

may be forfeited and may be detained in certain circumstances.

The Chief Secretary: The clause deals with cases where an offence has been committed.

Hon. A. THOMSON: I admit that paragraph (e) indicates that the goods may be returned if there is no conviction against the owner. It is to make this quite clear that I have moved an amendment to strike out the words "at such owner's expense."

The HONORARY MINISTER: The amendment would undermine the efficiency of the inspectors. The Chief Secretary has already elucidated the position. I am opposed to the amendment.

Hon. W. J. MANN: I support the amendment. The Chief Secretary dealt wholly with technical offences. He avoided any reference to possible mistakes on the part of inspectors. Mr. Thomson wishes to assist the man who has been made a victim. His amendment will enable the owner of the goods, if not convicted, to claim expenses for the return of his goods.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: The amendment would undermine the Bill. It would cover all those cases where the court considered an offence had been committed, but not of a sufficiently serious nature to warrant the forfeiture of the goods. I suggest that the hon. member should draft an amendment covering only the owners of goods who have not been convicted.

Hon. A. Thomson: I should be ruled out of order for imposing taxation if I attempted to do that.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: If the amendment is carried it will be a direction to the court that although an offence has been committed, the goods are to be returned at the expense of the State. Surely the hon. member can draft a paragraph to cover the point he has raised. He could suggest that in the event of the court being satisfied that a mistake has been made the goods shall be returned without expense to the owner.

Hon. A. THOMSON: Perhaps the Honorary Minister would give an undertaking to bring down a paragraph to protect the class of owner I have in mind. If he will give that undertaking I will withdraw the amendment.

The HONORARY MINISTER: I cannot undertake to draft a paragraph for the hon. member, but I will consult the officers of

the Crown Law Department on the point he has raised.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Clause put and passed.

Clauses 17 to 23—agreed to.

Progress reported.

House adjourned at 6.10 p.m.

Legislative Assembly.

Thursday, 19th November, 1936.

	PAGE
Bills: Industries Assistance Act Continuance, mes- sage	1961
Loan, £3,212,000, 1r.	1961
Financial Emergency Act Amendment, 3a.	1961
Lotteries (Control) Act Amendment, 2a.	1961
Banbury, (Old Cemetery) Lands Revestment, returned	2005
Vermin Act Amendment, returned	2005

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

BILL—INDUSTRIES ASSISTANCE ACT CONTINUANCE.

Message.

Message from the Lieut.-Governor received and read recommending appropriation for the purpose of the Bill.

BILL—LOAN, £3,212,000.

Introduced by the Premier and read a first time.

BILL—FINANCIAL EMERGENCY ACT AMENDMENT.

Read a third time and transmitted to the Council.

BILL—LOTTERIES (CONTROL) ACT AMENDMENT.

Second Reading.

Debate resumed from the 17th November.

HON. C. G. LATHAM (York) [4.53]: In all probability had the reports of the officer of the Auditor General's Department not been laid on the Table, the Bill would have been passed without much comment. In view of the fact that the Minister decided to accede to the request of the member for East Perth (Mr. Hughes) to make the reports public, I presume the facts disclosed have given members on both sides of the House some food for thought regarding the conduct of the lotteries to date. The motion for the second reading of the Bill was moved before the Minister decided that he would lay the papers on the Table. It is most interesting to me, holding an official position as I do, to find that the Minister refused to give the Leader of the Opposition what he was subsequently prepared to make available to another member of the House. That is a most unusual practice and I propose to draw the attention of members to a question I asked in this House and the reply that was furnished by the Minister. At the time I thought the Minister's reply was evasive, but I realised I would have an opportunity to discuss the matter when the Bill was before the House. On the 14th October last I asked the then Minister for Police the following questions:—

1, Has the Auditor General at any time caused an audit to be made of the accounts of the Lotteries Commission? 2, If so, will he lay the report upon the Table of the House?

The Minister replied—

The Lotteries (Control) Act does not require or authorise the Auditor General to audit the accounts of the Lotteries Commission. Section 15 (b) of the Act provides that the permit holder (i.e., the Commission) shall appoint some qualified person to be approved by the Minister to audit the accounts, and the conduct of each lottery. The same section provides, further, that the Minister may appoint an independent auditor to make an audit of the affairs of the lottery for his information. This latter provision has been exercised by the Minister in respect of Lotteries 2, 9, and 36 when an officer of the Audit Department was appointed.

It will be seen that the Minister did not actually say he was not prepared to lay the papers on the Table, but subsequently the member for East Perth, who is possibly a great deal more curious than I was, decided to ask the Minister for the papers and the Minister, for some reason I have not yet been able to understand, agreed to place them on the Table of the House. I

contend that if the Leader of the Opposition is not entitled to such papers, no member of the House sitting on the Opposition side is entitled to them. I trust that in future, irrespective of who may hold the office of Leader of the Opposition, when he asks for papers they will be given to him—if they are to be tabled at all. I have perused the very interesting documents, which were read to the House by the member for East Perth. As members, in consequence, are well acquainted with their contents, I do not propose to take up the time of the House by quoting from the reports submitted by the departmental auditor, but I shall have something to say about the distribution of money by the Commission. It is interesting to note the reports which concern Lotteries Nos. 2, 9, 23, 24 and 36. I presume it may be taken that the reports of the auditor have a general reference to all lotteries that have been held. It will be remembered that the principal Act was passed in 1932 and became operative during the last days of that year. I find that the permit for No. 1 lottery was granted on the 20th February, 1933, and the lottery closed on the 20th March, 1933. No. 2 Lottery, which was one of those dealt with by the auditor, closed on the 13th May, 1933, but I have not been able to gather from the file the date of the granting of the permit. Presumably that would have been granted a few days before the closing of the first lottery, which would be in March. I make that point because the Premier, by interjection, suggested that the Mitchell Government were responsible for the conduct of No. 2 Lottery. As the lottery did not close until May and the change of Government took place in April, it will be obvious that the Administration with which I was associated could have had no responsibility regarding No. 2 Lottery. For the benefit of members I desire to point out just when these audits took place, because I propose to charge the Minister of the day—not the present Minister, but the Minister who was in charge of the administration of the Lotteries Control Act at the relevant time—of neglect of duty. The auditor's report on No. 2 Lottery was dated the 25th October, 1933; that relating to No. 9 Lottery was dated the 12th February, 1934, and the report dealing with Lotteries Nos. 23 and 24 was dated the 30th April, 1935. The other report dealing with Lottery

No. 36 was dated the 7th March, 1936. I want to ask the Minister why he did not see that effect was given to the recommendations made in the report of the Auditor General's officer under date the 25th October, 1933. Apparently the Minister thought that it was a matter of insufficient importance to warrant his taking any notice of it. Surely if the report had been referred to the Lotteries Commission, they would have seen that the mistakes, if they can be called "mistakes," were remedied. Evidently the matters were either not referred to the Commission or the Commission were not informed that they must comply with the law and keep their books in a proper manner. That was the position, or else the members of the Commission totally ignored the Minister. I contend that the Act contains sufficient power to enable the Minister to say to the Commission, "Unless you conform to the wishes of the Auditor General, there will be no permits for further lotteries." That is the stand the Minister should have taken. On the other hand, the Minister continued to ask for further audits. Perhaps we have not all the papers in connection with this matter. I may be wrong, but I think the papers that have been tabled were taken from various files, including a police file.

The Minister for Police: All the papers are there.

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: Apparently something is wrong, because some have been taken from various files. Certainly it is not a running file, because of the numbering of the pages. I do not say that anything is missing. I should say that the report dealing with Lottery No. 2 was taken from No. 2 file; the report on Lottery No. 9 from No. 9 file, and so on. But there must have been other papers leading up to these various matters, and those papers must contain some references to the points at issue. I am not blaming the present Minister for that.

The Minister for Police: You have all the papers in connection with the matter and most of them have come from different files. You must remember that years have elapsed.

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: How many?

The Minister for Police: Two years.

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: The first report was dated the 25th October, 1933, and the latest was dated the 7th March, 1936. I noticed somewhere a reference to a police file. I want it to be understood that I do

not charge the Government with hiding any of the facts. If any action were taken following upon the presentation of the reports by the Auditor, naturally I would expect to see some references to the decisions on the file. The Minister had a duty to perform, and his first duty would have been to refer these matters to the Chairman of the Commission, drawing attention to the remarks made by the audit official and informing him that the action suggested would have to be given effect. If that had been done, the Chairman would have seen to it that these irregularities did not occur in the future. There have been five audits but presumably nothing has happened, because the same mistakes, apart from the Fremantle matter, continue to be subject for comment throughout the reports. The Commission made payments in cash instead of by cheque. They used the cash and then drew cheques subsequently. That is quite an unusual method. Certainly those associated with the Lotteries Commission would require to be told about these matters once only, and the various matters would have been attended to. I cannot understand why effect was not given to the recommendations of the audit official. That is the most serious part of the business. While we might be justified in blaming the Commission, we really cannot do so because we must blame the Minister in charge, seeing that he has, under the Act, sufficient power to control the Commission and make sure that they act within the four corners of the legislation. If we blame the Commission, then we must charge the Minister with being equally culpable. There is no excuse, and there can be no exclusion. Presumably this House has been led astray ever since the first amending Act was passed in 1933. I will indicate to the House exactly what the position is. So far 45 lotteries have been conducted, and the report I have in my hand is identical with those we have had before us after each lottery, except for the difference in the numerals. This is a report of the firm of chartered accountants and auditors to the Commission. They sent this along to the Minister:—

Dear Sir,—We have pleasure in enclosing herewith certified statement of income and expenditure of the No. 45 consultation recently conducted by the Lotteries Commission. This statement is required by you for presentation to the Legislative Assembly of Western Australia.

And at the bottom of the document this appears—

Subject to our report of even date, we certify that the above statement of income and expenditure in connection with the No. 45 consultation is correct, and in accordance with the books kept by the Lotteries Commission conducting Western Australian Charities Consultations.

Now let us see what the duties of the auditors are. Section 15 of the principal Act clearly sets out those duties. I am referring now to the Commission's paid auditors. Paragraph (d) of Section 15 provides as follows:—

The Commission shall within 30 days of the drawing of a lottery conducted by it furnish to the Minister a true and accurate account of the receipt and disposal of all property in the conduct of the lottery and such account shall be accompanied by a certificate of the auditor in regard thereto, certifying whether the conditions of the permit and of this Act and the regulations have been complied with, and, if not, draw attention to any details of non-compliance.

That clearly sets out the duties of the auditors. But it does not provide that those reports should be laid on the Table of the House. However, in Act No. 39 of 1933, an Act to amend the Lotteries Control Act, there is an amendment made to Section 15 of the principal Act by the insertion of paragraph (f), which states—

A copy of every account furnished by the Commission to the Minister under paragraph (d), together with a copy of the certificate of the auditor in regard thereto, shall be laid before each House of Parliament within 30 days after the receipt of such account and certificate by the Minister, if Parliament is in session, and if not then within 30 days after the commencement of the next session of Parliament.

The first lottery that was subject to that amendment was Lottery No. 11. Ever since then what the auditors have supplied has led us to believe that that was all that they were required to do. I have had very little faith in some firms of auditors of recent years; it seems to me that all they go along to do is to total up some figures and check the accuracy of the addition. I remember an instance I brought before the House some time ago where a certain firm conducting business here were called in. If those auditors had done their job properly, the mismanagement that took place would have been checked. The selfsame thing is done here; if this firm of auditors that were paid for their work and were directed by

Parliament what to do, had done their work properly we would not have had our own Auditor-General's officer coming along with the condemnatory report that was placed before us a couple of days ago. The firm of auditors evidently took no notice of those instructions. They had to produce a certificate declaring whether the conditions of the permit and of the Act and its regulations had been complied with. Then the Minister was bound by the Act of 1934 to lay the papers on the Table of the House. It shows sadly indifferent management by the Minister, and in consequence he has laid himself open to censure by the House for not conforming to the law. What is the best thing to do about this? I will admit that if we refuse to pass the Bill we shall be depriving the Government of a substantial amount of revenue.

The Premier: Not direct revenue.

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: I say revenue to the Government. For if one looks through these lists one sees that the Minister for Health and the Minister for Employment will be deprived of a lot of money that at present relieves their expenditure.

The Minister for Health: The lotteries were established for the purpose of relieving hospitals.

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: If I were to vote against the continuance of this Bill I would be depriving the Government of a good deal of what is revenue for them.

The Premier: Put it the other way and say you would be increasing their expenditure.

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: No. However, I am not going to allow the Bill to pass without a definite assurance from the Minister that he will have a marked alteration made. As a matter of fact I still believe he has time to bring down the necessary amendments to this Bill. There are two alternatives open to me: I could ask the House to agree to the appointment of a select committee thoroughly to investigate the Lotteries Commission's administration of the Act. Of course I hope that the session will close before Christmas, but this is important enough to detain the House after Christmas, if the Minister is not going to give us the assurance that I require. The other alternative is that the Minister shall so amend the

law that the Auditor-General will do the auditing in future, and there will be a continuous audit, and the Auditor-General's report shall be laid on the Table of the House. I have complete confidence in our own Audit Department, for I do not remember any instance where they have failed.

The Minister for Health: The best audit report we have had for years is one that that department just put in.

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: As for a comparison with this one that we are considering, a schoolboy could do the work equally well. Either the Minister has withheld information that ought to be supplied to the House, that is to say, reports of the auditor, or, if this is what the auditor is paid for, I should say we could get a schoolboy to do the work. The Minister has to give me an assurance—in this I believe I am backed by my Party—that he will have an audit made by the Auditor-General's Department on every consultation, and that he will see that the law is complied with and that the account books of the Commission are kept on lines of standard methods. This is most important. It is one of the things on which the confidence of the public is depending. If you have not the people's confidence in these matters Ministers and the Commissioners alike will be open to suspicion.

