISTER [5.42] in moving the second reading said: This measure is intended to frustrate the efforts on the part of unscrupulous persons to evade the provisions of the Town Planning Act. The Bill proposes to amend Sections 21 and 25 of the Town Planning and Development Act, 1928, which is an Act relating to the planning and development of land for urban, suburban and rural purposes. The Act provides that no plan of subdivision or diagram of survey shall be registered in the Titles Office until the plan has been approved by the Town Planning Board, and that no persons shall subdivide or sell land as lots until the plan has been approved by the board. It also provides that no transfer or conveyance or mortgage of any area of land containing less than half an acre shall be registered in the Titles Office until it has been approved by the board. In every case a board decision is subject to the right of appeal to the Minister. It will be noted that leases are not included in these provisions.

In the last ten years the Town Planning Board has refused many applications to re-subdivide lands in unduly small parcels, more especially in Kalgoorlie and Boulder and in the city of Perth. It has done this to prevent the re-subdivision of land into areas too small reasonably to accommodate a dwelling, whereby slum conditions could be established. That action has been taken in the interest of all sections of the community. The prevention of slum conditions is one of the main functions of the Town Planning Board. However, certain people have found a loophole in the Act by which they are registering in the Titles Office leases of small areas of land for 99 and 999 years, thereby establishing subdivisions in fact, which subdivisions would not be approved by the Town Planning Board had the proposition been submitted on a freehold basis. If the practice becomes general, and indeed it is increasing, then the whole of the relevant sections of the Act can be evaded by those seeking to do so.

By this Bill, therefore, it is proposed to rectify the situation by bringing leases of land comprising less than half an acre for any term exceeding 21 years, under the jurisdiction of the Town Planning Board, to the same extent as now prescribed in regard to transfers, conveyances and mortgages. Any person aggrieved at a decision of the board will have the right of appeal to the Minister. No attempt is being made to control leases below a term of 21 years. It is emphasised that the proposal is that all leases exceeding 21 years shall be subject to the approval of the board. It is considered that the controlling of leases under that term might inflict a certain amount of hardship in certain instances, and might also embarrass normal business transactions.

I am sure that members who in 1928 decided to eliminate from the measure what was then considered unnecessary, will now support this proposal because of the opportunity which is being taken by a small but unscrupulous section of the community to avoid the provisions of the Act and thereby destroy altogether the effect and purpose of town planning legislation. This matter was brought before the Town Planning Commissioner in the first instance by the Registrar of Titles, who noticed that these leases were going

through. I am sure that all members will realise the necessity for preventing such action by unscrupulous persons. By passing this legislation we will debar people from making use of land in such a way as to create slum conditions.

Hon. A. Thomson: Does this Bill apply to business premises as well?

The HONORARY MINISTER: Yes, and to houses. I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

On motion by Hon. H. S. W. Parker, debate adjourned.

BILL—LOTTERIES (CONTROL) ACT AMENDMENT.

Second Reading.

Debate resumed from the previous day.

HON. A. THOMSON (South-East) [5.49]: I think we are all indebted to Dr. Hislop for the illuminating information he supplied to us concerning the distribution of the money raised by the Lotteries Commission. Some of his remarks seem to indicate that it is time an overhaul of the general administration of hospitals was undertaken. I confess that he rather startled me when he stated that Dr. Atkinson, upon whom we look as being the principal medical officer of the State, has no control over or say in the administration of hospitals.

The Chief Secretary: You did not assume that that was correct? That is the kind of information for which you can thank the hon. member!

Hon. A. THOMSON: It was certainly news to me. The Lotteries Commission has performed a very useful function in Western Australia. While I respect the views of those members who would like to see the Lotteries Commission put out of existence, I consider it would be a foolish act on the part of this House to defeat the measure. Possibly I am one of those members who think that the metropolitan area is receiving undue preference in regard to the amount of money provided for the Perth Hospital, but I am not going to move for the appointment of a Select Committee, because such action tends to be regarded as an attempt to delay the transaction of business. But it is possible that the appointment of a Select Committee, during the next session of Parliament, might achieve the result Dr. Hislop seems to have in mind.

Certainly he knows a great deal more from the professional point of view than does the ordinary layman.

There appear to be great disabilities in many country areas in connection with adequate medical attention. From the balance sheet submitted to the House, however, it can be seen that country hospitals as a whole, and infant health centres and similar movements have derived very considerable benefit from money which has been received from the Lotteries Commission and which otherwise would have gone to waste. I was in another place when this measure was first introduced and, for quite a number of years, I have been pointing to the wonderful benefits derived by Queensland from its Golden Casket lotteries. I have also, in the past, drawn attention to the enormous amount of money which goes to Tasmania week after week and month after month. Much of that money came from this State which, therefore, did not derive any benefit except when people were fortunate enough to obtain prizes. The appointment of the Lotteries Commission has led to the provision of a considerable sum of money for various organisations, and the Government has benefited from the amount so provided for the Perth Hospital.

One of the grievances I have always had, and which I have frequently voiced in this House and in another place, is that the metropolitan area is always treated very much more generously than are country areas. I know the experience of my own home town. Years ago we had a hospital which had outlived its usefulness and it had become necessary for us to march with the times. Unfortunately, the Lotteries Commission was not then in existence and in order to obtain a new hospital—a hospital which is now in existence and of which we are very proud—the Katanning Road Board had to agree to provide half the cost, the Government providing the balance. Dr. Hislop refreshed my memory as to what happened. It was not the present Administration that benefited from the hospital tax. Prior to the inauguration of that tax the State Government had to provide a certain sum each year for the general administration of our public hospitals. Most of us who voted for the imposition of the hospital tax did so under the impression that we were providing additional money for the construction and general adminis-

tration of hospitals. It certainly caused us some amazement when the then Government proceeded to benefit from the tax by not providing on the Estimates anything for the administration of hospitals.

I hope that those members who are opposed to the lotteries as a whole will not be successful in their attempt to have the second reading of this measure defeated. If the Lotteries Commission is abolished, gambling will not disappear. All that will happen will be that the lotteries in the Eastern States will be enriched. While some people look on lotteries as an evil, it has to be recognised that the gambling spirit is prevalent in Australia and we would be very foolish to take the risk of losing the funds that come to us from this source. I have not had much personal experience of the commissioners, but every reasonable request that has been submitted to those gentlemen has received favourable consideration. After all, they are governed by the Act which definitely lays down the charitable purposes for which it is desired to raise funds by lotteries. Dr. Hislop mentioned that two hospitals had received a sum of £300 for the establishment of free wards.

The Honorary Minister: There is no free ward in the State.

Hon. A. THOMSON: That is true enough. If one has been a patient in a Government hospital, one is presented with a bill on leaving the institution. If he is not in a position to pay the full amount, a collector in his particular district will call on him week by week to see that he pays what he can. In fairness, however, I should say that if it can be proved that a man is not in as financial a position as he would like to be, favourable consideration is given to a reduction being made in the amount charged. I support the second reading of the Bill but I suggest to Dr. Hislop that when the new Parliament assembles he might consider asking, at an early stage, for a Select Committee to inquire into and make proposals for the better administration of the funds raised by the Commission. He might then accomplish his purpose. I have no complaints against the Commission and intend to support the Bill.