The Premier: The confidence of the people is essential to the lotteries.

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: Of course, and the Auditor-General's report which has been read does not give any confidence to the people.

The Premier: It does not destroy any confidence, either.

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: I say it does. As a matter of fact I propose to ask one or two questions in the House regarding it. The law has not been complied with, and the regulations have not been complied with. Then there are the charges for expenditure for travelling expenses, for which there are no vouchers nor any receipts. So of course it does break public confidence. Consultations such as these can only live by the confidence of the public, and when those consultations bear the hallmark of the Government, the Minister cannot afford to take any risks. As I say, the Minister will have to give me an

assurance that in future the accounts for every one of these consultations will be immediately audited after each drawing when the books are closed, and an assurance that the law has been complied with. If the Minister brings down a Bill next session to amend the Act so as to provide statutory authority for the various things that must be done, he will have our support. I claim that the Minister could bring down the necessary amendments this session. Paragraph (b) of Section 15 reads as follows:—

In respect of every lottery for which a permit is granted by the Minister under this Act, the permit holder shall, on the granting of the permit, appoint some qualified person to be approved by the Minister to audit and report to the Commission in connection with such account and the conduct of the lottery: Provided, however, that the Minister may at any time appoint an independent auditor, either during the conduct or after the close of the lottery, to make an audit of the affairs of the lottery for his information.

I am sorry that there should be those words, "for his information," because if we are to have no notice taken by the Minister himself of the report, it is up to Parliament to take a hand in the matter. The Minister has to give me that assurance before he gets any help in putting this Bill through its second reading. As I have already remarked, one alternative is that we should have a select committee, and that Parliament itself ought to go thoroughly into the question through that select committee, and say what it is possible to do to rectify the mistakes that have been made, and to declare that the Act must be administered in a proper way. I propose quoting from this auditor's report on the Lotteries Commission. I do not propose to quote from all over the report, but on page 37, statement (c), I notice there was an item of £1,500 for the equipment of nurses' quarters. Surely that does not come under the Act, for the equipment of nurses' quarters is entirely a matter for Government expenditure. I do not even know where the nurses' quarters are. It is new to me that £1,500 had to be drawn from the Lotteries Commission to furnish nurses' quarters. I contend there is no provision under the Act for that kind of expenditure.

The Minister for Health: But for the Lotteries Commission, the country hospitals would be in a bad way.

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: The Act provides for buildings, but it does not provide that

the Department of Health shall get £1,500. If it had gone to the Perth Hospital it might have been all right, or at all events no strong exception could have been taken; but what right has the Minister for Health to draw money from the Lotteries for his department's activities? If it had been for the Children's Hospital or the Fremantle Hospital one might not have complained; but this is for the Department of Public Health. Where are the nurses' quarters?

The Premier: At the hospital.

The Minister for Health: And we have 53 hospitals.

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: They do not belong to you. I know of some of them, Bunbury, Kalgoorlie and others, but no £1,500 was used to furnish nurses' quarters in any of those. On the 21st November, 1935, I find that Reedy Progress Association building received £400. Where did the authority for that payment come from?

Mr. Marshall: That is entirely wrong. I will explain it all later.

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: I have no objection to the hon. member explaining the item. It will show how the accounts were kept.

Mr. Marshall: It will show that the auditor did not go fully into the matter. The money did not go to the progress association. I got the money, but I do not know where it went.

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: If that is the case, we ought to stop this sort of thing. The hon. member says he does not know where the money went. I do not believe he meant that, but that he was instrumental in getting the money.

Mr. Marshall: That is what I meant. I will tell you all about it directly in no uncertain terms.

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: The item shows this expenditure of £400 on a building for the Reedy Progress Association.

Mr. Marshall: It is a hospital. They have no hall.

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: We should find out how the accounts are kept. It is a disgrace to the Minister and the system itself that we should have this sort of thing going on.

Mr. Raphael: Have you not had it in your own electorate?

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: Not charged up to the progress association.

Mr. Marshall: That is wrong. The money was for a bush hospital at Reedy.

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: If grants were made in my electorate in violation of the law, I should want to know all about them.

The Minister for Health: A fair amount of money has gone into your electorate.

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: A surcharge should be made against the Lotteries Commission for spending money without legal authority.

Mr. Marshall: The money was for a hospital at Reedy. It was not spent outside the Act.

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: That is not the only item.

Mr. Raphael: Tell us something about York.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order!

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: When one wishes to draw attention to anything that is wrong, it is wonderful how few members will stand behind those who are trying to get to the bottom of things. These interjections are only caused through the annoyance of members opposite. If they wished to do the right thing they would stand behind me in trying to find out about these matters.

Mr. Marshall: Your argument is that the people of Reedy should not have a hospital.

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: Nothing of the sort; the hon. member should not be so stupid.

The Minister for Works: Your temper is only assumed.

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: If that is how it is, we will see that this Bill does not go through. If the Minister is in earnest in respect to that interjection, we will see whether it is a sham or not.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member is not entitled to use threats.

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: Then the Minister should not charge me with putting up a sham.

The Minister for Health: That is another misrepresentation. The Minister did nothing of the kind. He used the word "assumed."

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: This is the Minister who has been away to the Melbourne Cup.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member will address the Chair.

The Minister for Health: You are peeved because you were not there. I had an opportunity of seeing the Cup and enjoyed it very much.

The Minister for Employment: Why not bring down another no-confidence motion?

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: It is surprising how easy it is to put up a defence for things that are improper. In the report of the auditors on the distribution of money for charitable purposes from the 1st January, 1936, to the close of the No. 36 lottery, we find reference to such items as "Goldfields League of Youth, Block of land, £500."

Mr. Hegney: That is an offshoot of the Nationalists.

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: I do not care if it is first cousin to the Nationalists or the Country Party. The Commission were not permitted by law to make that expenditure.

Mr. Raphael: Have a Royal Commission.

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: The Surf Life Saving Association, £300, is another item for which there seems to be no authority. Then there is another, "Medical Department, nurses' quarters, £500."

Mr. Wilson: Shame!

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: Here is an even better item, "A.L.P. Perth, school books, £50."

Mr. Hegney: What about the R.S.L. school books?

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: Another item deals with school books for Parents and Citizens' Association, £5. That item does not make the other one right.

Mr. Thorn: Read them all.

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: I dare say I could find quite a lot if I did.

Mr. Raphael: Go on, we are enjoying it.

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: I wish the hon. member would cease from interjecting.

Mr. SPEAKER: I wish he would.

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: Perhaps you can keep him quiet, Sir.

Mr. SPEAKER: If it were possible.

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: The Act provides that the money shall be used for charitable purposes.

Mr. Cross: Is it not a charitable purpose to provide school books to people who cannot afford to buy them?

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: Shall I resume my seat?

Mr. Hughes: It is all right if they are given to people holding certain political views.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! I appeal to members to cease interjecting, otherwise I shall have to take action to compel them to do so.

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: Section 2 of the Act provides the following:—

"Charitable purpose" means any purpose which is designed to raise funds for all or any of the following:—(a) Any public hospital in the State as defined in Section 2 of the Hospitals Act, 1927; (b) Any free ward at any private hospital in the State; (c) The relief of former soldiers, sailors or nurses of His Majesty's sea or land forces resident in the State; (d) Any institution in the State for the instruction or care of the blind, deaf or dumb; (e) Any orphanage or foundling home in the State; (f) Any home or institution in the State for the reception of dying or incurable persons in indigent circumstances; (g) Any body incorporated under the laws of the State which distributes relief to sick, to infirm, and to indigent persons; provided that the Minister is satisfied that the activities of such body extend substantially throughout the State; (h) Any body whose activities are substantially State-wide dispensing voluntary aid or medical or nursing advice to expectant mothers, nursing mothers, and children under age of 16 years; (i) Subject to the limitations imposed by Section 19 any objection which in the opinion of the Minister may be fairly classed as charitable.

Section 19 gives the Minister limited powers. If he reads into that section the powers which he has evidently taken to himself, I should like to know how he did it. Section 19 says—

No sum of money exceeding £250 shall be paid out in distribution of moneys raised by any lottery conducted by the Commission under this Act to any one association, body or institution where the purpose to which such money is to be applied comes within the provisions of paragraph (i) of the definition of "charitable purposes" in Section 2.

This applies to any object which, in the opinion of the Minister, may fairly be classed as charitable. He can utilise any £250 out of each consultation, I presume, for any of the purposes which he thinks can reasonably be classed as charitable. I have referred to a few items where I think the Lotteries Commission have gone outside the Act. If the audit had been effective, an audit by their own auditor, this sort of thing would not have been permitted to continue. Although the Minister has known since October, 1933, of these abuses, he has done nothing to rectify or check them. I have here "Hansard" dealing with the debates when the Bill, now the Act, was being dealt with. The member for Leederville obtained the adjournment of the debate. Whilst he did not give the Bill his blessing altogether he dealt fairly and fully with it. Gener-

ally, he expressed himself as opposed to gambling. Then there were the remarks of the member for Guildford-Midland and the then Leader of the Opposition, the member for Boulder. The intention of the Act was to prevent the running of a number of small lotteries that were then without any control. We find nearly every week, and sometimes more often, some lottery book being poked under the noses of members of Parliament, who are asked to buy tickets. I contend that the Commission have become lax in this respect. The Minister may or may not know that this sort of thing goes on. The other day I was approached by an organisation known as the "Young Labour Social League," to buy a ticket. I had never heard of it before. I noticed, too, that tickets were being sold in connection with one of the branches of civil aviation. From this morning's paper I could produce some of the results of these sweeps.

Mr. Patrik: You can see the tickets displayed in the shop windows.

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: Section 5 provides:

Where the Commission desires to conduct a lottery the Commission shall make application in the prescribed form to the Minister for a permit at least 14 days before the proposed date of the opening of the lottery.

(b) Where any other person or body desires to conduct a lottery, such person or body shall make application in the first instance to the Commission at least fourteen days before the opening date. The Commission shall consider the application and may, in its absolute discretion, either reject the application or remit the same to the Minister with a recommendation that a permit be granted.

(c) Every application for a permit to conduct a lottery shall be signed by the person applying for the permit, and shall state—

- (i) the proposed opening date and closing date and date of drawing;
- (ii) the locality in which tickets are to be offered for sale or in which subscriptions may be received;
- (iii) the purpose for which the lottery is to be conducted;
- (iv) the total number of tickets to be offered for sale, or the total number of subscriptions proposed to be called for;
- (v) the price of each ticket or subscription;
- (vi) such other details as may be prescribed.

Section 6 is as follows:

(a) The Commission shall, before recommending any application made to it under paragraph (b) of Section 5, refer the same to the Commissioner of Police for his investigation and report as to the unsuitability of the person desiring to conduct the proposed lottery

and of all persons whom it is proposed shall be associated therein.

I want to know whether Sections 5 and 6 are being carried into effect. Now that we know about the careless management of the lotteries, I suggest that many of the small lotteries that are in circulation have never had the authority of the Minister, or been submitted to the Commissioner of Police. We should honour the promise we gave to the public, that, if this law was put upon the statute-book, we would stop all the other lotteries. We did what at the time was perfectly right. But to-day the thing is getting out of control. I hope the Minister will give some information on that aspect before the Bill passes. It is useless to have lotteries nominally under an Act of Parliament while anybody desirous of running a lottery may run it, and even without obtaining permission. Prior to the passing of the Act, many lotteries were run for the benefit of the promoters.

Mr. Marshall: Don't go too far in that direction!

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: I have made the statement, and I know very well that lotteries were run in many cases for the benefit of promoters. We should see that the thing does not get out of control again. The other evening we had a full-dress debate on gambling, and the Minister explained that gambling had got out of control and that therefore something must be done. Let us check the sweeps while the chance of doing so exists. Do not let us have uncontrolled methods of raising money by lotteries. Sufficient profit comes from the consultations to supply, generally speaking, the needs of the charitable organisations that are entitled to support. I speak of charitable organisations in the sense of the interpretation section of the Act.

Mr. Marshall: What about the poppy movement on Armistice Day?

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: That is provided for. Besides, it is simply a question of selling something. To some extent we did discourage flag days by giving money to the organisations interested, but evidently they have not received sufficient. The management of the lotteries has not been the same management right through. However, there has been no change for the better because of the alterations. I say nothing about the present chairman, for he has not had sufficient time to gain control of the situation. I do

not know even that lottery No. 36 was managed by him. Therefore I exclude the present chairman from any charges made by the Auditor General, and from any criticisms I may be offering to-day. However, this debate should be an object lesson demonstrating to the new chairman that similar doings will not be tolerated by Parliament. The Act and its administration require a thorough overhaul, and it is the Minister's responsibility to see that that is done. There are two ways of doing it. One is to refer the Bill to a select committee to determine what amendments are necessary. Even if those amendments cannot be made during this session, the select committee may be able to advise Parliament on that aspect, so that the public will not lose confidence in the consultations. Not that I am anxious for the public to subscribe to them at all, but I do not wish to see the Government and the Commission charged with doing things that are not right. I shall let the Bill go through, subject to an assurance from the Minister that either he will agree to a select committee or, alternatively, that he will have an audit made by the Auditor General of every future consultation. Let the Minister lay such audits and reports on the Table here, instead of that useless document of which 35 specimens have been submitted.

Mr. Marshall: How do you know we will let the Bill go through?

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: I am responsible only for my party and myself. I want that assurance before voting for the second reading.