HON. F. E. GIBSON (Metropolitan-Suburban): It is my intention to support the second reading of the Bill because failure to pass the measure would be fraught

with serious consequences to the charitable institutions and the hospitals of the State. I think that most members will recall that the Lotteries Commission was created as a result of Government dissatisfaction with the conduct of crossword puzzles run by weekend papers with a view to enabling the owners to "get rich quick." It was my good fortune to be associated with the Commission in its early days and to help lay the foundations of the wonderful work that has since been done.

I know that many people have a sincere objection to this particular method of raising money for charitable purposes. They consider it should be the concern of the Government; that the money should be raised by direct taxation. As Australians, we realise that the people are anxious to have a gamble, and the Lotteries Commission makes provision for that desire.

The success of the lotteries in recent months has been due to the change of policy, whereby sweeps are being conducted in much less time than when the Commission tried to provide a prize of £6000. The average person simply wants to put in his 2s. 6d. and know his luck. If he misses this week, he subscribes another 2s. 6d. next week. As a result of this policy, a large sum of money has been raised during the last 12 months. I was not aware of the amount until I heard Dr. Hislop give the figures yesterday. The Lotteries Commission and the Government are to be congratulated on the fact that £100,000 has been paid off the capital expenditure of the Perth Hospital from the money raised by the Commission, and so relieved those in authority from the necessity of raising about £7200 annually to provide interest and sinking fund on that £100,000. I am hopeful that the Lotteries Commission will provide £100,000 in each of the next ten years. If it does that, it will then practically have wiped out the cost of the hospital building. It should not be called the "Perth Hospital." It is a State hospital. Mr. Thomson said that the metropolitan area received a greater proportion of the Commission's funds than did the country. He should remember that the greater amount of those funds is subscribed in the metropolitan area. But the Perth Hospital is not for the sole benefit of the people residing in the metropolitan area, but for the people of the State.

Hon. A. Thomson: The Mount Hospital is in the same position. People come from many miles distant.

Hon. F. E. GIBSON: I realise that. I hope that the equipment in the Perth Hospital will meet with the approval of Dr. Hislop, and of the other members of the medical profession in this State. I know personally the gentlemen who compose the Commission, and their capacity for distributing these funds in a reasonable and fair manner is as great as that of any other persons who could be appointed to the position. It has been my good fortune to go to them on many occasions to ask them to assist charitable causes, and they have always met me in a most courteous manner. I hope the measure will be carried. It is nearly time that, instead of having an annual Bill, we had a permanent enactment on the statute-book.

HON. T. MOORE (Central): My remarks will be brief. I would not be doing the right thing if I did not say something in favour of the Lotteries Commission now that it has been criticised, particularly by Dr. Hislop, on the last two occasions. He has singled it out for special attack. It seems to me that his remarks should, if it is necessary, be directed against the Health Department and not against the Lotteries Commission. I am afraid he is confusing the two bodies. If he wants to get results, I advise him to address himself, if it is necessary, to the Health Department. After all, what does this Commission do in the allocation of these funds? It does not say what kind of building shall be erected. When plans are drawn up, the local committees have the say. All of those men are not fools. Dr. Hislop may think so, but I do not. They are pretty wise in their generation, and know what they want. The method adopted by the Commission is serving a long-felt want for those in the back country. Perhaps Dr. Hislop does not know that, but we who live in the country do. We are very pleased with what has taken place by the introduction of the Lotteries Commission. Without the Commission, how would our country hospitals fare today? Like they did previously!

Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. T. MOORE: All country members reiterate what I say. Unfortunately, Dr. Hislop does not know what we have gone through. If he did, he would be more likely

to eulogise the great change that has taken place instead of criticising the good work that has been done. Like Mr. Gibson, I have never gone to the Commission without being well received. I have gone along on many occasions in company with other members, and with members of other parties, too, because we in the country hunt in packs in most cases. We take along with us the members who know the conditions out back and who are prepared to throw in their weight in the requests that we make, and which have never been turned down.

Hon. G. B. Wood: The Commission gave us more than we asked for on the last occasion I went.

Hon. T. MOORE: Yes. I will not idly listen to criticism which should be levelled, if any criticism is necessary, against the Health Department. Dr. Hislop singled out the lay-out of buildings and many other things which have nothing to do with the Lotteries Commission, because those matters are dealt with by boards whether in the metropolitan area or in country areas.

Hon. A. Thomson: The Lotteries Commission inspects the plans.

Hon. T. MOORE: Yes, but it does not disapprove of the plans.

Hon. A. Thomson: The Commission suggests improvements at times.

Hon. T. MOORE: That is all right. Take the Perth Hospital. It was planned by a pretty good advisory board. We should all be proud of that hospital. I am proud of the fact that the Lotteries Commission is standing behind it. For years appeals were made for the Perth Hospital. Does the hon. member recall those appeals? Was he here in those days? Those appeals for charity fell on deaf ears! Today the people are encouraged to gamble to this very slight extent. The sum of 2s. 6d. does not set anybody on the wrong track because everyone knows that a portion of it goes to charity. In addition Australians will always take a chance, and I hope they will continue to do so because, unless they are prepared to take a chance, they will not do much good in the world. Because the Perth Hospital is a State hospital, much more can be done for it by the Lotteries Commission than can be done for the other hospitals. Any number of patients are sent from my district to Perth. Dr. Hislop knows that that is so. Members, generally, know how many of our country people come to Perth. There are

patients in the Perth Hospital from every portion of the State. They will continue to come to the big hospital when it is open. This Commission has done a wonderful work and I hope it will continue to do so for many years.

HON. H. L. ROCHE (South-East): I hope the House will pass this Bill. When all is said and done, if the benefits derivable from the Commission under the present arrangement are not as great for the country districts as they could be, still the position is infinitely better than it was. Because of that I am sure no country member feels disposed to interfere unduly with the present position. Some people who are quite honestly averse to this means of raising money object to lotteries. They are entitled to their objection. Fortunately, there are not sufficient of them to defeat the legislation. Personally, I am not averse to it. It is, after all, a poor man's chance to obtain a fortune, and he might as well have that chance.

Hon. G. B. Wood: A fortune!

Hon. H. L. ROCHE: It is to many people, but not to wealthy people. The Commission provides money for hospitals in the country areas which otherwise would be hard to obtain. Even if there is objection to the personnel of the Commission, or the manner in which its members are appointed, I cannot see that any other proposals would give better results than we get now. I have had very little to do with the Commission in my limited experience, but I have found on all sides—even from people who once were bitterly opposed to it—the highest approbation expressed for the chairman, and recognition of the work he is doing. I do think that this Commission has achieved so much and been of such vital assistance to people in country districts, that the House should continue the measure. If objection is raised to its being a yearly enactment, it is likely that the Government would accept an amendment to make it, if not permanent, two-yearly or three-yearly legislation.

THE HONORARY MINISTER: I agree with other members respecting the view of people who do not believe in lotteries or gambling. I listened with astonishment to Dr. Hislop's hostile criticism of this Bill and of the distribution of the funds by the Lotteries Commission. His statement bristles with inaccuracies and

gross exaggeration. The Fremantle Hospital was mentioned. I am chairman of that hospital board. I am also State president of the Infant Health Association, besides taking a keen interest in the successful work of the dental clinic at Fremantle, plus the valuable social services conducted by the Free Milk Council which distributes milk to the school children. I am also interested in the Silver Chain nursing scheme, which does so much to assist our indigent people. For these reasons, I have no hesitation in saying that, had not the Lotteries Commission generously and unstintingly supported these organisations, all of them would have been seriously handicapped and in some cases their valuable work would have been stopped altogether.

Sitting suspended from 6.15 to 7.30 p.m.