Mr. Marshall: I do not care whether the Bill goes through or not.

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: The defeat of the Bill would not worry me except from the aspect that charitable organisations would then lose a great deal of financial assistance from that source.

The Premier: That is so, indeed!

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: I know the Government's financial position well enough to be able to say that the Treasury could not supply the funds which would then be missing. The Government might give the amount required to meet necessities, but the charities have been getting a little more than money for absolute necessities. They have received contributions enabling them to furnish comforts. It is on account of the charitable organisations that I give my qualified support to the second reading.

MR. RODOREDA (Roebourne) [5.21]: I would not have risen but for the fact that there appears on the Notice Paper an amendment in my name. Apparently there is some doubt as to whether the amendment will be in order.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member cannot discuss the amendment at this stage.

Mr. RODOREDA: No, Sir; but presumably I may indicate the direction which that amendment would give to the Committee. As regards the Bill generally, I regret that the Government did not again bring down a measure to extend the life of the Commission by more than a year. The majority of us are agreed that these continuance Bills are unnecessary. The principle of the lotteries has existed long enough to prove itself. I do not know how the Government would get on as regards financing hospitals and charities without the profits from the lotteries. The Leader of the Opposition made a point of various amounts being shown as sent to road boards. He wanted to know what all that was about. It was due to the careless manner in which the Lotteries Commission has been run.

Hon. C. G. Latham: I said nothing about road boards.

Mr. RODOREDA: Well, progress associations, then—which are something after the same style.

Hon. C. G. Latham: Yes.

Mr. RODOREDA: As an indication of what has occurred under the Commission, I may say that two cheques for hospitals in my district were sent to me direct by the Commission, the cheques being drawn in my favour. I speedily returned them, with a request that the Commission send them to the Public Health Department. That is what has been done in the case of amounts granted by the Commission as contributions towards nurses' quarters. The Public Health Department have recommended to the Commission that assistance be granted, and the department are the right people to handle those funds. I see nothing in these things to arouse criticism, though certainly it shows careless administration. In any case, I do not feel called upon to defend either the Commission or the Minister or the Government. They are quite capable of doing that for themselves. The member for East Perth (Mr. Hughes) referred to the Commission as a Government institution. Earlier in his speech, when he was more careful, he described it as a quasi-Government institu-

tion. But to the Auditor General an institution is either a Government institution or not a Government institution, and cannot be a quasi-Government institution. The Government endeavoured to make the lotteries State lotteries, which would have obviated much of the mismanagement and many of the irregularities that have occurred, as the lotteries would have been under the control of the Auditor General. I would like the Government to do something about the rates of commission paid to agents for the lotteries. A commission of 10 per cent. is altogether too high. I see no reason whatever why two or three firms should make fortunes out of the lotteries. A commission of 5 per cent. would be ample, and there would be no trouble at all in getting agents to undertake the sale of tickets on those terms now that the lotteries are an established fact. Failing that, the Commission could find work for "C" class men selling these tickets on wages. Thus the men in question would be usefully employed. They would be earning their own living, and we would not have firms drawing £400 or £500 for selling lottery tickets—a thing that was never contemplated. The lotteries being well established, an endeavour should have been made to cut down the commission of 10 per cent. Five per cent. would be plenty. The Auditor General's report shows that there is great need for a continuous audit of the Lotteries Commission's activities, and I intend to move an amendment in that direction. The member for East Perth in his speech of yesterday gave no indication that he intended to move any amendment. It may be that recent experiences with amendments in this Chamber have made him feel not too confident of success. Had he evinced an intention to move in the direction indicated, I would not be doing so. I trust other members will air their views on this subject which is of great interest to the public. In view of the reports laid on the Table, it is also a matter of great concern to the public. Although no direct charges have been made against the Lotteries Commission, the matter is one which should be cleared up as soon as possible. Like other members, I am somewhat in a quandary as to how to vote on the Bill. Whilst we wish the lotteries to continue, we do not wish them to continue under present conditions. If the Minister gives an assurance that the Auditor General's reports will be tabled monthly—as the Minister has

power to require—I shall vote for the second reading.

MR. BOYLE (Avon) [5.29]: I intend to vote for the second reading of the Bill, and any motion for its reference to a select committee will have my support. I have a lively and grateful recollection of the benefits which have come to my district, at any rate, from the profits earned by the Lotteries Commission. We have heard here some disquisitions on the control of lotteries in the past, or rather before the enactment of the existing statute. Some of the charges, to my mind, are simply appalling. It appears that in the first stages of lotteries control, there was a kind of free-for-all. Probably the experience gained by certain individuals was brought into use in connection with the handling of lottery funds. However, that applies to the past. To-day I support control by Commission. Everything must go through its stages. The Lotteries Commission in Western Australia was an attempt to control what was admittedly an unbearable nuisance. Not only in the streets of Perth, but in every little country town, one would be besieged with invitations to take tickets in sweeps. The average amount paid into the Lotteries Commission would be somewhere in the vicinity of £200,000 annually and the amount is growing. The profits last year totalled £84,600 which is a great sum of money. It should have been much higher. Section 10 of the Act empowers the Commissioners to use up to 25 per cent. of the gross profits from lotteries for expenses. That is too wide a margin and places too big a power in the Commission's hands.

The Minister for Justice: You know what those expenses are?

Mr. BOYLE: I know what they are, but the amount is too high. At the commencement of the activities of the Lotteries Commission the Returned Soldiers' League were conducting sweeps in Western Australia and they were conducting them at less than 12½ per cent. The commission paid to sellers of tickets was five per cent. The Lotteries Commission gives 10 per cent. Certain agents in this city have built up a wonderful business. One agent has profits of anything from £3,000 to £4,000 a year. I object to opportunity being given to anyone to make £3,000 or £4,000 in a private business out of what is essentially a charitable organisation or to anyone attempting to turn the

gambling instincts of the people into private profit. I am old enough and most members of the House are old enough to realise that people will gamble, especially Australians.

The Minister for Justice: Why "especially"?

Mr. BOYLE: The half a crown ticket is a mild gamble, but it proves that anything from 100,000 to 150,000 of our population indulge in this form of gambling every month. The number of tickets sold has risen from 100,000 to 140,000 or 150,000. Assuming that some buy more than one ticket, one may judge that about 50 per cent. of the adult population indulge in this mild form of gambling. The present system of control of this defect in our human nature by a Commission is good so long as the Commission itself is controlled. The amount of good which has been done by the money raised by the Commission does not need any recital from me.

Mr. Sleeman: Would you not prefer a straight-out State lottery?

Mr. BOYLE: No, because I object to this money going to the Treasury. I would remind the hon. member that it is harder to get the money out again than for a camel to pass through the eye of a needle. With the Lotteries Commission one has an opportunity of putting up an individual case. I have done so and I have never failed to secure some recognition and relief.

Member: You must be persuasive.

Mr. BOYLE: No, I put up a just and honest case. Reasonable men receive the recognition they deserve. The Minister for Health was recently in my district where he opened a hospital and I was able to tell the people that £3,000 towards the cost had come from the Lotteries Commission. That meant that the ratepayers of that district were saved that amount of money. I am not one to bite the hand that feeds me. The many deficiencies of the lottery or rather of the drawing of it are apparent to everyone. I was once honoured by a request to draw a lottery. I think the Almighty must have guided me, for I drew the first prize for a most deserving case. As a matter of fact the lady was an old friend of mine, but there was no collusion. She was an old Albany friend and she received £2,500. She said, "Thank God; now I can get my feet attended to." That

is an indication of what her occupation was before. She had been running a boarding-house for years. I hope the dear old soul has had her feet attended to. But the crudity of the whole procedure was appalling. There was a barrel with numbers in it. The first prize came out and nobody knew who had it. Why should the Commission not adopt modern methods? In Queensland they have a mechanical system where, at the pressure of a button, the numbers are shown and there is no fooling about with barrels. In the Stock Exchange in London where the £150,000 sweep is drawn on the big English races the same mechanical method is involved. In Dublin they have air agitation by means of which the tickets come out, without any of this marble business.

Mr. Lambert: In Dublin they engage a brass band.

Mr. BOYLE: I have often wished for the service of a brass band in this Chamber, too. The method of selling tickets here is extraordinary also. The issue of books of tickets was abolished by Tattersall 30 years ago. In spite of improvements elsewhere, we have all these obsolete systems operating in this State and making for expense. Under the Tattersall system the agent issues a slip and your name goes on to a sheet which is sent to headquarters and there is no question of unsold books or tickets. There is no occasion to do other than post the ticket to the applicant in the ordinary course. It certainly costs 2d., but absolute safety is assured. Agency fees could be cut down to meet that particular objection. Advertising has become a gross evil in connection with lotteries in this State. Almost every time one turns on the wireless one hears that "Quayne's Black Cat will bring you luck," or "Whitty's for winners." All that sort of blatant cheap-jack advertising is stuffed down our throats. You turn on the wireless expecting to hear some classical music and you are informed that somebody lost the first prize by a whisker.

Hon. P. D. Ferguson: Or that Quayne's black cat will meet you on the roof tonight.

Several members interjected.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. BOYLE: I am sorry I have started a chorus of knowledge, but it shows the

power of advertising. Every member of the House has knowledge of the matter. In fact, every child in Western Australia has the same knowledge which they should not have at that stage of their career. I am of the opinion that a select committee would devise means of proper control. I do not want to see the money go into the Treasury or the Health Department sit in conference with the commissioners to decide what amounts are to be given to hospitals or other places.

Hon. P. D. Ferguson: They know the hospitals most deserving of assistance.

Mr. BOYLE: I do not think the Health Department should be concerned one scrap in the distribution of the lotteries funds. Country hospitals are controlled by the Health Department and that is sufficient work for the department and for the Under Secretary for Health. It is not necessary that he should attach himself as a supernumerary commissioner to the other three.

The Minister for Health: Merredin would have been in a bad way but for the Health Department.

Mr. BOYLE: I am surprised at the Minister making an interjection of that kind, that it would be a bad job for this district if the Lotteries Commission did not do certain things. The department controlled by the Minister should mind their own business in that regard. If the department say how much should be given to a district by the Lotteries Commission, I say that is interference with the work of the Commission. The Act has given the Commission independence and I want to see that independence continued. I intend to support the second reading of the Bill and I would also support any movement made by the member for Roebourne to have the period extended. It is deplorable that every year when this matter is brought before the House there is an acrimonious debate. The member for Murchison has been accused of something he did not do because there is an evident error in the Lotteries Commission's report that a progress association at Reedy got £400. These progress associations are usually the bodies which have to arrange for pioneer hospitals, sanitary reserves and the general pioneering work relating to the prevention of disease in a new district. I can understand what happened. Those of us who have lived in the blackblocks know that the

first thing that is done in a new place is to form a progress association.

The Minister for Health: Many of the associations do splendid work too.

Mr. BOYLE: The Commission set down that Reedy Progress Association should get £400. I would not take exception to that because these associations usually have to do with the commencement of hospitals and sanitary services and a thousand and one other things. I am sorry Reedy did not get £800.

MR. LAMBERT (Yilgarn-Coolgarlie) [5.44]: I intend to support the second reading. I would like to remind the member for Avon that the composition of this board is a legacy from the previous National Government.

Hon. C. G. Latham: The composition of it?

Mr. LAMBERT: With the exception of one or two variations recently.

Mr. Marshall: What do you know about it anyway?

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! The hon. member will address the Chair.

Mr. LAMBERT: In the first instance this legislation was passed by the Mitchell Government which appointed the secretary and appointed the Commissioners, too.

Hon. C. G. Latham: Not the present Commissioners.

Mr. LAMBERT: I am speaking of appointments previous to those recently made. The hon. member knows quite well what I am about to say. The two men originally appointed were members of the Ugly Men's Association, of which the member for Toodyay is quite qualified to become a member.

Mr. Thorn: Well, do not laugh at your own joke.

Mr. LAMBERT: They functioned for a considerable time, but members on this side of the House were not altogether satisfied to allow the new organisation to develop unchecked and uncontrolled. The ex-Premier ordered that the accounts and books should be supervised and audited by the Auditor-General's Department.

Hon. C. G. Latham: They took no notice of it.

Mr. LAMBERT: That, I do not know, but I am aware that the first audit by the Auditor-General's Department was undertaken at the direction of the ex-Premier.

Hon. C. G. Latham: The present Minister for Works authorised it.

Mr. LAMBERT: Probably under instructions from the Premier. The fact remains that the secretary and the previous commissioners were taken over from the Ugly Men's Association. I am not going to say anything derogatory of those appointments or of the efficiency of the appointees. I believe that the Mitchell Government felt that those men could carry on the work because they had had experience of similar work before this legislation was enacted. It is quite competent for Parliament to tighten up the Act. The few pounds spent on motor car journeys is insignificant compared with the question of the extent to which we should permit the holding of lotteries. I have always maintained that if we permit lotteries, the funds should be devoted to charity, and to charity alone.

Several Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. LAMBERT: The charities to benefit could be included under three or four headings. We should not continue the elastic provision in Section 2 of the Act, which permits of almost anything being defined as a charity. Notwithstanding all the miserable imputations made against the Lotteries Commission, I consider they have carried out their work dutifully to the State and faithfully to the provisions of Section 2. If members believe that a tightening up of the law is necessary we do not need a select committee. Satisfactory amendments could be made by Parliament. The money raised by lotteries should be definitely devoted to charities such as hospitals, blind institutions and one or two other organisations of the kind, leaving other institutions to raise funds for themselves elsewhere. The Leader of the Opposition spoke of tin-pot sweeps being conducted. How far would an innocent little sweep affect the lotteries? As a matter of fact we in Parliament House ran a sweep on the Melbourne Cup a fortnight ago, and almost every member subscribed to it. Why this transparent hypocrisy about running an innocent little sweep?