The HONORARY MINISTER: The Commission, by sympathetic support, is encouraging the people to organise and raise money by public subscription. I am not one of those who think that the new order is going to provide large sums of money and that all one need do is to sit down and wait for it to come along. I believe that a large proportion of the people recognise their duties as citizens and are prepared to take part in various organisations to provide efficient social services of all kinds. As Assistant Minister for Child Welfare, I know that some denominational orphanage organisations have been enabled to extend their activities greatly owing to the sympathetic support received from the Lotteries Commission. Dr. Hislop mentioned the medieval hospital at Fremantle, and stated that £250,000 would be required to convert it into a model hospital. He also referred to the lack of equipment in the various hospitals and the urgent necessity for the replacement of instruments, etc. Here again is misleading exaggeration. As a matter of fact the Fremantle hospital is better equipped than ever before in its history, and has the best medical service in operation today. War conditions make difficulties, of course. With regard to buildings, it has the best men's community ward, and the finest women's surgical ward in Western Australia.

Hon. G. B. Wood: And the best nurses' quarters in Australia.

The HONORARY MINISTER: Yes. This is the McCallum block which cost, with

the additions to nurses' quarters, a total of £25,630. Of this sum the Lotteries Commission provided £14,306. Since January, 1938, to date the Lotteries Commission has subscribed to the Fremantle Hospital a total of £18,870 19s. 8d. This continued valuable help is keenly appreciated both by the Fremantle Hospital Board and by the people of Fremantle. We do want a new women's medical ward to replace the old portion of the hospital, which is very ancient, as mentioned by Dr. Hislop, but it represents only one-sixth of the total hospital-patient accommodation provided, the other buildings being comparatively new.

Our post-war reconstruction scheme is for a three-storey modern hospital wing—women's community ward, women's medical ward, with new administrative office, kitchen and store room on the ground floor. We have no reason to doubt that the Lotteries Commission will continue its policy with regard to Fremantle hospital requirements and subscribe a substantial amount of this cost, on the understanding, of course, that the Government and the public of Fremantle, will contribute their fair proportion of the total cost. We are also discussing the erection of a convalescent hospital on Government land known as Scotsman Hill, adjacent to the present hospital—an urgent need for the economical working of the metropolitan hospitals. The proposed site for the convalescent hospital is said by Eastern States hospital and medical experts, and also by medical and hospital authorities in this State, to be the finest in any part of Australia. Knowing the keen interest the Lotteries Commission takes in the hospitals of this State, I feel sure that this scheme will be solidly supported by it, always again on the understanding that the Government and the public subscribe their fair share of the total cost.

It is correct to state that the 30 infant health centres in operation in this State would have been financially paralysed owing to war conditions and many of them would have ceased operations had it not been for the financial grants advanced every year by the Commission. The same applies to the Silver Chain nursing scheme. We could not manage without that scheme, which is carrying out magnificent work amongst sick people in the metropolitan area. The post-war reconstruction scheme for the Infant Health Association plans a £25,000 building

for the housing of further clinics. This cannot be carried out without the assistance of the Commission. Nearly all the clinic buildings erected to date have been made possible through generous grants by the Commission.

The statement made by Dr. Hislop regarding the free wards of the Mount Hospital and St. John of God Hospital is very misleading. I am assured that the cost of the free service at St. John of God Hospital last year was over £5,000, while free hospital service at the Mount Hospital was nearly twice as much as the money granted by the Commission.

Hon. J. Cornell: What do you mean by free hospital service?

The HONORARY MINISTER: I was about to explain that point. As a matter of fact, literally there are no free wards either in the public hospitals of Perth and Fremantle, or at the hospitals mentioned. What exists is a free hospital service to all who have not the means to pay. Obviously it would be highly improper and very humiliating to advertise indigent patients, either in the public hospitals or at the St. John of God or the Mount Hospitals, by placing them in beds in special places set apart for the purpose. The only ones who would know would be the doctors attending the patients free of cost, and the hospital secretary.

I strongly disagree with the statement that professional advice is lacking in the Medical Department and that hospitals have to depend on lay advice. This is untrue. The Under Secretary of the department is extremely careful not to express any opinion which would intrude in any way on the etiquette of the medical profession. In many years of association with the Medical Department, I have always found Mr. Huelin scrupulously careful in this respect. He relies upon the advice given by the Commissioner of Public Health, Dr. Atkinson, and the various doctors who take a deep interest in hospital matters.

Hon. J. Cornell: He has one friend, anyhow.

The HONORARY MINISTER: One must be fair.

Hon. J. Cornell: Had I been asked, I would have said the opposite.

The HONORARY MINISTER: In all my dealings with the Under Secretary, I cannot recall one instance in which he has

offered advice on matters about which he was not competent to speak. As regards management, he is in a position to give advice. It is safe to say that there was no proposition with regard to hospitals put up to the Lotteries Commission without its first being discussed with medical men. Every country doctor would be, and has been eager to press for improvements to the hospital in his particular district. In a progressive district the doctor is generally found to be the driving force in any move to obtain improvements for the local hospital. There can be no doubt that in the metropolitan area a large number of doctors have been anxious and willing to assist in the improvement of metropolitan hospitals, and their services have been gladly accepted. We owe a debt of gratitude to the doctors for their honorary services.

As to the suggestion that the members of the Commission should be replaced by another board, including a professional man, this would be a retrograde step. The chairman of the Lotteries Commission and his colleagues have carried out a difficult task with conspicuous success. All are trusted men with high reputations. The members of the Commission have had lengthy experience, and the distribution of the funds has been made with strict impartiality. The chairman has given inspiring leadership by his constant personal attention to the various problems of the respective organisations. His personal interest and advice have been very welcome and extremely helpful. There is no one in the State with a greater knowledge of hospital requirements and the needs of social services than the chairman of the Commission, Mr. Kenneally.

Apart from his official duties, Mr. Kenneally has devoted much of his spare time to attending meetings of various organisations and has given a decided impetus to the work by his presence and advice. In my opinion it would be an error of the gravest magnitude to appoint another board to distribute the funds. Dr. Hislop's criticism of the large amount of money granted to the Perth Hospital is unwarranted; because, as was stated by other members, it will provide State-wide hospital service and consequently the money could not be devoted to a better object. I hope the Bill will pass without undue delay, and I make this plea because I know from personal knowledge

the tremendous amount of good work that has been done by the Commission and the inspiring help it has given to various committees throughout the State to raise money by direct giving.

HON. H. V. PIESSE (South-East): Before addressing myself to this Bill, I would like to thank the Chief Secretary for his kindly remarks on my return to this Chamber. I also desire to thank the many members of the House who so kindly sent messages to me during my illness. Above all, I wish to thank Mr. Moore for having paired with me, because by his so doing my vote was recorded and therefore my province was represented by its three members. Dealing with the Bill, I have always supported a similar measure and have favoured the way in which the funds of the Lotteries Commission are controlled. In the first place, Mr. Clydesdale did excellent work as chairman of the Commission and now we have Mr. Kenneally in that position. He has devoted himself to the affairs of the Commission. Until the shortage of petrol prohibited the practice, Mr. Kenneally was able to travel throughout the State and make inspections of various hospitals, with the result that the institutions benefited greatly. We in our district have not always obtained everything for which we asked, but the Commission has given us everything possible in reason.