Hon. C. G. Latham: I spoke of small consultations, a totally different thing.

Mr. LAMBERT: The hon. member knows that on Armistice Day the Returned Soldiers' League supporters were selling poppies, and every member of the Labour Party was wearing one.

Mr. Thorn: Except you.

Mr. LAMBERT: The hon. member is quite wrong. Would the Leader of the Opposition suggest that the Lotteries Commission would be performing a useful function by limiting the R.S.L. in the selling of a few poppies?

Hon. C. G. Latham: The Commission have no power to prevent anyone from selling anything.

Mr. LAMBERT: One of the objects in introducing the lotteries legislation was to prevent men and women, boys and girls from selling buttons and other things in the streets. Every member was fully seized of that position at the time. We desired to abolish the objectionable practice under which people were pestered almost every day to buy buttons, flowers, etc.

Mr. Hegney: And solutions of puzzles, too.

Mr. LAMBERT: The hon. member is rather a puzzle to me. Little can be gained from indiscriminate discussion such as we have heard this afternoon. I hope for the sake of our hospitals and charitable institutions that any unmeasured language used this afternoon, no matter how well-intended it might have been, will not be considered to reflect upon the integrity or usefulness of the Lotteries Commission. There is no need to remit this Bill to a select committee. If certain provisions are not functioning as intended, our duty is to remedy the weakness. Notwithstanding the remarks of the member for East Perth (Mr. Hughes) in his critical analysis of the auditor's report, hospitals and other charitable organisations in my district have received much-needed assistance from the lotteries. Even if the officials of the Commission have spent £10 or £20 on motor cars and a few pounds on advertising, my admiration for their work is by no means diminished. The rate of commission paid to agents and the number of agents permitted are points that should be reviewed, but having decided to place the Commission on a businesslike basis, we can with confidence vote for the second reading of the Bill.

MRS. CARDELL-OLIVER (Subiaco) [5.56]: I shall vote against the second reading, hoping that the Bill will be thrown out.

Mr. Lambert: How awful!

Mrs. CARDELL-OLIVER: I shall take that course, not because I believe the Commission to be a dumping ground for pro-

viding positions of political preferment, not because I have heard from the auditor's report that the secretary was sailing close to the wind in respect to commission contracts, not because the office staff seems to be a happy hunting-ground for the families of politicians, past, present and future, but because I consider that lotteries are not in the best interests of the State, and particularly of the youth of the State. During my election campaign I denounced the Government for endeavouring to finance hospitals and other charitable institutions by means of games of chance. I believe that other candidates were equally vehement in their disapproval of this means of raising funds for financing charitable institutions. I feel that those members now have a chance by their votes to show what their election speeches were worth. We have been told that the Mitchell Government were responsible for this legislation. I have heard that said from the platform on quite a number of occasions.

Mr. Hegney: That is correct.

Mrs. CARDELL-OLIVER: What past Governments have done matters not; the question is, what do the present Government propose to do? The present Government are responsible for the continuance of the lotteries legislation. It seems strange that the Government have reaped over £1,000,000 from emergency taxation—a kind of taxation not dreamt of a few years ago—and yet, despite the great increase in revenue, they have been unable to find any better way of financing some of our most sacred institutions than that of games of chance. Here I disagree with many members who have spoken this afternoon. The community expect the Government to govern, and in so doing, not to lower the moral standards of the people. I refuse to believe that people expect the Government to finance our hospitals by means of games of chance. No doubt the Irish Sweepstake and the New South Wales lottery gave the Mitchell Government the idea that they could raise money in the same way.

The Minister for Police: No; the methods under which lotteries were previously run demanded improvement.

Mrs. CARDELL-OLIVER: I was not in the State at the time, and cannot speak as to that. But I did hear something about a "White City" scandal, was it not? Perhaps it was that which led the Government to introduce lotteries.

Hon. C. G. Latham: There were "White City" scandals.

Mrs. CARDELL-OLIVER: Many of those people who are opposed to lotteries just tolerate them because they understand that the opportunity is thus provided through the medium of the lotteries for putting the hospitals on a better financial basis. But after years of experience what is the result? The hospitals are just as much in need as ever they were. A few weeks ago the Minister for Health said that he would refuse to assist country hospitals that did not collect the fees that were due to them.

The Minister for Health: I never made any such statement and you have never seen it anywhere. Now be fair!

Mrs. CARDELL-OLIVER: I believe it is in "Hansard."

The Minister for Health: Nothing of the kind.

Mrs. CARDELL-OLIVER: The Minister said that he would refuse to allow his department to subsidise those hospitals that did not collect fees from their patients.

The Minister for Health: I never said anything of the kind.

Mrs. CARDELL-OLIVER: It is impossible for country hospital patients to pay their fees because they have no money with which to pay. Only last week I had a letter from a relief worker and in it he enclosed a hospital account for £11 19s. He asked me in the letter how on earth he was expected to pay the bill. I investigated the case and found that the man was receiving a little over £4 a week—he was a relief worker—but work had only recently come to him. He had been on sustenance on the 21s. basis, and he had a wife and a boy of 14. Naturally, while on sustenance, his rent and other accounts had fallen into arrear, and he had no money with which to pay. His child had also been in the hospital, and when leaving the institution the doctor told the father that the child had to be taken 100 miles inland for a few months to recover his health. How could a man without means, and earning little over £4 a week, carry out such instructions? It could not be done. It may be argued that the debt would be wiped out if he applied to the proper authority. This man, I suppose, like everyone else, has been paying hospital tax and perhaps bought lottery tickets. So why on earth should he be asked to wipe out a debt that he has incurred at the hospital? I have paid a considerable amount in hospital tax—

The Minister for Health: And you would not be entitled to hospital treatment unless you paid for it.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member must not discuss the hospital tax under this Bill.

Mrs. CARDELL-OLIVER: It is dishonest, then, to collect money—

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! The hon. member must not say that.

Mrs. CARDELL-OLIVER: I was going to say that it was dishonest to collect hospital tax—

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member must not discuss the hospital tax under this Bill.

Mrs. CARDELL-OLIVER: Well, may I be permitted to say that it is dishonest to permit a person to buy lottery tickets and not give that person anything in return. It has been stated that when lotteries were introduced, street appeals would no longer be made. But we have had not only street appeals but a Stew Sunday. We have heard from the Minister of the wonderful distribution of the funds, the number of blankets that have been given away, and the gifts to the Y.A.L. and Boys' Employment League, all laudable objects, but nothing to do with hospitals. The time has come when our social services should be put on a proper footing, and when we should no longer be in a position of having to depend upon the lotteries to enable us to get hospital treatment. To my mind the lotteries are demoralising the youth of the country. The member for Avon said that Australians must gamble, but does it occur to him and other hon. members that gambling legislation encourages gambling? Only the other week, in a very respectable school, some of the children were putting 3d. into a tin and in that way raising enough to buy lottery tickets. When it was discovered what they were doing, and they were spoken to, the reply was that it was all perfectly legitimate because it was a Government lottery from which they were buying the tickets, and the funds of that lottery were being devoted to the hospitals. Propaganda for the lotteries is increasing, and, as the member for Avon said, we can see the advertisements in the streets, the trams and the newspapers, as well as in many shops. There is a section in the Act which allows up to 23 per cent. of the gross collections to be used towards expenses.

Mr. Hegney: What do you suggest should take the place of the lotteries? Direct giving?

Mrs. CARDELL-OLIVER: Yes, direct giving. In Russia they take 30 per cent. off the people's wages to provide for social services, and it is a much better system than that which we have here. At least it is honest, and everybody gets fair treatment. The other evening, while I was at a picture show, I was struck by what I saw on the advertising slides. The first picture represented a child putting a penny into a pillar of the Commonwealth Bank, the object of the advertisement being the encouragement of thrift. The second slide also illustrated the saving of money, while the third advocated the purchase of a ticket in the Western Australian lottery, and it gave the amount of the first prize with the caption below it "It might be yours." So, on the one hand there was the advertisement to encourage thrift, and on the other the inducement to gamble. Either one or the other was wrong; both could not be right. The other day we had a raid on the automatic machines that were in Perth and although prizes were offered they were considered to be illegal. There is also a prohibition against lotteries which might savour of the display of skill, like crosswords or puzzles where really a considerable amount of skill is needed.

The Minister for Employment: You have shares in the biggest gamble in the State.

Mrs. CARDELL-OLIVER: I wish to read the findings of the Royal Commission on lotteries and betting which sat in 1932-33. On page 146 of that report this appears—

Recommendations: Clause 501. Our unanimous recommendations are as follows:—The existing laws relating to lotteries should be repealed and a new law passed which should take the form of a general prohibition in this country of all lotteries, whether promoted here or abroad, subject to exemptions in respect to art unions, private lotteries, and small public lotteries incidental to a bazaar, or the like.

Reasons: Lotteries involve considerable overhead charges, salaries, and staff. Lotteries appeal with special force to those in straitened circumstances, and to those in economic insecurity since they hope to gain financial stability by winning a prize. The number of these people in such circumstances is unfortunately high, and lottery tickets are purchased with money that for the sake of well-being should have been spent otherwise.

Character: The effects of large lotteries upon character are more subtle and harder to determine, but may well be more important in the long run than the material results. Lotteries depend for their success upon blatant advertisement of large-money prizes. They tend to exalt the results of chance and to encourage

a belief in luck, while the draw and the announcement of the results give rise to an unwholesome excitement. In the history of public finance lotteries take their place amongst the expedients which are resorted to when other and more reputable methods of finance have failed.

It is significant that in this country lotteries were abandoned when more assured sources of income became available to the State. A Commission visited this State from Adelaide a little while ago to inquire into the system of our State lottery but in their report to the South Australian Government the Commission did not recommend the establishment of a lottery in that State. Since the establishment of lotteries in Western Australia, we have found that it is possible to get tickets almost anywhere, and in the Arcade and other places we see kiosks where girls do nothing but sell lottery tickets. In one of the arcades in the city there are no fewer than three of these kiosks. Vested interests have been created, and if anyone desired to buy one of the businesses where the lottery tickets are being sold, the probability is that £400 or £500 would have to be paid for the goodwill. No country can thrive on vice, and while I do not appeal to members on behalf of the men and women in the State to throw out the Bill, I do appeal to them to throw it out on behalf of the children for whom we in this Chamber are directly responsible.

MR. MARSHALL (Murchison) [6.13]: When the Lotteries Bill was originally introduced I opposed it because I then held the view that I hold now namely that this should never have been anything but a State lottery. Had that view been given expression in the legislation, the member for East Perth would never have had the opportunity of presenting the picture he did the other evening with regard to the conduct of lotteries.

Sitting suspended from 6.15 to 7.30 p.m.

MR. MARSHALL: Had this lottery been made a State lottery, all its activities would have had to be submitted to the Auditor General, and his reports on them would have been laid on the Table here and every member could have perused the information; and long ere this the anomalies or irregularities revealed by the Leader of the Opposition and the member for East Perth would have been corrected. I confess I have supported these continuance Bills from year to year; but on each occasion, to the best

of my belief, I have protested against the elaborate and extensive advertising of the lotteries and against the amount of money paid away in the form of commission to agents, as well as against the system of agencies in general. I do not agree with the member for Subiaco (Mrs. Cardell-Oliver) in her opinion that the lotteries have an immoral aspect. I would ask the hon. member to recollect that one State of the Commonwealth has had a lottery ever since most of us can remember. I have no doubt the lottery existed long before I was born.

Hon. C. G. Latham: Which State is that?

MR. MARSHALL: Tasmania. I know that Tattersall's has been in existence for many, many years. I suggest to the member for Subiaco she should not say that the Tasmanian standard of morality is below that of other States. To assert that such is the case is to cast reflections upon the people of those Australian States which do conduct lotteries. I agree with the hon. member, however, that it is not right to afford children the opportunity to educate themselves in the art or science of gambling. From that aspect I support the hon. member. I enter an emphatic protest against the broadcasting of the lotteries either by the Commission or any of its agents, either over the wireless or through the Press. Hon. members who were present on the last occasion of my making a protest along these lines will recollect that I also drew attention to the unseemly window displays of certain agents inviting people to come in and buy tickets. It was to do away with such objectionable features and factors that this legislation was first introduced. Has anyone ever seen any elaborate advertising of Tattersall's sweeps?

Members: Yes.

MR. MARSHALL: In the window of an agency for the local sweeps one can see a kangaroo with a young one, accompanied by the suggestion "Hop in!" That form of advertising is extreme, absurd, and objectionable. Such advertising causes people to become inclined to gamble. The same remark applies to other forms of betting, and particularly that on horse-racing. The continual presentation of coming events placed before the public invites and encourages them to gamble. That is bad enough, but it becomes tenfold more evil when children are subjected to such incitements. I support the member for Subiaco in that respect. Although no gambler myself, I never could see that any form of gambling, provided

participators in it do not bet beyond the measure of their pockets, has anything immoral about it. I admit, though, that I do not like to see anything in the way of inducement to gamble being thrown in the way of children who have not reached years sufficiently mature to enable an independent judgment to be formed. Children should not be subjected to enticements to gamble in any form. On the last occasion I suggested to the Minister controlling the Lotteries Commission—though he controls it only to a limited extent—that numerous persons who are aged or infirm but cannot qualify for the old-age or invalid pension might be employed on wages as agents for the Lotteries Commission, especially in the thickly-populated areas of the State. I agree that in isolated centres the commission basis is more suitable and more workable. Last year, we learn, an amount of about £18,000 was paid out in commission fees. I suggest that that amount could absorb quite a number of honest, decent, legitimate people.