On behalf of the various hospitals in the South-East Province, I feel I must both thank and congratulate the Commission on the help it has afforded them. I regret I was not present last night to hear Dr. Hislop's remarks on the Bill. However, I well remember the last speech he made on a similar Bill; he then gave members much valuable information for their consideration. From the way in which members have commented on his speech, I have no doubt he gave similar valuable information on this occasion. It is extremely helpful to have a member of his standing and ability to keep the Chamber on an even keel with respect to hospital matters. I shall vote for the second reading.

HON. H. TUCKEY (South-West): It is not my intention to oppose the second reading; nevertheless, I feel there is room for amendments to the principal Act. Possibly an amending Bill will be brought down before it is necessary again to introduce a

continuance measure. I have been a member of the Murray District Hospital Committee for a considerable period and can say that that hospital has been treated fairly by the Lotteries Commission. I cannot remember an occasion when we were refused a reasonable request. At the same time, that does not mean a great deal, because we have always had to provide our quota, a difficult thing to do in sparsely populated districts. The sum quoted by Dr. Hislop, namely, £1,400, seems to be a small amount to be distributed to hospitals by the Lotteries Commission over a period of ten months. However, I am sure the amount would have been much larger if local committees could have financed part of their requirements.

At Pinjarra we need a new hospital. The existing one was formerly an old private home. It was converted into a hospital and from time to time improvements and additions have been made to it, but these really amounted to throwing away money. We have now reached the stage when we have not sufficient hospital accommodation; the asset is rather large to scrap and we are not in a position to erect a new building. Not long ago the average number of beds was two or three; today it is about 14 or 15. The Murray Hospital is not singular in that respect; other district hospital committees have found it necessary to provide additional accommodation from time to time. Some people seem to think that the Perth Hospital is the only institution in need of extra beds, but I assure the House that applies in the majority of hospitals throughout the State.

Some means should be found whereby finance can be provided to build adequate hospital accommodation where it is needed. I greatly favour doing the job once and for all; by this I mean that hospitals should not be built piecemeal. I supported the building of the Perth Hospital, although I was opposed to the locality. It is dreadful to think that that fine building has been erected in what might be described as a smoky hollow. However, that is now past and we must look to the future. There is room for alteration in the distributions made by the Lotteries Commission. The sum of £100,000 is a large amount to be raised each year. The hospital with which I am connected has to deal with a number of road accident cases. At the present time, owing to scarcity of petrol, there are not so many

accidents, but we have had as many as six or seven cases in a week. No doubt when cars come on the road again the number of patients due to car accidents will increase. We have had to make use of the verandah as well as the wards and so have found it difficult to manage. As I said, I think the amount of £1,400 would have been considerably increased if the local hospital committees could have provided their quota; in the case of the hospital I represent, we would probably require £2,000 which is a large amount for such a district to find.

HON. E. H. H. HALL (Central): I listened with close attention and a good deal of interest to the many members who have spoken to this Bill, and I very much regret to think that one member, who enjoys the confidence of, I think, the great majority of members of this Chamber—Dr. Hislop—should have been accused undeservedly by another member, who also deservedly enjoys the esteem of every other member, of being guilty of uttering an untruth. It makes me wish that the Standing Orders could give the member so accused the right of reply.

The **PRESIDENT**: Order! The hon. member is perfectly entitled to say that another member has said something untrue. The assumption in that case is that the member who made the statement did not know it was untrue. If the statement had been made that a member had said something that was untrue, he knowing it to be untrue, then of course he would have been called to order by the President. The hon. member may proceed.

HON. E. H. H. HALL: I do hope, Mr. President, that you do not think for one moment that I had any idea you were allowing something to happen that should not have occurred, because nothing was further from my mind. My desire is to get at the truth of the matter. I feel sure Dr. Hislop did not mean to do what has been attributed to him by two Ministers in this House, one of whom said he was guilty of gross exaggeration and of making misleading statements, while the Honorary Minister said that something which Dr. Hislop said was untrue. I express my regret that there should be this acute difference between such members. We know the Honorary Minister has a very kindly nature. We are aware that for many years he has taken a deep interest in the Fremantle hospital and in

health clinics. That is why I regret so much that he should have made that statement about another member who we think is equally conscientious and equally, if not better, informed. Having said that, I wish to add that I shall vote for the second reading of the Bill.

Every country member who has spoken to the measure has expressed his deep gratitude to the Lotteries Commission. Is it not pertinent to ask what would the Lotteries Commission have done with the money had it not distributed it in the way it has done? Mr. Tuckey and other members have spoken their minds. We are entitled to express our views without being accused of making unfair inferences. Those of us who are at variance with the Commission consider that far too great a proportion of this money is voted to the Perth Hospital. A rose by any other name would smell as sweet; we all know that the Perth Hospital gives treatment to people from the country. But who said it did not? I ask what percentage of cases treated at the Perth Hospital comes from the country and what percentage from the metropolitan area. Of course, the Perth Hospital caters for country people, but what would be the position of the capital of the State were it not for the people in the country?

Let us be logical. I have repeatedly said in this Chamber that capital expenditure cannot by any stretch of the imagination be deemed to be charity. It is something for which the Government is directly responsible. The Government is responsible for the health of the community, for education and for aid to the aged and infirm. Those are matters for which the Government of any civilised country is directly responsible. They should not be the responsibility of the Lotteries Commission. I want to emphasise the non-party character of this Chamber that has so often been sneered at. Mr. Wood said that money had been granted by the Lotteries Commission to poor unfortunate people in the East Province whose roof had been blown off by a gale.

Hon. G. B. Wood: What is wrong with that?

Hon. E. H. H. HALL: I am glad that those people did get relief, but is it a function of the Lotteries Commission to give aid in matters of that kind? The pearlers at Broome might just as well have called on the Lotteries Commission for help. Some

of the farmers in my district who suffered loss from rust should also have been paid compensation by the Lotteries Commission. It is about time that the Commission was put on a proper basis. I am certain that when the original legislation was introduced, it was never intended by Parliament that money should be distributed all over the State by the Lotteries Commission under the guise of charity.

Hon. J. Cornell: A lot of sins are committed in the name of charity.

Hon. E. H. H. HALL: I agree with what Mr. Parker said about the members of the Lotteries Commission. I do not know them very well. The chairman, who was once a Minister of the Crown, has been in public life for many years and I think I have only had a few minutes private conversation with him at any time. I have no doubt that both he and the other Commissioners are very estimable men. Every member knows that there are scores of people doing work in an honorary capacity who would deem it an honour to be associated with a function operating under the name of "sweet charity" instead of belonging to a board paid to undertake such work. I happen to be the secretary of a hospital advisory committee, a much smaller concern than the Lotteries Commission, but the members of that body have rendered many years of service in an honorary capacity and have advised the Government regarding how money should be spent. Those men are not nominated by the Government—Mr. Parker drew special attention to this aspect—but are nominated by the local people, the A.L.P., the doctors, the friendly societies, and by the Government itself.

Why cannot we have a board elected along those lines to deal with the distribution of lottery funds? That would be much preferable to the present system under which the Government nominates the whole of the members of the Lotteries Commission. Unfortunately I am not in a position to deal with the statements made by Ministers and, of course, the Chief Secretary has the right of reply. I am not sufficiently well up in matters concerning hospital administration to enable me to reply to damaging statements made by some members. For instance Mr. Piesse said the House appreciated hearing from Dr. Hislop what he had to tell us. But what is the good of a man getting up and making false and untrue state-

ments—that is, if Dr. Hislop has done so, which I doubt. Being desirous of informing myself, seeing that hospital administration bulked largely in the debate, I sought official reports about the hospitals of the State. I asked the officers of the House for the Commissioner of Public Health's latest reports so that I might learn something about those institutions. Some years ago in order to protect the lives of our womenfolk who were bearing children, the Geraldton Municipal Council, of which I was a member, applied to the Government and obtained the use of a building that has been known for many years as "The Residency." A local committee set to work to establish it as a maternity hospital. Later Mr. Huehn, the Under Secretary for Health, visited Geraldton to inspect the institution and investigate its methods. As a result of that we were granted by the Government an annual subsidy of £50 a year.