Hon. C. G. Latham: "C" class men.

Mr. MARSHALL: Yes, and men not sufficiently disabled to be entitled to military pensions but nevertheless largely deprived of the capacity to work. Such men could be worthily employed in connection with the lotteries, earning the basic wage at least. Instead, we see certain agents holding good sites in the city and suburbs earning large sums of money on each lottery by means of extensive advertising. I understand that some agents get as much as £100 and even more out of a single sweep, as the result of a month's work. I do not know how many of these analyses may be true and how many untrue but if all the analyses submitted to the Chamber by the member for East Perth are as little accurate as that of the Reedy Progress Association, none of them is true. I admit that the hon. member had to make a hasty analysis of the position, but I suggest to him that it is most unjust and most unfair to make the comments he made—and he referred to me in connection with the matter—without affording himself fair and full opportunities to ascertain the real facts. The Leader of the Opposition was prepared to walk in his wake.

Mr. Hughes: I did not mention you!

Mr. MARSHALL: I will accept the hon. member's statement. I was absent from the

Chamber at the time, but I was informed that I had been referred to.

Mr. Hughes: Well, that is not so.

Mr. MARSHALL: I will accept that. On the other hand, the Leader of the Opposition had more time to analyse the position and make the necessary inquiries than the member for East Perth, but nevertheless he followed in the latter's wake.

Hon. C. G. Latham: Surely one can accept a statement in the report of a Government auditor.

Mr. MARSHALL: Surely an outstanding man like the Leader of the Opposition who leads a political party in this House should be expected to act otherwise. He holds an important position in this House and he has the advantage of a secretary to assist him. He could have asked his secretary to make inquiries and ascertain the actual facts. He could have checked up these matters and secured the real facts. He could have rung up the secretary of the Commission and got the information.

Hon. C. G. Latham: And perhaps be told to mind my own business.

The Minister for Employment: He could have obtained the truth from you in a few minutes.

Hon. C. G. Latham: Of course, the Minister for Employment knows everything.

Mr. MARSHALL: The hon. member could have got the facts by ringing up the secretary.

Hon. C. G. Latham: If we had to check up every statement that is made in a report by a Government auditor, where would we be?

The Minister for Agriculture: Then you should not make such a statement.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! This conversation across the floor between Ministers and the Leader of the Opposition must cease.

Mr. MARSHALL: In referring to half-a-dozen points, he dealt with the Progress Association at Reedy. I suggest to the Leader of the Opposition that he could have ascertained the facts regarding the position at Reedy without unduly inconveniencing himself, because he could have delegated that duty to his secretary.

Hon. C. G. Latham: I will accept your statement.

Mr. MARSHALL: I do not care whether the hon. member does or does not. I will give the facts regarding the position at Reedy, which is an isolated mining town 36

miles from Cue. The mine there is small, and does not employ sufficient men to warrant the presence of a medical man at that centre. Like all budding mining towns where operations are expanding, the population rapidly increases and, unfortunately, due to the dangerous nature of mine work, accidents frequently happen. The population largely comprises farmers' sons and young men who formerly had been temporarily employed in the cities, although many had not been employed before in their lives. When they migrate to a mining centre such as Reedy, they have no knowledge of what they will have to do, but they certainly know what they want. One of the first things required at such a centre is a hospital, and medical attention is also necessary. In the circumstances, the Cue Road Board, who control Reedy, from the local government standpoint, commenced negotiations with the Health Department with a view to securing the establishment of a hospital there. In the meantime a progress association was formed at that centre, and subsequently the two bodies became associated in an endeavour to expedite the provision of a small hospital. The object was to secure the establishment of what is known as a bush hospital where attention could be given to anyone who suffered from injuries while working on the mine. The scheme was to arrange for a visit by the doctor at Cue once, or perhaps twice, a week, and to secure the services of a nurse. As Reedy was a new mining centre, the population was not large enough to enable sufficient money to be raised to establish the hospital. However, a hospital fund was inaugurated and was generously contributed to by the miners. Between £300 and £400 was collected but it was impossible to wait until sufficient money had been secured to provide for all that was necessary. During a visit I paid to Reedy, I was asked to interview the Health Department to secure their aid. I did so, and was fortunate in securing some assistance. I then approached the members of the Lotteries Commission, and asked if they could see their way clear to expedite the establishment of a small hospital in this isolated mining town. The Commission donated £400 on a pound for pound basis. I ask the member for East Perth if he would deny those people the right to a hospital.

Mr. Hughes: Have I ever denied anyone the right of a hospital?

Mr. Marshall: No, but the hon. member, in his impulsive and vindictive manner, instead of ascertaining the actual facts, said that the officer responsible for the allocation of that money should be made to refund the amount.

Mr. Hughes: That is so, and I stand by that statement.

Mr. MARSHALL: Without ascertaining the facts!

Mr. Hughes: You did not give me a chance. You voted to continue the debate, whereas I wanted to look through the auditor's report.

Mr. MARSHALL: I agree that the hon. member has a grievance in that direction, but, notwithstanding that, I respectfully suggest that he is impulsive and vindictive.

Hon. P. D. Ferguson: Two of a kind!

Mr. MARSHALL: Despite his rapid general analysis of the situation, he must have known, being an experienced auditor and well aware that the secretaryship was none too efficient, that it would not have been possible for the Commission to provide £400 for the road board for utilisation in meeting their own requirements. That should have been obvious to him.

Mr. Hughes: Do you not agree it would be a terrible position if a member of this House could not accept a statement made in a document such as I quoted from? If he could not accept such statements, the report of the auditor would be of no value at all.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. MARSHALL: Now the hon. member admits that he made a statement without knowing the facts.

Mr. Hughes: You have explained the position.

Mr. MARSHALL: Let me refer to a statement that the hon. member made. He said that, as a matter of fact, the auditor did not say this amount had been paid to the road board, but had drawn attention to this amount having been listed as a commitment.

Hon. C. G. Latham: He stamped it as "O.K."

Mr. Hughes: Did I not read the statement, headings and all?

Mr. Sampson: The hon. member merely read what was in the report.

Mr. MARSHALL: I will not indulge in a dialogue with the hon. member as to what he did or did not say; I contend at least he should have ascertained the facts.

Mr. Sampson: You want a monologue.

Mr. MARSHALL: Certainly the member for East Perth was handicapped in that

regard because of the speed with which he had to deal with the subject. The hon. member has had some years of experience in this House, and he knows it was not compulsory for him to speak at the second reading stage. He could have put forward any arguments he desired at the third reading stage.

Mr. Hughes: That is not a very satisfactory procedure.

Mr. MARSHALL: It is every bit as satisfactory. I have taken the opportunity to put forward arguments on the third reading of a Bill, and so has the hon. member. He could at least have attempted to be fair, instead of making a wholesale charge of irregularities.

Mr. Hughes: I go further and say that the Wokalup payments were not—

Mr. MARSHALL: I am not going to argue with the hon. member about Wokalup. The case as far as Reedy was concerned should never have been mentioned here. With all due respect to the grants made by the Commission, there was no more worthy grant made than that £400 to expedite the erection of that paltry little institution at Reedy. Inconvenient as it is, it has been a wonderful blessing to the women and children isolated there, who have never even had a water scheme and very little sanitary control because of the fact that the civic offices are 36 miles from the Murchison centre. The hospital was very necessary. Those are the facts about Reedy. I do not know how much truth there is in the other comments offered by the member for East Perth and the Leader of the Opposition, but if they are no more accurate than those in regard to Reedy they are all very far astray from the actual facts. I am not particularly concerned whether the Bill goes through or not, but with all the Commission's faults, or alleged faults, and all their irregularities, I have frankly to confess that much good and much alleviation of distress, misery and poverty, has been achieved as a result of their activities.

Hon. W. D. Johnson: Where has the money come from?

Mr. MARSHALL: From the public, of course.

Hon. W. D. Johnson: From the workers of the country.

Mr. MARSHALL: That is true, but I would remind my worthy friend on my right that if the money had not come from the pockets of the workers and gone to the

Lotteries Commission, it would have gone to starting price bookmakers and Tattersalls.

Hon. W. D. Johnson: Oh no!

Mr. MARSHALL: The hon. member says, "Oh no!" simply because that argument suits him. There was one place in this city that was actually alive with activity. There was a perpetual flow of people in and out of the doors, people who were buying tickets in Tattersalls, before the inauguration of the lottery.

Mr. Patrick: There was a good deal of buying of crossword puzzles, too.

Mr. MARSHALL: I do not want to get into that. There is no harm in my mentioning the name of the place to which I refer—Watson and Gutmann, in Barrack-street, Perth. In those days, before the Lotteries Commission, there was a perpetual flow of people in and out of the doors of that place buying tickets in Tattersalls.

Hon. W. D. Johnson: Not the same buyers as there are to-day.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! The member for Murchison is making the speech.

Mr. MARSHALL: I disapprove of the elaborate forms of advertising, of placing temptation before people by continually referring to the lotteries, and broadcasting the business into every home every morning of the week both by wireless and by the reading of the newspaper. That is wrong in principle. If the lotteries were State-controlled, we could have a say in the distribution of the funds, and eliminate any objectionable features that appeared. Obviously, it is wrong to shut our eyes and say, "I can see nobody, so nobody else can see me." To make people moral by legislation is impossible. It has been tried by every Government in every civilised portion of the globe, and has failed.

Hon. W. D. Johnson: You can demoralise people by legislation.

Mr. MARSHALL: I admit it and I am not sure that we have not arrived at that position in this State, not by legalising lotteries but by impoverishing people in another direction. The member for Subiaco got to the point when she quoted that report of the English Commission which made the investigation into gambling generally. The Commission stated that when people found themselves with a better sense of financial security, these evils declined. It will always be so. When we can give our people a decent standard of living and a proper sense

of security of tenure of that standard of living, they will not want to gamble. It is the poverty of the people that causes them to indulge in gambling.

Mr. Sampson: Are the people poverty-stricken who go to the Melbourne Cup?

Mr. MARSHALL: I am not concerned about the people who go to the Melbourne Cup. They are probably like the hon. member, with deep pockets into which they can put their hands. If people could afford it, they would be attracted to higher centres of culture and would look for higher forms of amusement, and would have no desire to gamble. Now, if they have a shilling to spare, they have hopes that by taking a share in a lottery they will multiply it into a fortune. It is only poverty that drives them to that sort of thing.

Mr. Hughes: A philosophy of despair!

Mr. MARSHALL: They have no other outlook, but eking out an existence on sustenance.

Mr. Sleeman: Do you ever buy a ticket yourself?

Mr. MARSHALL: I do, but I do not know that the hon. gentleman would be any more moral than myself if he never bought one.

Mr. Sleeman: I don't know whether I would be either.

Mr. MARSHALL: That is the viewpoint I take. I support the second reading of the Bill because the Minister has yet to speak. I suppose there is some reply to the criticism levelled at the administration of the board. In conclusion, I want to make this statement: that if there is much truth in the allegations of irregularity as set down by the Leader of the Opposition and the member for East Perth, I will want a general clean-up before I will vote for this Bill on another occasion. I shall support the second reading.

MR. WARNER (Mt. Marshall) [8.0]: I intend to support the second reading. The original Bill was brought in for the purpose of controlling gambling, and it was because of that that members on this side supported it. It cannot be denied that the position today is far better than it was before the Bill was brought down. We cannot forget the days of the crossword puzzles and of White City, where people went to do their gambling. Gambling was encouraged there, particularly amongst the children, and there was

considerably more gambling then than there is at present, although it is perhaps bad enough even now. Certainly the lotteries legislation has controlled the evil to a considerable extent and good use is being made of the money collected by the lotteries. I am not going to be hypocritical, so I will admit that within my time I gambled just as much as did other returned soldiers and I believe that most men gamble too. It is of no use saying we have never gambled when we know what is going on around us all the time.

Mr. Stubbs: And we shall never stop it, either.

Mr. WARNER: I believe it never will be stopped by legislation. I think it was the member for Murchison (Mr. Marshall) I heard say the other evening that if we were to succeed in stopping the forms of gambling that are indulged in to-day and in driving the gamblers out, it would result in their gambling in places where none of us would like to go at present. In my opinion the lotteries have been of great benefit to numberless women and children in my district, to whose support grants have been conceded by the Commission, grants not only in clothing, but in some instances in blankets. Then the lotteries have been the means of supplying hospitals with much needed refrigerators and other invaluable equipment. If there have been irregularities, such as have been spoken of, to my mind it is the duty of the Minister to make inquiries and clean up those irregularities. Possibly these things have happened. We had an auditor's report read by the member for East Perth (Mr. Hughes) and that report did not sound very encouraging. I have not had time to study it yet, but intend to do so. In any event I think it is the duty of the Minister to put right these irregularities, if there really are any. I will join forces with those who say that too much money is being expended in advertising the lotteries, and that much of the advertising matter goes through wrong channels. I believe there are many of our C class men who could possibly be permitted to sell lottery tickets on commission. Even so, in my view that commission should be reduced by 50 per cent., which would not prevent those men getting a living at the business. Advertisements over the air and in picture theatres where children attend are entirely wrong. It has been suggested to me that even the children get together and put in 3d. or 6d. each for the purchase of lottery

tickets. I have heard that they do that, and that they even have an occasional bob in with the starting price men during the week-end. Personally I hope the lotteries have come to stay. It has been suggested that these irregularities spoken of by the auditors should be inquired into by a select committee. I would be inclined to support that proposal but, as I have already said, I think it is a matter for the Minister to clean up. Gambling has to be controlled, and I think the Bill is about the best means of controlling it. I will support the second reading.