Hon. A. Thomson: That is what every other nursing home receives.

Hon. E. H. H. HALL: We are told that under the new order about which we hear so much, there will be much decentralisation. I hope that is so and that we will have more of it in the future. We have in the metropolitan area the King Edward Memorial Hospital for women, an excellent well run institution about which I have never heard anyone say a disparaging word. Of course, that institution caters mainly for the womenfolk of the metropolitan area but it also provides accommodation for country women lucky enough to be able to take advantage of it. Naturally we would not expect women from the Murchison or Victoria districts to travel right down to Perth to receive attention at the King Edward Memorial Hospital. However, I want to give some official information which I have taken the precaution to obtain. When Dr. Hislop has been a member of this Chamber for a few years he will not risk what happened here this afternoon. The Government takes the sole responsibility for financing and carrying on the King Edward Memorial Hospital. It is a public institution just in the same way as the Victoria Hospital at Geraldton is a public institution.

I have been hammering away at this question ever since I have been a member of this House because of the unfairness of the system. Why should the womenfolk of the Victoria district have to go to an institution

that is conducted as a result of voluntary effort while the womenfolk of the metropolitan area can go to a Government institution equipped with all the best facilities? That practice still continues. As Mr. Tuckey said, let us put an end to it. If Dr. Hislop is the man I take him for, he will not sit down and make no effort to prove what he said. If he cannot prove his statements, perhaps he will be able to explain them. He does not require any assistance from me. The Bill under discussion is simply a continuance measure and must go on. I trust Dr. Hislop will take the means open to him to secure an inquiry into hospital administration. I have contrasted the position between the King Edward Memorial Hospital and the maternity hospital at Geraldton and I emphasise the unfairness of it all. I hope Country Party members and those representing country districts will endeavour to secure a better deal for their constituents who for years past have been told that if they want to build a hospital the Government will go 50-50 with them.

Hon. A. Thomson: That is right.

Hon. E. H. H. HALL: I do not want the people in the metropolitan area to be put in a spot like that. I know that the very fine metropolitan hospital caters for distressed people from the country areas, and I have been responsible for a number from my province receiving that treatment. One was an old age pensioner and, in an appreciative letter he wrote to me, he said he could not have received better treatment had he been the Prince of Wales.

Hon. J. A. Dimmitt: Surely that was not at the King Edward Memorial Hospital!

Hon. E. H. H. HALL: I must apologise for not explaining that I was referring to the Perth Hospital, not to the King Edward Memorial Hospital for Women. The difference between the position in the city and in the country is too great. The people outback have suffered too long in silence. When I hear members getting up and expressing gratitude to the Lotteries Commission for receiving something that the people should have a right to, I am forced to enter my protest. Here is another point. Do members realise that it was the Mitchell-Latham Government that was responsible, in the face of bitter opposition from those now occupying the Treasury bench, for the passing of the Hospital Fund Act, which was one of the finest things ever done in the interest of

our hospitals? That imposition of a penny-halfpenny in the pound built up the fund to a total of about £250,000. It was that action on the part of the Mitchell-Latham Government that afforded Government hospitals in the country districts and elsewhere the opportunity to be properly equipped.

Hon. A. Thomson: But still the assistance is on the 50-50 basis.

Hon. E. H. H. HALL: I think that sort of thing was in Dr. Hislop's mind when he directed attention to the manner in which the Government is taking advantage of the Lotteries Commission. In these days it is not a case of 50-50 but a sort of trinity—the local people, the Lotteries Commission and the Government. For instance, if £3,000 is wanted and the Government is approached for the assistance we are advised to approach the Commission through the agency of our local members of Parliament. If we get a £1,000 from the Lotteries then the Government will give another £1,000 if the local people can raise their proportion.

Hon. A. Thomson: That is perfectly true.

Hon. E. H. H. HALL: Of course it is true and everybody knows it is so. The Government has been enabled to side-step its responsibilities in these matters. Here is one direction in which Dr. Hislop can take some action. He said that the Medical Department was not under the control of a medical man. In the honorary position I hold in connection with the Government hospital at Geraldton I have frequently come into contact with the Under Secretary for Health, Mr. Huelin. Remembering the important duties that officer has to carry out and that his department is non-revenue earning, I must assert that I have always received a fair deal from him.

Hon. A. Thomson: That is quite right.

Hon. E. H. H. HALL: The members of my committee are not completely with me in regard to this matter, but Mr. Huelin has an unpleasant job to do. I know that many people do not get along with him very satisfactorily; but I have had some years of experience in dealing with him, and I always found him to be just and true.

Hon. A. Thomson: So have I.

Hon. E. H. H. HALL: However, let me deal with the Public Health Department. I called for the annual departmental report this afternoon. I then rang up the Public Health Department and asked if the Commissioner did not submit a report

to Parliament each year on the departmental activities. I was told that such a report was not presented annually but every second year. I informed the officers of the House accordingly, and they made a diligent search but could not find a recent report. I again got in touch by telephone with the departmental officers and they promised to look for a report but came back with the information that none had been submitted for some time; in fact, the latest report was for the year 1935-36. The present war commenced in 1939, so it cannot be blamed for the lack of departmental reports. However, the latest report I have contains quite a lot of useful information but I find that the only hospital mentioned in it is the Wooroloo Sanatorium. Naturally I thought I would see something about the Perth Hospital, the King Edward Hospital, or even the Geraldton hospital, but not a word!

I desire to know why Parliament has not received annually the departmental report from the Commissioner of Public Health. The report I have contains interesting statements from the schools medical officer, the medical officer for health centres, information regarding meat inspection and the report of the pathologist and bacteriologist. In fact, it conveys information about almost everything—except hospitals. There seems to be something wrong. Anyhow, I have shown where I stand on this matter, and if members of Parliament are afraid to say what they mean, it is time the institution was wiped out of existence. One other point I wish to refer to is that when the question of lotteries was brought before Parliament some years ago, a private firm of auditors—I do not know why that was so—was doing the auditing of the Commission's accounts. The firm was quite a reputable one. However, after spending 20-odd years in the Public Service, and knowing how easy it is for some people to go wrong, I maintain that we cannot have too close a check on a business such as this. I advocated that the Auditor General should audit these accounts, but it was not until a defalcation took place that the Auditor General was called on to do the audit—another instance of locking the stable door after the steed had been stolen. It was said by my namesake here only a few weeks ago that there was not much use in private members giving advice. I support the second reading of the Bill.

HON. W. R. HALL (North-East): I listened attentively to the very impassioned speeches made by various members on the Bill. For my part I consider that the Lotteries Commission has done a wonderful job, irrespective of what Dr. Hislop thinks and also irrespective of whether any member votes against the Bill. After all, doctors have been known to make mistakes. Whether a doctor should be placed on the Lotteries Commission is a matter for this House to determine. In going through the Commission's history what mainly strikes me is that the Commissioners have done a very good job inasmuch as they have helped the goldfields districts considerably. The Goldfields have not worried about the Lotteries Commission very much. The local authorities have performed that task in connection with the Government.

Hon. J. Cornell: And the Chamber of Mines.

Hon. W. R. HALL: Yes. Mr. Kenneally, the chairman of the Lotteries Commission, and the other commissioners and the staff have admirably carried out the task they were appointed to do. When it comes to a point whether there is a little bit of gambling associated with the Commission's operations, my reply is that I do not think too many members of this Chamber have not at some time had a ticket in a Charities sweep. I rose to voice my warm appreciation of the good work done by the Lotteries Commission. I hope the commissioners will be permitted to continue their good work, and therefore I have much pleasure in supporting the Bill.

THE CHIEF SECRETARY (in reply): It has been quite refreshing to hear so many eulogistic addresses concerning this measure since Dr. Hislop spoke on the Bill recently. I very much appreciate the fact that Mr. Gibson drew the attention of the Chamber to the circumstances under which the Lotteries Commission was first established. I think it well to recall for a moment how the Lotteries Commission came into being, because in those days conditions were very different from what they are now. There were not only the cross-word puzzles run by newspapers. There were all sorts of small lotteries being conducted, in some cases by irresponsible people; and it hardly mattered what day of the week one went down the street, one was pestered by some

person or other to invest in one or other of the lotteries of this kind. So eventually something had to be done. The Lotteries Commission was established in 1932, and it has carried out very good work ever since. I would point out, too, that the Lotteries Commission is not set up for the purpose of providing funds for hospitals only. One would imagine, hearing Dr. Hislop, that that was its chief purpose.

Hon. C. F. Baxter: It seemed to be.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: The Lotteries Commission was established in order to assist charities generally, and the Lotteries (Control) Act contains a very clear definition indicating concisely the way in which the Commission may distribute any funds it may raise. When I introduced this continuance Bill I gave the House at least an outline of the manner in which the money had been distributed during the preceding ten months. The figures I gave were not confined to hospitals, although those are the only figures to which Dr. Hislop appears to have given attention. Certainly he misconstrued them seriously when dealing with the Bill.

Hon. J. Cornell: That is what figures are for!

The CHIEF SECRETARY: To be misconstrued? There is no necessity on this occasion to misconstrue the figures. They speak for themselves. However, I propose to reply to some of Dr. Hislop's statements, because I think it is a thousand pities that a member of this Chamber should make the statements which that hon. member made—statements which he could not possibly have made had he examined the facts of the case as it was quite possible for him to do with the aid of the returns submitted to this House from time to time. Or he could have ascertained the facts of the case by merely asking a question of me. That course, however, apparently did not suit the hon. member's book. May I suggest that if Dr. Hislop is not satisfied with the Health Department, or with the administration of our hospitals, there is a right time and also a right place for criticism of that kind? As regards the Perth Hospital, it is perfectly true that the Lotteries Commission had agreed to provide interest and sinking fund on the amount of loan moneys used in the erection of the new building. One of the conditions under which the Lotteries Commission agreed to provide interest and sink-

ing fund is that this shall not be at the expense of any other hospital.

Hon. V. Hamersley: How can that be? It must be done at the expense of some other charity, then.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: If the hon. member will wait for a moment he will realise that what I say is perfectly correct. First of all let me tell the House that there has not been one request from any country hospital during the last ten months that has not been satisfactorily dealt with by the Lotteries Commission. Not one request has been turned down. But, of course, it is perfectly well known to everybody that during the present period it is not possible to provide many new buildings. In the first place, we have not the manpower, and, in the second place, we cannot get the materials. Consequently some requests put forward have not been met, but the Lotteries Commission has accepted commitments with regard to them. And the Lotteries Commission has gone further. It has created a fund in order that it will have money at a later stage when it will be possible to provide more of those additions and more of the equipment doubtless required at the present time, and likely to be required even more urgently and to a greater extent at a later period. It is perfectly true that the Lotteries Commission has undertaken to meet interest and sinking fund payments in connection with the Perth Hospital.

Hon. C. F. Baxter: Then what will happen if the Bill is rejected? Where will the money come from then?

The CHIEF SECRETARY: If the Bill is rejected and the Lotteries Commission goes out of existence, then the promise is automatically done away with.

Hon. C. F. Baxter: This House could not provide the interest and sinking fund.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: And for that reason it will not turn the Bill down. The Lotteries Commission has provided the interest and sinking fund up to date, and in fact has provided more money than is really necessary at present. The Commission has a very good reason for placing that additional money in the trust account which is kept at the Treasury for this purpose. If the Lotteries Commission had had more money than it could reasonably expend during this period on account of war conditions, is it not only right that the Commission should do the best it pos-

sibly could with the money at its disposal?

Hon. V. Hamersley: Put the money into war bonds!

The CHIEF SECRETARY: I will state what has been done with the money. As a matter of fact, on all loan moneys used in connection with the Perth Hospital there is an interest charge of 4 per cent.; but on any money which the Lotteries Commission can invest in the trust account, it draws only 2 per cent. Consequently, having that amount of money available, it decided to pay off £100,000 of the loan money that had already been advanced from elsewhere. By so doing, the difference between 4 per cent. interest charged on the loan money and the 2 per cent. drawn by the Lotteries Commission is saved.

Hon. L. Craig: The Lotteries Commission gets 4 per cent. on that?

The CHIEF SECRETARY: The Lotteries Commission gets 2 per cent. There is 4 per cent. on the loan moneys used in the erection of the hospital. As a result of doing that, the Commission has saved £2,000 a year, which is a considerable sum of money.

Hon. H. S. W. Parker: Have they loaned that £100,000?

The CHIEF SECRETARY: No, paid it off.

Hon. H. S. W. Parker: They have given the £100,000?

The CHIEF SECRETARY: The cost of the hospital has been reduced by £100,000.

Hon. L. Craig: The Treasury has been saved £2,000.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: There has been a permanent saving so far as the Lotteries Commission is concerned of £2,000 a year.

Hon. L. Craig: The Treasury has been saved £2,000.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: No, the Lotteries Commission, because the Commission has undertaken the payment of interest and sinking fund on the money required to build the new hospital.

Hon. L. Craig: These are payments in advance, surely?

The CHIEF SECRETARY: I will give some figures shortly which will enable the hon. member to understand the present position. The Lotteries Commission has performed a very good service indeed. Quite apart from the question of hospitals,

there is the question of money provided for various other organisations throughout the State. There are orphanages which have to be catered for, and which receive several thousand pounds each year. Included amongst the organisations to which I have referred are such bodies as the Returned Soldiers' League, which has a statutory right. The R.S.L. receives £2,000 every year. The School for the Blind receives £2,450, the Silver Chain Nursing Association, £1,710, the St. John Ambulance Association, £1,800; the Hospital Social Service, £1,712; Christmas Cheer to Hospitals, £1,026; the Infant Health Correspondence Nursing Scheme, £100; and the Alexandra Home, £102. There is a long list of organisations which are assisted to the tune of £14,909.

Hon. H. S. W. Parker: That is for 12 months.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: No, 10 months. Then, of course, there is the £4,000 for hospitals to which Dr. Hislop referred as being a very small sum, and which is spread over about 30 hospitals and includes the amount of £300 to the Mount Hospital and St. John of God Hospital. The Honorary Minister has dealt with that matter. I do not want to deal with it at any length except to say that I confirm what he said of the circumstances under which donations were made to the two hospitals I have mentioned. The Lotteries Commission has documentary evidence upon which it acted. I am not in a position to doubt the word of members of the Commission, and I hope Dr. Hislop would not do so. The Commission has been provided with documentary evidence from both hospitals with regard not only to the number of patients but also to the cost incurred by the hospitals.