MR. STYANTS (Kalgoorlie) [8.7]: I will support the second reading. I approve of the principle of running State lotteries, and I can say with a degree of certainty that the majority of the people of the State also agree with that principle.

Mrs. Cardell-Oliver: How do you know that?

Mr. STYANTS: I judge it by the fact that when first the lotteries started they were merely fully subscribed, but now, owing to their popularity, we find that on nearly every occasion they are over-subscribed by 20,000, 40,000 and 50,000 tickets. That shows that the State lotteries are strongly approved of by the people.

Mrs. Cardell-Oliver: Why do not they buy whole books of tickets?

Mr. STYANTS: It is a matter of being able to afford such a luxury. The gamble, as it has been designated this evening, of having a ticket in the lottery is not confined to one section of the people, for we know that people in affluent circumstances are often fortunate enough to win a big prize. That of course indicates that the taking of a lottery ticket is not confined, as some members would lead us to believe, to those who cannot afford it, those who are pauperising themselves for the sake of a little gamble. Prior to the institution of State lotteries in Western Australia, thousands of pounds per annum were being sent out of the State to provide revenue for the Tasmanian Government, through Tattersalls. That money which was then sent out of the State is now being kept in the State by the State lotteries.

Hon. W. D. Johnson: There is plenty still going out.

Mr. STYANTS: Yes, some, but nothing approaching the total that was previously sent out.

The Minister for Justice: And some money is coming in for our lotteries.

Mr. STYANTS: Yes, that is true, as we see when it is announced that lottery prizes have gone to the other States. However, Western Australia and the charitable institutions of this State are benefiting thereby. The Queensland Golden Casket consultation used to get a certain amount of patronage in this State. I understand the whole of the net proceeds of those consultations go to the upkeep of Queensland hospitals. We can do just as well and probably much better with the money derived from our own lotteries by being able to finance our charitable institutions and the hospitals of the State. That is one reason why I favour the State lotteries. This form of gambling is very innocuous. I have yet to learn of anyone who placed his home or family in a position of want for the sake of buying a two-and-sixpenny ticket in a lottery. I admit that gambling, when indulged in beyond one's means, is an evil, but rarely does one find either a mother or a father jeopardising the interests of the home or children for the sake of buying a lottery ticket. Usually the tickets are purchased with a few pence saved from the housekeeping money or a few shillings accumulated over a period from the husband's pocket money. We have to consider the motive that prompts people to buy lottery tickets. The majority of people in poorer circumstances who take tickets do so in the hope that they will be able to win a prize sufficiently large to enable them to enjoy a much-needed holiday. Others are prepared to use the money for the education of their children. Most people desire to get out of the rut of poverty, and many buy lottery tickets in the hope of winning a prize and making a rise in life. Many people have benefited as a result of winning prizes, and I have yet to learn of any who has suffered through success of this kind.

Mr. Hughes: I know one who was killed as the result of winning a prize.

Mr. STYANTS: I remember the case; the man came from my electorate. Previously hospitals were provided with only bare necessities, but consequent on the operations of the State lottery, those institutions now enjoy a measure of comfort. Hospitals are not the only institutions that have benefited; the list read by the Leader of the Opposition shows that many charitable institutions ministering to all classes of the com-

munity have had reason to be grateful for assistance thus received. As a result, many people have enjoyed a considerable measure of comfort that otherwise would have been denied them. I cannot agree that any inducement is needed to get adults in Australia to bet. The desire to bet seems to have been born in them—imbibed with their mother's milk. Analysing the whole social structure, one must admit that life is a gamble. Many members of Parliament have gambled reasonably good permanent positions against the chance of retaining the confidence of their electors and being returned at each election. The State lottery is not the only form of gambling in which the people of this State indulge. There are enchre parties and bridge parties, both of which are forms of gambling.

The Minister for Justice: Bridge parties are very bad.

Mr. STYANTS: Especially if there are too many cocktails between hands.

Mr. Thorn: The two things go together, do they not?

Mr. STYANTS: I think so.

Mr. Thorn: Does that happen at the Karrakatta Club?

Mr. STYANTS: The hon. member probably knows more about the Karrakatta Club than I do. Horse-racing, said to be the sport of kings, also involves gambling. The lotteries are not the only evil we would have to suppress if we embarked on a campaign to stamp out betting. The commission of 10 per cent. paid on the sale of lottery tickets is altogether too high. I consider that 5 per cent. would be ample. I know an agent who derives an income of £3,000 a year from the sale of lottery tickets, much of which money should be going to charities. Although that man derives £10 per day from the sale of lottery tickets, he probably employs two or three girls in kiosks to sell the tickets, for the magnificent pay of 25s. or 30s. a week. I agree that there is too much advertising of the lotteries—advertising over the air, in shop windows, and in the newspapers. The agents appear to have ample money available to advertise lavishly. If agents' commission were reduced by half they would have less money for advertising, and the evil of over-advertising would, to a great extent, disappear. Gambling beyond one's means is admittedly an evil. I recognise it as such, but I believe that if we endeavoured by Act of Parliament and police action to suppress all forms of gamb-

ling, worse conditions would arise than those now in evidence while control can be exercised. The report of the auditor on the accounts of the lotteries calls for some action. Irregular practices and methods have been indulged in. The auditor, in his first report made on No. 2 lottery, directed the attention of the authorities to the irregular methods adopted, so far as they were revealed to him. Yet, according to the latest report, those irregularities have not been remedied one iota, but are continuing. To me that is the astonishing part of the whole business. However, I propose to support the second reading.

MR. SHEARN (Maylands) [8.19]: After having listened attentively to the various members who have addressed themselves to the debate, may I suggest that the points at issue have been rather lightly regarded, and that a major issue has been made of something that I consider is more or less extraneous to the subject under review. I do not yield to any member in my belief of the evil influence that gambling exerts on any community. Any member who consulted his conscience would readily concede that, when legitimate means can be employed to raise funds for the purposes to which lotteries money is devoted, those means should be adopted, and we should abolish the lotteries. We must look at facts. As one who is opposed to gambling I find myself in the position of being obliged to subjugate my own sentiments in favour of a more common-sense view. Much as one would be opposed to gambling one must look at the economic position as we find it to-day, and ask oneself whether it would be practicable for us or possible to raise a similar amount of money for the worthy purposes for which this particular fund is used, by means of direct giving. If my own experience counts for anything I fear that the result would be a very disappointing one. One of the points about this Bill that commends itself to me is that it continues the life of the Commission for a period of only 12 months. I disagree with the member for Avon who said that the Commission should be given a longer life. The day will come, I hope in the near future, when by an adjustment of our economic position we shall be able to support many of these worthy institutions which are to-day dependent for their maintenance upon the Lotteries Commission, and to raise the money required through legitimate

avenues. Whilst conditions are as they are to-day we must look facts in the face. I know the sentiments I have expressed are not popular with certain sections of the people. We are, however, here to serve the interests of all sections of the community, and not to blind ourselves to the facts. Whatever Government may be in power under conditions such as these will have to find the money for these particular objects. The use to which the money raised by the Lotteries Commission has been put in many instances appears to be well justified. I suggest that the most important matter with which we are confronted in this debate is represented by the reports submitted by the Auditor-General and his officers. I feel that these reports are not only of a serious but of a grave nature. If the Lotteries Commission is to continue and to possess the confidence of members of this Chamber, we must know that it is being run on proper businesslike lines.

Hon. C. G. Latham: And the confidence of the public too.

Mr. SHEARN: We must know that these trust funds, and they are funds held in trust, are handled in a proper manner. We know that there have been certain inaccuracies, for these have already been referred to, and it is possible that certain statements of a more serious nature may not be entirely inaccurate. Coming as many of these statements have come, from responsible officers, I contend that it is the duty of the Minister, and of the members of this House generally, to see that full and proper steps are taken, not only to prevent a recurrence of the discrepancies to which reference has been made, but to ascertain why they have been allowed to continue for three years, to our knowledge. I support the second reading of the Bill in the hope that members will agree to an inquiry by a select committee. By that means the House can be assured that during the ensuing 12 months the responsibility will to some extent be shifted from the shoulders of the Minister. It is not a fair thing that the Minister should be asked to carry the whole responsibility attached to the lotteries, more especially in the light of the disclosures already made. The select committee should be appointed and the whole position clarified, in order that the Commission may regain that prestige and confidence which it must enjoy to be able to function properly. I hope that when the period of 12 months has elapsed circum-

stances may have altered to such an extent that the aspirations of the member for Subiaco (Mrs. Cardell-Oliver) may be realised.

THE MINISTER FOR WORKS (Hon. H. Millington—Mount Hawthorn) [8.25]: I would not have risen to my feet but for the comments upon my administration on the part of the Leader of the Opposition. It appears that all those associated with the lotteries project are disposed to regard it as a painful subject. Everyone who touches it appears to get into trouble. It has always been surrounded by an atmosphere of suspicion.

Hon. C. G. Latham: And pitfalls.

THE MINISTER FOR WORKS: Yes. I remember bringing an amendment before this Chamber. Members became so perturbed over it that they sat all night and part of the next day discussing it. Even now, as soon as one begins to speak, the Leader of the Opposition is inspired to interject. I listened carefully to his criticism, which was not entirely fair. I could say much about the conduct of sweeps and lotteries if I chose to do so. It would be interesting history, and would be associated to an extent with some very foul smells and scandals. Unless it becomes necessary I do not propose to do that.

Mr. Thorn: Go ahead.

THE MINISTER FOR WORKS: That is not my usual policy. I like to be fair. One can be in public life without attempting to belittle all those in opposition, and without indulging in scandal. That has never been my policy. People talk of scandals in administration. I would remind the Leader of the Opposition that he could find plenty of them in connection with the administration of the Agricultural Bank Act, and he had something to do with that. I suggest he had not the slightest idea what was wrong, although he was administering the department.

Hon. C. G. Latham: I was not.

THE MINISTER FOR WORKS: A Royal Commission discovered them. Up to date no scandals have been divulged, even by the Auditor-General, in connection with this particular matter.

The Minister for Mines: None whatever.

THE MINISTER FOR WORKS: The conduct of lotteries in this State has passed through several phases. Within my memory

there were many promoters and organisations connected with lotteries. The organisations were either charitable or it was claimed they had a worthy object. It was very difficult to discover an organisation desirous of running a sweep or a lottery which had not some worthy object. There was given to that word a very wide interpretation. Many organisations were permitted or obtained permission to run sweeps. The first attempt to control lotteries was made by the then Minister for Police, the late Mr. Scaddan. He formed what he called, I think, an honorary lotteries control commission. This in plain language was drawn from the Ugly Men's Association. I am speaking only from memory, but it had been in operation for 12 or 15 months and had conducted certain sweeps successfully. It enjoyed practically a monopoly under the terms of the appointment, although acting in an honorary capacity. During that time, according to the speech delivered by the Minister when introducing the Lotteries Control Bill, that Commission collected—I do not think the number of sweeps was mentioned—£68,000, distributed in prize money over £30,000, spent £12,000, and made a profit of £25,000. By that means the Minister arrived at the running costs, which I believe were 18.75 per cent. of the gross takings. Included in that was 10 per cent. commission, granted to ticket sellers. Therefore, he pointed out, it was desirable at this stage to have some legal control of lotteries in Western Australia. He was opposed to making the lotteries a State department. At that time the party of which I am a member sat in Opposition, but we were all in favour of State control. Therefore this Act about which there is so much contention is certainly not a product of the Labour Party. It was devised by the other party. I believe the loose-jointed principles of the Act still meet with the approval of that party. I say unequivocally that I myself—and I think I speak for the whole Government on this point—would favour lotteries under State control. The only way in which that can be achieved is by making the lotteries definitely State lotteries under proper supervision, and subject to the practices and policy of Government departments, with all the security they afford. That course, however, was not adopted. To those who

assert that the Minister has this power and that power, I will quote Section 3 of the principal Act, and ask them whether that section appears to describe a Government department—

A body corporate is hereby constituted under the name of the Lotteries Commission, hereinafter called the Commission. The Commission shall have perpetual succession and a common seal, and shall be capable of suing and being sued, and entering into contracts for the purpose of carrying out its powers and functions under this Act.

Is it suggested that the Works Department, or indeed any Government department, is a body corporate having a common seal? We know perfectly well that that is not so. Therefore Parliament definitely and distinctly declared that certain powers were vested in the Commission. Let me quote Section 4 in order that the House may see whether the Act is consistent in still vesting the various powers in the Commission—

(a) Subject to the obtaining of a permit in every case as hereinafter provided to conduct lotteries in the whole or any part of the State in order to raise funds for charitable purposes; (b) to receive and make recommendations to the Minister in regard to applications to conduct lotteries by persons desiring to conduct the same; and to exercise such supervision and control over the conduct of lotteries by such persons as may be prescribed—

I ask hon. members to note the following especially—

(c) to hire and dismiss servants subject to such regulations as may be from time to time prescribed.

Therefore the Commission itself not only conducts the lotteries but has full power to appoint and dismiss its staff. That is highly important—to appoint and dismiss its staff. It has complete control over its servants. Section 15, which has already been quoted, empowers the Commission to recommend the appointment of an auditor.