It is a fact that one could go into those institutions and would not know which patients were indigent and receiving the benefit of free treatment from the hospital and from medical men. I believe it is true that in cases of that kind medical men give their services free. However, I do not know that I need delay very long on the question of the £300 given to those two hospitals. I do not want to go through all these figures that have been supplied to me in regard to the various institutions and charities which receive grants from the Commission, but I would like to clear up the position concerning the new Perth Hospital. I am doing

this because Dr. Hislop quoted a lot of figures when he was speaking and used them in his own way. He referred to £72,000 being provided each year for the Perth Hospital and to money being paid into Consolidated Revenue. That has never yet occurred so far as the Lotteries Commission is concerned and never will. Any moneys which the Lotteries Commission has to deal with in that way will be paid into the usual trust account which is audited by the Auditor General.

There is no question of outside auditors in this case. That audit is a running audit. There is always a representative of the Auditor General in the office of the Lotteries Commission so there can be no question as to the bona fides of the Commission in these days. A question was asked by Mr. Miles as to how much money has already been spent in connection with the Perth Hospital. The amount provided from loan funds to the 31st July of this year is £353,290 11s. 1d. There has been the repayment of £100,000 by the Lotteries Commission, to which I have referred, leaving a balance of £253,290 11s. 1d. With regard to sinking fund, the amount is £8,503 1s. 6d., and accrued interest is £430 3s., a total of £8,933 5s. The net balance after deducting sinking fund is £44,357 6s., and the interest during one month amounts to £810 11s. 11d. Those figures will alter from time to time as more money is provided for the completion of the Perth Hospital. Now to deal with the amount of money that has been found by the Lotteries Commission in this connection. The total amount paid into the trust fund to which I have referred is £158,000.

That trust fund has earned a total of £3,518 10s. 7d. in interest, making a total of £161,518 10s. 7d. The position today is that interest on loan moneys amounts to £33,472 16s. 4d., the interest accruing is £110 11s. 11d., and sinking fund is £8,503 1s. 6d., all of which has been paid out of the £158,000. Then there is the payment of £100,000 I have referred to, which leaves a balance of £18,732 0s. 10d. still available.

Hon. J. A. Dimmitt: That £100,000 is a contribution to the capital account.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: Yes.

Hon. J. A. Dimmitt: That is in excess of the arrangement.

Hon. L. Craig: That is outside the commitment.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: Not necessarily, though it may be outside the commitment I spoke of in regard to the sinking fund. The Commission has done a jolly good thing for itself and the hospital.

Hon. L. Craig: That money is not available for other purposes later on.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: It is certainly absorbed. A balance of £18,732 Os. 10d. is left. One of the conditions is that money has to be available if required for other purposes. There is the position concisely and correctly set out, and I think it should answer questions that have been put forward by one or two members concerning the Perth Hospital.

Hon. C. F. Baxter: You were quite wrong in what you said previously. You made a strong speech in opposition to the Bill when it was introduced in this House.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: Did I?

Hon. C. F. Baxter: Yes.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: Well, it is a long while ago.

Hon. A. Thomson: He has seen the light. We can all change our views.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: I shall now deal with the criticism that was offered to the effect that not one single member of the Commission is competent to decide upon the distribution of these funds.

Hon. L. Craig: Do not take any notice of that!

The CHIEF SECRETARY: Unfortunately, I do take notice of what members say. Notwithstanding what has been said about the members of the Lotteries Commission—and I admit there have been eulogistic compliments paid to them—I assert that there is not a body of men in this State more capable of dealing with matters of this kind. That arises from the fact that they have had many years of experience. There is not a body of men with a better or more intimate knowledge of the charitable organisations of Western Australia or a body of men with a better knowledge of the circumstances of the various hospitals of this State. As I have said, that is due to the fact that the members of the Commission have had many years of experience and have taken a personal interest in these things. If another Commission were appointed it would take years for the members to reach the stage that these gentlemen have attained in regard to matters of this kind.

Hon. E. H. H. Hall: They have gained their experience since they have been in their present positions.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: Not all of them. One or two of the members of the Commission were associated with charities long before the Commission came into existence. It seems rather remarkable to me that in recent years there have been very few complaints in regard to the method adopted by the Commission or the allocations it has made from time to time. As a matter of fact, I think I would be safe in saying that the only complaints we hear are those made in this Chamber by two or three members. Sir Hal Colebatch opposes the Bill and he is quite consistent in his attitude. He opposes the measure on principle, not because the Commission is doing something he does not care about, but because he does not believe in lotteries or in any other form of gambling. One can respect his opinion, but unfortunately he, too, is given sometimes to making statements that are not strictly correct. Sir Hal said that the money that goes to charities is about 1½d. out of each 2s. 6d. If ever there was an exaggerated statement, that is one! In order to put the matter clearly, I advise the House that prize money absorbs 52 per cent., commission 10 per cent., working expenses 4 per cent., and charities get approximately 34 per cent.

Hon. Sir Hal Colebatch: You are including the Perth Hospital as a charity.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: Of course I am. The Lotteries (Control) Act is my authority for it. It is deliberately inserted in the Act.

Hon. Sir Hal Colebatch: There is nothing in the Act to suggest it.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: The hon. member had better read the Act again. I want to disabuse the mind of anyone who is under the impression that charities benefited to the extent suggested by Sir Hal. We can show that 10d. out of every 2s. 6d. has been allocated by the Commission to the various charities of the State. If I attempted to reply to all the statements made, I would be speaking for a long while. I have answered some of the more important complaints. I have given the House the actual position in regard to the funds being provided for the Perth Hospital, and I have indicated, too, that in every case where an approach has been made to the

Lotteries Commission in connection with the hospitals of this State it has been received with consideration. That being so and in view of the present circumstances, I cannot see that anyone has any ground for complaint except that put forward by Sir Hal where the objection was raised on principle.

In regard to the other function of the Lotteries Commission, that is the raising and distribution of money, we have much to be thankful for in that the Commission has been so efficient in the way it has carried out its business. There can be no question about the integrity of the Lotteries Commission, or about its fairness when it comes to a question of distributing the available money. I would like to see the Lotteries Commission become a permanent institution. I do not think it is right that a commission of this kind, handling the amount of money that it does, should have to depend from year to year on the continuance of this Act. It should be established for a period of years, or become a permanent institution. Unfortunately at the present time we cannot deal with that phase of the subject. I do hope, notwithstanding the strong criticism offered by one or two members, that this House will again agree that the Lotteries Commission should be allowed to function for a further 12 months.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

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

BILL—COMPANIES.

In Committee.

Resumed from the previous day. Mr. Cornell in the Chair; the Chief Secretary in charge of the Bill.

Clause 1—Short title and commencement.

The CHAIRMAN: Progress was reported on Clause 1 to which Sir Hal Colebatch had moved an amendment to add to Subclause (1) the words: "but not until six months after the cessation of hostilities in the present war."

The CHIEF SECRETARY: As I indicated at the last sitting of the Committee, it has never been the intention of the Government to proclaim this Bill until such time as the commercial community has had an

opportunity to understand its contents. It is certainly not our intention to proclaim the Bill during the war. I have no objection to the amendment.

Hon. L. CRAIG: There is some objection to it. It may be necessary for the Government to allow some parts of the Bill to come into operation. The amendment will preclude the Government from allowing any part of it to be put into operation. One recommendation of the Select Committee has already been put into effect, namely, that dealing with the stamp duty on the transfer of shares.

Hon. H. S. W. PARKER: It is essential that this Bill be not proclaimed until six months after hostilities have ceased.

Hon. L. Craig: Or any part of it?

Hon. H. S. W. PARKER: Yes, for the reason that it contains many provisions which entail a tremendous amount of office work being done by the auditors, the Companies Office, legal offices and the company officials themselves. That will require much labour that is not now available. It may be said that this Bill is virtually in force in the other States, but it was put into force in those States when the necessary labour was available. It will be almost impossible to carry out the provisions of the Bill within six months of the termination of hostilities.

Hon. C. F. BAXTER: I support the amendment. Firms working on defence contracts have piles of forms to sign and are governed by numerous regulations which entail a lot of work. The commercial people impose voluntary rationing so as to give their customers a reasonable chance. Today it is difficult to carry on any sort of business. We should not ask the people to do something that is not possible. With the numerous regulations and high taxation imposed, business firms will be looking, not for an increase in business, but rather a decrease.

Hon. A. THOMSON: Mr. Baxter's remarks would have been fitting if it were proposed to proclaim the Bill immediately. When it was introduced in another place, and when it was being dealt with by a Select Committee, we were given a definite assurance that the legislation was not to be proclaimed immediately, and Subclause (2) deals with that aspect. We can rely upon the assurance of the Government, which is

inserted in the Bill, that it will not be proclaimed immediately. But in the Bill there are provisions to give effect to which might be found necessary before the war is over.

Hon. L. Craig: Those relating to the flotation of private companies for instance.

Hon. A. THOMSON: One of the main reasons for the introduction of the Bill was to deal with investing companies.

Hon. C. F. Baxter: How can you form an investing company today?

Hon. A. THOMSON: Companies such as Litchfield's could start as before.

Hon. J. A. Dimmitt: You cannot start a company today without the permission of Canberra.

Hon. A. THOMSON: Then why hesitate to pass the clause? If members wish to kill the Bill, it would have been fairer to move that it be read a second time this day six months. The measure has been considered by a Joint Select Committee and we should be able to trust the Government, especially in view of what is set out in Subclause (2).

Hon. Sir HAL COLEBATCH: The amendment is not intended as an attack on the Bill, but the commercial community is entitled to some assurance that the measure will not be brought into operation until six months after the war. It is all very well to say that the Bill has been considered by a Joint Select Committee, but there are two pages of amendments on the notice paper. We have a company law which has served this State for many years, and it can very well carry us on until six months after the war.

Hon. H. S. W. PARKER: I am not a party to the suggestion that the Government would not act properly in the matter, but it is only fair to provide for the measure to come into operation six months after the war. I want to avoid the risk of pressure being brought to bear on the Government, and if definite provision is made everyone will understand the position. Under the National Security Regulations a company cannot be formed at present.

Hon. L. Craig: Not without permission.

Hon. H. S. W. PARKER: It is impossible to get permission.

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

Clause 2—agreed to.

Clause 3—Interpretation:

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

That the definition of "attorney" be struck out.

I do not like the definition; it is too wide. Is there any need for it? I have not been able to find any reference in the Bill to attorney except in relation to a foreign company. The definition does not appear in the New South Wales Act, though I do not know whether it is in the statutes of other States.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: I understand the term is applied to a person appointed with written power of attorney as distinct from an agent who may be appointed in the ordinary way. The Solicitor General has advised—

The term "attorney" has a special legal connotation and is generally used in relation to a person who is appointed by a principal by means of a written power of attorney under seal as distinct from an agent appointed by ordinary writing or verbally. Consequently the term being used in its ordinary sense has a narrow interpretation. The definition is intended to give the term the widest possible interpretation necessary to cover all persons employed by or acting for a company in a fiduciary capacity and in that way to avoid the necessity of enumerating all the various classes of persons who may be in such a fiduciary capacity in the various provisions of the Bill which apply to such various classes of persons. Thus, if the definition is deleted as proposed, in all the very numerous provisions of the Bill in which the term "attorney" now appears, that term will have to be deleted and a statement of all the various classes of persons now mentioned in the definition will have to be substituted. Otherwise the term "attorney" now in those provisions of the Bill will apply only in its very narrow sense and so will exclude from such provisions all the classes of persons in a fiduciary capacity whom such provisions are intended to cover and must cover if the provisions are to have an effective operation.

Hon. H. S. W. PARKER: In which clause is the word "attorney" used?

The Chief Secretary: In quite a number of the clauses.

Hon. H. S. W. PARKER: So far as I can see, a foreign company is the only one that will require an attorney. It might be advisable to postpone the discussion in order that further information might be obtained.

Hon. G. W. MILES: What would be the position when the director of a local company appoints somebody with power of attorney?

Hon. H. S. W. Parker: That is a private matter and has nothing to do with the Companies Act.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: The object is to include certain persons who are acting in a particular capacity. The definition cannot do any harm.

Hon. L. CRAIG: I cannot see any objection to the definition, which covers anybody who acts for a company with authority. Mr. Parker has not shown that the definition will do any harm.

Hon. H. S. W. PARKER: A power of attorney is a document. The Swan Brewery is a foreign company, and a carter who delivers a case of beer at a house is the agent for the time being of the brewery and therefore the attorney. We should adjourn consideration of this definition. I can see no occasion for it. It is not in the New South Wales Act and I have not yet had time to read all the other relevant Acts. The word "attorney" does not appear in this measure except in the phrase "power of attorney."

The Chief Secretary: I do not think the hon. member is quite correct in saying that.

Hon. H. S. W. PARKER: May I suggest we adjourn this definition?

The Chief Secretary: The hon. member may recommit the Bill at some later stage.

Amendment put and negatived.

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

That the definition of "Mining purposes" be struck out.

I cannot see any object in this definition. Would I be exaggerating if I said that if a person dug a hole and removed the earth for the purpose of a building, he would be disturbing the earth and thus his action would constitute mining purposes? I put an extreme case.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: The definition is inserted because the term is used in Clause 12.

Hon. H. S. W. Parker: Surely we know what a company formed for mining purposes is.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: I wonder!

Hon. L. CRAIG: Evidence was given before the Joint Select Committee on this clause. The first witness called said that the

definition of "Mining purposes" was wide enough to cover quarrying.

The Chief Secretary: The definition excludes quarrying.

Amendment put and negatived.

Clause put and passed.

Clauses 4 to 23—agreed to.

Clause 24—Registration:

The CHIEF SECRETARY: There are two amendments to this clause. As I informed the Committee yesterday, several amendments on the notice paper are fairly lengthy; they have really been suggested by the Registrar of Companies and are designed to assist him in the administration of the Act should the Bill become law. One of the amendments is also recommended by the Registrar General of Victoria.

Hon. H. S. W. Parker: Would the Chief Secretary postpone consideration of these amendments so that the Committee may have an opportunity of studying them?

The CHIEF SECRETARY: I really have not had time to study them myself and I am extremely anxious that they should receive proper consideration by the Committee.

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

Clauses 25 to 27—agreed to.

Clause 28—Name of company:

The CHIEF SECRETARY: Here again I have a very lengthy amendment to move, and in order that members shall have an opportunity to peruse it, I move—

That the consideration of the clause be postponed.

Motion put and passed; clause postponed.

Clauses 29 to 36—agreed to.

Progress reported.

House adjourned at 9.35 p.m.