Hon. C. G. Latham: You ought to read Sections 8 and 9.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: The hon. member can read the whole Act if he pleases; there is plenty of time. I am reading such portions of the Act as I consider relevant to the case I am putting up. Briefly, Section 15 gives the Commission the right to recommend the appointment of an auditor. Naturally the Commission, with the arbitrary powers vested in it for the conduct of its business, the running of sweeps or lotteries, would require, in addition to its

other servants, an auditor. I assume that in the early stages auditors were recommended by the Commission. I believe the firm's name is Coombs, Whyte & Lissiman. A qualified auditor, approved by the Minister has to be appointed to audit accounts and report to the Commission in connection with the lotteries. Thus the Commission's auditor would not be under the control of the Auditor General. The section has the following proviso:—

Provided, however, that the Minister may at any time appoint an independent auditor, either during the conduct or after the close of the lottery, to make an audit of the affairs of the lottery for his information.

That is an entirely different thing from the appointment of the Commission's auditor. The same firm of auditors has acted throughout the four years of the Commission's existence; and the same firm of auditors has presented the balance sheets—or statements of receipts and expenditure, really—which have been regularly laid upon the Table of the House, as required by an amending measure subsequently passed. I do not know that any exception has been taken to that firm of auditors. Is any hon. member prepared to say they are not a reputable firm of auditors?

Mr. Sampson: They are good.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: I do not know where we would be in any business if we expected those in control to set themselves up as pimps and spies upon the auditors. We depend on the reputation of the firm. The commercial life of the country could not be carried on if we had not reliable firms of auditors. To that extent, therefore, the Commission have conformed to the Act. But the Government went further. Without the authority of the Government, the Auditor General cannot act. Without that authority he has no access to the books and documents of the Commission. Accordingly, a letter as provided in paragraph (b) of Section 15 was drafted by the Crown Law Department and sent to the Auditor General. No notice was given to the Commission that this action was about to be taken. Do hon. members think the Government had anything to hide? For their own information, and in order to ensure the protection of the public interest, the Government selected an officer to make special audits. I am making no excuses for the Commission. Attention was called to the fact that the manner in which the lotteries were conducted did not conform

to Government practice. That was pointed out particularly in the first report of the Government auditor. I must be excused if I cannot remember all these things consecutively, for I have many matters to think of besides the affairs of the Lotteries Commission. The first report certainly says there are discrepancies. Those discrepancies, and various practices which are mentioned in the report, would not meet with my approval. Like most people, I am far more careful in handling other persons' money than in handling my own. I realise that too much care cannot be exercised in the handling of public money. The first report certainly criticised the manner in which the lotteries were conducted. In the first place it referred to the No. 2 lottery. The chairman of the Commission was not furnished with a copy of the report, which was a confidential report to the Government and not a document to which the Commission were entitled. It was purely a document for the use of the Government. The Commissioners were made aware that their practices did not conform to those of the Auditor General or those of Government departments. Who were the Commissioners? Who were the staff at that time? Those appointed were the Hon. A. Clydesdale, M.L.C., and Mr. Harry Mann, who also was a member of Parliament at that time, Mr. F. E. Gibson, the present Mayor of Fremantle, a very reliable man, and Mr. Hearty of the "Daily News." They came holus-bolus from the Ugly Men's Association and brought with them, as secretary of the Commission, Mr. Buscombe who was then secretary of the Ugly Men's Association. At the commencement of his work as secretary of the Lotteries Commission, Mr. Buscombe, I understand, continued to act as honorary secretary of the Ugly Men's Association. The explanation they gave to me was that they had to start a new business that was really a State-wide concern. In those days sweeps—I will make this assertion here—were run in a rough and ready fashion. There is no doubt about that. No sweep run in those days would conform to the ideas of the Auditor General. The Commissioners had to build up a business extending throughout the State and, as they explained to me, they had to adopt what they termed "business methods." They had to indulge in a certain volume of advertising and they had to establish their agents. It is true that payments

were not made with the regularity that is customary in Government departments. After reading the auditor's report, it seemed to me that strict business practice regarding receipts and banking was not observed. After all, we must remember that the officer from the Auditor General's Department dropped down upon the Commission without notice, dropped down upon men who were starting out in a big way on a big business and breaking entirely new ground. I do not know that even now there is any suggestion that fraudulent practices were indulged in. Does anyone say that there were? Undoubtedly there were irregularities. I make no excuse for them; it was not my business at that time. Many other of their methods were open to criticism, and perhaps more than mere criticism. The fact remains that these things happened in the early stages of the undertaking. In view of a statement made by the member for Kalgoorlie (Mr. Styants), I suggest he had better read the first report and then the latest report of the auditor. The hon. member said that the methods of the Commission had not altered one iota. I am positive that they were altered in recent years, when we had the late Mr. O'Mahony as chairman of the Commission. That gentleman was formerly an officer of the Auditor General's Department. Certainly he introduced into the operations of the Lotteries Commission methods that he had followed as a Government officer. He was a man well trained in public service procedure and methods. On many occasions I discussed with him the question of tightening up the administration of the Lotteries Commission and bringing it more into line with the procedure he had been accustomed to in the public service. I do not know of any more conscientious man than he was. He was an extremely capable and honourable man. He did his best with a staff who were not trained public servants but had been drawn from I know not where. With the staff at his disposal he introduced, as far as possible, proper business methods, which were more in accord with those of the public service. I said earlier that I favoured a State lottery. Although I say that, I also assert—there may be those who will disagree with me—that had the lotteries business been run strictly as a State concern, it would not have been as successful or made as rapid progress as it has under independent control. I agree that it has proved a great suc-

cess, although we may take strong exception to some of their rough and ready methods. Anything we may lose from the standpoint of control, it may be we have gained in the enormous success that has attended the lotteries. I am not too sure that we give adequate credit to those who initiated the idea. I admit that I claim no credit myself. I believe that neither I nor any other member of this House would have had the nerve to inaugurate the Lotteries Commission at the time it was born. To those who are quibbling now about the petty cash and other irregularities, I would point out that, as a result of this movement, now that it is in full swing, the lotteries have become so popular that the profits amount to between £70,000 and £80,000 a year. The present Minister in charge can give the House the exact figures, but I know that at one stage that amount was available for distribution. To those who now criticise the methods of the Commission and assert in plain language that they are inefficient, I would point out that those conducting privately-controlled lotteries before the Act was passed usually took 25 per cent. of the gross proceeds.

Mr. Raphael: In one instance 90 per cent. was taken.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: I will not go beyond 25 per cent., because that is sufficient for the purposes of my statement. The Lotteries Commission have conducted their lotteries with a deduction of 16 per cent.

The Minister for Police: Nearer 14 per cent.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: Of that 14 or 16 per cent., 10 per cent. goes automatically to the ticket sellers. In the old days when 25 per cent. was deducted by the promoters, 10 per cent. went to the ticket sellers, leaving 15 per cent. to cover ordinary office expenses. The present Commission with administrative expenses representing between 15 per cent. and 16 per cent., also pay 10 per cent. to the ticket sellers and thus are running the lotteries for between four per cent. and five per cent. This is the inefficient Commission that has been referred to! I am not sure, wedded as I am to a State lottery, that the State could run it as economically as that. From that standpoint, therefore, there is certainly no ground for valid complaint. The present Commission have certainly done what others failed to do. I do not know where the member

for Avon (Mr. Boyle) got his figures. I have never heard of a sweep being run with a deduction of $12\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. only from the gross takings.

Mr. Boyle: I got that from the Returned Soldiers' League.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: I would like the Auditor General to have a look at that. I want to know if all wages and charges were included. It may be that the returned soldiers, running their own sweeps, did not collect high fees or commission for selling tickets. I know of sweeps that have been run for organisations of which the members sell tickets for the benefit of the organisations and charge nothing, but I am speaking now of big sweeps that have to be run without such assistance, and where the usual commission agents have to be employed. Concerning the rate of commission, I do not agree either that 10 per cent. should be charged, and I have told successive Commissions I thought they were overcharging. As to those few agents who are making enormous incomes, I think that for the benefit of this House I presented a statement showing what all the agents made, and it is incredible how few make anything worth while. In the case of one or two who have extensively advertised, and who happen to have hit upon the right method of attracting the public, an enormous proportion of the business has been secured, but they are on exactly the same footing as the others. In the old days there might have been half a dozen or a dozen lotteries in competition, and more than 10 per cent. was paid then; but now we have a monopoly and it seems to me that 10 per cent. is too much to pay to an agent for selling lottery tickets which are a monopoly. I am not for the time being in control of the Police Department, which has this lottery business tacked on to it, but if any member likes to suggest to the Commission that he knows more about the business than the Commission, then I suggest that he should be one of the Big Four. I have discussed the matter with the Commission and they say these agents do a good deal of advertising, thus saving expense to the Commission. The agents are reliable—and I have had some experience of what happens when reliable agents are not employed—and the butts and the money are returned in time. The Commission say it is worth while, from that point of view. I consider 10 per cent. is too big a deduction for commission

agents, but that is not my affair, or that of the Minister in control, because this Parliament has placed upon the Commission the business of running the lotteries. It is a business and the Commission say they are conducting the lotteries on business lines, though not on approved Civil Service lines. Now about the auditor's report. I would say to those who are disposed to censure me and, through me, the Government, that it does not look as though we had anything to hide or cover up; as though we were protecting the Commission, when we authorised, without a moment's notice, an auditor—a competent auditor from the Auditor General's Department—to audit these books. The result of the audit was not presented to the Commission, but to the Minister and the Government. Our job was, as nearly as we could, to bring the methods of the Commission into line with what we considered proper business methods, and to have them as nearly as possible conform with the practice of Government departments. That was our sole idea. As a result of those audits and the information conveyed to the Chairman of the Lotteries Commission, the methods have undeniably been improved. There has been an improvement, I think it can be said, as a result of experience and, I assume, of the advice of their own auditor, who makes a running audit and is there at least two days a week. All this money comes in in small amounts and also in a rush during the last day, a very big rush from all directions. It would require an army of civil servants to deal with such conditions. The money does not dribble in quietly day by day so that it can be banked nicely. It comes in a rush at the end of the term.

Hon. C. G. Latham: It must come in from day to day.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: Very well then; you make an inquiry. In one day the Commission has received as much as £3,000 or £4,000 in small amounts. Money for lotteries does not come in regularly. It is hard to get it in at all, and it comes in a rush in the last few days. If the office closed at 12, the money would be there at 11.45 if they were lucky. After that it has to be checked, and unless there is an army of servants, and pretty expert at that, the business cannot be easily run. I have had a little experience, enough to enable me to appreciate the difficulties. Even if it were run under Public Service rules and

regulations, there would be great difficulty in satisfying the Auditor General. I would not like to be the man in charge of a State lottery, having to satisfy the Auditor General with his strict views as to how money should be handled and receipts given. Without making any excuses, I am showing that there are difficulties. But the responsibility is that of the Commission. If hon. members desire that this business shall conform to Public Service rules, regulations and practice, by all means let it be a State lottery. It would have been, long ago, if we had been able to have our way.

Mr. Sleeman: That is what we wanted.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: Are we going to hold the Minister responsible? This is what the Minister did in 1933. I thought I should have additional powers. It was said that this Commission, drawn from anywhere, none of the members expert, with a staff drawn from anyone and none, so far as I know, with any particular or expert knowledge, should be the Commission to control the lotteries. We thought that when such big sums of money were being handled, the Government, representing the people, should have some say. Therefore I introduced this provision in 1933—

Amendment to Section 11A. Before any distribution of money raised by the Commission is made for any charitable purpose, the Minister shall give his approval in writing to that distribution, specifying the several sums of money and the persons or bodies to receive the same.

Hon. C. G. Latham: We told you that you already had that power.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: Why was it not left there, so that it would be specific? We said we had not the power, and desired that the provision should be set out plainly. That does not make it a Government concern. But the hon. member said he desired this Commission removed entirely from Government and political control.

Mr. Marshall: That was the point.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: Do you think the Commission is removed from political control? I know there is scarcely one member amongst the 80 who has not had a quiet word with the Commission.

Mr. Cross: The Leader of the Opposition amongst them?

Hon. C. G. Latham: You mind your own business.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: I would say that a member did not know his duty to his own electorate if, money being available, he did not see to it that his district got its share. But the idea of the Commission being removed from political control is not sound.

Hon. C. G. Latham: Who suggested that it should be?

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: You did.

Hon. C. G. Latham: I did not.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: You were determined that this Government should not have control.

Hon. C. G. Latham: But you have control.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: Have we to take control everywhere by inference? Why not put it down in plain language from the Crown Law Department? It shows that the hon. member did not desire that this Commission should be controlled by the Minister. Those who say we should watch petty cash and should see to it that the secretary, if his car is used, puts a receipt on his file, do not seem to worry when there is an amount of £60,000 or £80,000 to be looked after; there is no need to be very particular over such a sum. But it must be remembered that the be-all and end-all of the Commission is to raise money for charitable purposes. At times I interfered and I found it did not meet with the approval of the Leader of the Opposition, who now wants to know why £1,500 should be expended on nurses' quarters. I admit I had the temerity to advise the Commission; I said to them, "When you have any money you are disposed to give to hospitals, I want you to consult the Medical and Health Department." I may say I had previously consulted with my colleague, who is not in the House just now. The reason for my thus advising the Commission was that smart people, in country districts too, were not above first of all getting an amount from the Lotteries Commission, an amount say of a couple of thousand pounds, and then going along and asking the Medical Department to add another £2,000 to it for the purpose of building a hospital. So I thought it just as well that there should be some uniformity, for even the Leader of the Opposition desires that this money should be distributed fairly, and he doesn't want the smart people in the country to get it all. Does the hon.

member suggest that the Lotteries Commission would know more of the needs of the hospitals than would the Medical Department that has all the necessities of the hospitals on record, and has also all the requests from country districts? So I was responsible for setting up the policy that the Commission should consult the Medical Department in respect of any gifts to hospitals. They were consulted in respect of the donation they made to the Dental Hospital. I advised them to do that. Is there anything wrong with that? We have to establish some order in respect of the distribution of the fund which, by the way, has scarcely been mentioned to-night, the debate having centred on our own auditor's report of three years ago. The difficulty complained of by the hon. member may be due to the fact that a body of men were brought in from the Ugly Men's Association, partly trained, and then given legal status under this Act of 1932. The Leader of the Opposition himself is far more polished since he came into the House. Men who come in here more or less of a crude type, I find, soon improve. In the same way the Commissioners had rough and ready methods to begin with; they did not conform to business practice as they should have done. But I suggest they soon improved as a result of their own experience and the advice of their own auditors, and, I assume, the staff became more efficient from year to year, as a result of information conveyed to them in consequence of the independent audits authorised by the Government. Those audits were not made available to the Commissioners, but were submitted to the Government. When they were asked for in the House, although confidential documents, they were laid on the Table. So I certainly have nothing to hide, and everything in respect to my association with the Lotteries Commission was open and above board. It seems to me that those associated with the Lotteries Commission or with the Employment Department are deserving of sympathy. The hon. member also takes exception to a sum made available to the Surf Life-Saving Association. I am definitely responsible for that, and so I will take the blame for it. Does the hon. member know anything about surf life-saving?

Hon. C. G. Latham: I told you before, that if you wanted to do that you should have amended the Act.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: I should not have amended the Act at all.

Hon. C. G. Latham: Well, show me where you have power to do it.

Mr. Marshall: No instructions! Let the Minister do his own job.

Hon. C. G. Latham: It's a pity you can't control yourself.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: Section 19 of the principal Act reads as follows:—

No sums of money exceeding £250 shall be paid out in distribution of moneys raised by any lottery conducted by the Commission under this Act to any one association, body or institution where the purpose to which such money is to be applied comes within the provision of paragraph (i) of the definition of charitable purposes.

So it will be seen that the Minister has the necessary power. This surf life-saving association is composed of bodies of young people who work in an honorary capacity.

The Minister for Health: They are next best to the St. John Ambulance Association.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: Every one of these life-savers has to submit to an arduous training, and in his own time he carries on his life-saving activities.

The Minister for Police: And at the risk of his life.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: Did I stress the interpretation of that section? I think I did not. I told the hon. member that this money was specifically for equipment. Does the hon. member suggest that these young fellows, in addition to giving their time to the work, should buy reels and equipment? That is what the money was spent on. Members can verify that statement by getting in touch with the Surf Life Saving Association. I contend that such donations should not be used for the building of club houses but should be used definitely for the equipment of the life-savers—for providing their tools of trade. Let members quibble at that if they will; I take full responsibility for it. In like circumstances I would do it again. I think the grant should be made annually and that a greater amount should be donated. I pressed the Commission for that money.

Mr. Thorn: Did you treat all life-saving clubs alike?

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: This amount went to the association.

Mr. Raphael: The member for Toodyay is squashed.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: One of the seaside resorts in my electorate, Scarborough, is the most dangerous on the coast, and I think more life-saving work is en-

tailed there than at North Beach. Probably a couple of superannuated life-savers could manage North Beach, but an active body of young men are required at Scarborough.

Mr. Marshall: Then the member for Toodyay is only concerned about his own electorate, is he?

Mr. Thorn: The Minister need not reflect on my seaside resort.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: If the hon. member has not received his fair share of the funds, he must have been remiss in his duty and had better liven up. What else is there to be said?

Mr. Thorn: You have said enough.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: It is not my business to defend the Commission. They were appointed by Parliament and have powers vested in them by Parliament. If members wish to make the Minister responsible, let them be sure to give him the power of control. I am prepared to accept the responsibility where I have the power, but I refuse to take the responsibility of a loose-jointed concern set up as a lineal descendant of an honorary committee appointed by the late Mr. Scaddan. The members of the Commission had been successful; in 15 months they had handed £25,000 to charities. Although we were not at all enamoured of the machinery under which they were appointed and the powers vested in them, we were impressed with their achievement, and we thought the object so laudable that we legislated accordingly. The ex-Premier (Hon. P. Collier) was opposed to the legislation. I think he voted against it throughout. Like the member for Subiaco (Mrs. Cardell-Oliver) he does not believe in gambling. Lest there be any doubt as to the opinion of the lotteries entertained by the people, let me mention that there are on the roll something over 200,000 adults—the member for Greenough, who has been studying the figures can check me—and I think the last sweep resulted in the sale of 165,000 tickets. Hence there were a few people who did not subscribe to that lottery.

Member: Some people had four or five tickets.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: That interjection reminds me of the bad days when people were on sustenance and a sustenance worker won a prize in a crossword puzzle competition. He was interviewed by the Press. Photographs of himself and his family were published. He had four child-

ren dependent on him. He was asked how many tickets he had taken in the competition and replied "Four." He had spent 2s. out of his sustenance money on crossword puzzle competition entries! In those terrible days, before the advent of the present respectable sweeps, those competitions were conducted under the lap. Because of those things, I suppose, the late Mr. Scaddan determined to establish some order in the conduct of lotteries, and he did so. He established order and at the same time made a good deal of trouble for those who have been associated with the lotteries ever since—members of the Lotteries Commission and Ministers. For my part I have no excuses to offer. I say that if members want the lotteries tightened up, let them do it in the proper way. Tighten them up legally and put them under legal control instead of pursuing the loose-jointed methods laid down in the Act.

MR. RAPHAEL (Victoria Park) [9.16]: I support the second reading. When lotteries-control legislation was first introduced by the late Mr. Scaddan, I was one of those who voiced protests against the proposals of the then Government. I had in mind the abolition of the crossword puzzle competitions being conducted by week-end papers. The people, in no uncertain voice, clamoured for permission to participate in the week-end gambles sponsored by two popular week-end papers. In listening to the member for Subiaco (Mrs. Cardell-Oliver), who has occupied a seat in this House for only a few months, one would conclude that the Government by assuming control of gambling, had encouraged gambling amongst the youth of the State. The reasonable inference to be drawn from her remarks was that by controlling gambling, the Government encourage it; by controlling traffic, the Government encourage speeding; by controlling the liquor trade, the Government encourage drinking; by the divorce laws, we encourage immorality. What does the hon. member know about those matters? Why does she suggest that the responsibility for this legislation must be placed on the shoulders of the Labour Party? On various occasions the member for East Perth (Mr. Hughes)—the Deputy Leader of the Opposition, or may I describe him as the Leader of the Opposition, whom he has dispossessed of his job—

Mr. Thorn: You are getting a bit mixed.

Mr. RAPHAEL: Not at all. I have seen the member for York leaving the office of the Lotteries Commission, where he had been, I suppose, begging and praying for a small grant for his electorate.

Hon. P. D. Ferguson interjected.

Mr. RAPHAEL: I have seen you there, too.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. RAPHAEL: I have been there on various occasions and make no apologies for having been there. I shall be calling there again. I have seen many Country Party members there begging and praying for grants for their electorates.

Hon. P. D. Ferguson: We did not get any pleasure out of it.

Mr. Thorn: Have you seen me there, too?

Mr. RAPHAEL: I have seen you there.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! The hon. member must address the Chair.

Mr. RAPHAEL: Certain irregularities in the conduct of the Commission's business have been mentioned in the report of the auditor. That report has been attacked by members of the Country Party. They in turn have perhaps helped to construe the report that has been sent in by the Government auditor into something against the Minister in charge of the Bill. The member for East Perth must know something about the expense of running lotteries. He has been associated with them on different occasions. He knows what money has been spent and what it costs to run lotteries. He also knows that from time to time something must be allowed for incidental expenses. He might have been given time in which to investigate the auditor's report. He is a lawyer and accountant, and if he had gone through that report carefully he might not have made the attack he did upon the Government. The hon. member by interjection to-day suggested that perhaps we needed a hospital in Victoria Park. What he wants for himself is a mental home. He referred to the money granted by the Lotteries Commission to the Victoria Park married men's organisation. By inference he suggested that that organisation had no right to be possessed of a motor truck. I am making these remarks to protect the Commission because of the sums it has made available to that organisation. By means of dances and other entertainments, the unemployed of my district raised over £100, with which they purchased a truck for the carting of firewood

for their wives and children to keep them warm in the winter. These men raised that money of their own free will. Not only was the truck used for the purpose I mentioned, but it was also used for the carting of firewood for invalid pensioners and the wives of men who were away under the mining scheme. After a while we found that the free giving in Victoria Park had reached an untimely end.

Mr. Thorn: Had committed suicide.

Mr. RAPHAEL: Yes. I took a deputation of men and women from different unemployment organisations in Victoria Park to the Lotteries Commission, and asked for a grant for the purchase of parts and for the repair of the truck, which was then of no further use. Much to my surprise, because I had attacked the Commission from time to time, sufficient money was made available to put the truck on the road and continue its good work.

Mr. Thorn: You must have frightened the Commission.

Mr. RAPHAEL: The truck is now five years old. Several times since it has been necessary to ask for further sums for repairs. According to the last reply from that body the fountain of giving has gone dry, the Commission having come to the conclusion that it will no longer pay for repairing the truck.

Mr. Thorn: Hand it over to the member for Canning.

Mr. RAPHAEL: I have not lost heart yet. I do not take any notice of the Leader of the Opposition who goes whichever way the wind blows. I think the member for East Perth attacked the Government because he was a little piqued that they had not given him an opportunity to go through the auditor's report. I do think the hon. member should have been given time in which to peruse the report and make inquiries, when perhaps this howl about the Commission would not have been heard. I hope the Bill will become law. In Victoria Park there are still hundreds of men on relief work and on rations. We have a very able relief committee which is subsidised from time to time by the Lotteries Commission through the central executive. The money brings a little brightness into the lives of people who might not be here to-day but for this financial assistance. The Leader of the Opposition held up his hands in horror to learn that the A.L.P. had received £50 for school

books. That was a shocking thing! The Lotteries Commission were making money available directly to the public schools for the purchase of books, and the teachers were inscribing on the books the fact that they had been given by the Commission. In that way they were staining the character of the children because they were receiving their school books through charity! I suppose the Leader of the Opposition stands for that, as he does not represent the industrial classes of the State.

Hon. P. D. Ferguson: I suppose they were given as from the A.L.P.

Mr. RAPHAEL: The hon. member would not give anything away.

Hon. P. D. Ferguson: I would give you away any day in the week.

Mr. RAPHAEL: The money that was made available to the Trades Hall was administered by one of the cleanest men in the State, P. J. Mooney. Many of us have electors in indigent circumstances, on the dole, and unable to purchase school books for their children. We have thus had an opportunity to see that these books are supplied, seeing that they are so necessary to the education of the youngsters. Does the Leader of the Opposition, and do hon. members on the other side of the Chamber, object to that?

Mrs. Cardell-Oliver: But we want the school books, too.

Mr. RAPHAEL: You have the same opportunity to get them. I have never questioned a person coming to me as to whether he or she was a member of the Labour or the Country or the National Party. If the money was available, the books so sorely needed were supplied to the kiddies. I daresay the Minister will deal with various phases of the gambling laws of Western Australia, and with those who support such laws, and also with those who through hypocrisy deplore them. I suppose we shall hear from members opposed to gambling in any shape or form. It is definitely dangerous to touch either the gambling or the liquor laws in Parliament, because whatever one does, one gets one's fingers burnt. Someone has to carry the burden of the Lotteries Commission. A former Minister for Police, the late Mr. John Seaddan, gave a fair explanation of the administration of the Lotteries Act. I do not agree with all the Lotteries Commission have done, nor do I anticipate that

I shall agree with all they may do in the future. At present I am in the happy position of having nothing against the Lotteries Commissioners, because I have got from them all I want, and therefore am satisfied. The Lotteries Commission has prevented tens of thousands of pounds from leaving Western Australia to be ventured in the Golden Casket of Queensland, for instance—about the "crookedest" thing ever run in any part of the world. The Golden Casket created a terrific smell. Again, Tattersall's consultations were also taking thousands of pounds out of this State. The creation of the Lotteries Commission largely stopped the illegal outlet for lottery money from Western Australia, though there is still a great deal going out. The balance sheet of the Lotteries Commission is something for the Government to be proud of. I hope that the Commission will survive for another year, and that the excellent charitable work carried on by it will continue.

MR. NORTH (Claremont) [9.34]: The Bill is the result of support from both sides of the House. We remember that this legislation first came from the Opposition side of the Chamber, and therefore much political somersaulting would be needed to prevent the Bill from passing. The Minister referred to subsidies granted to surf life-saving clubs. Where subsidies are being granted to certain clubs, surely the Lotteries Commission would take care to be absolutely impartial. Although in the first place on the initiative of a previous Minister for Police, certain clubs were given assistance, I hope that now all clubs will share in the benefits. As for the main principle of hon. members approaching the Commission, one wonders what would happen if an old fellow like Gladstone sat here and listened to the debate. Surely members should not go near a Commission created by themselves. It would be just as much out of order to approach the Transport Board. However, it is now a generally-accepted practice. Personally I have not had the opportunity of collecting large sums from the Lotteries Commission. Once I received a cheque, with the request that I should accept it for a certain institution in the North-East Fremantle electorate, where I hope it did some good. Probably the explanation of the cheque reaching me is that the Lotteries Commission managed to mis-

hit the boundary. If there is to be a competition of members in the opening of mouths widely, it is time the thing was cleaned up. If some members are to get these sums, let us make it an open go. How can we, under the Constitution and the whole system of Parliament, go cap-in-hand to bodies of our own creation? Mr. Gray, a member of another place, is able to get things done for my district.

Mr. Tonkin: How is it you can get something for my district if you cannot get anything for your own?

Mr. NORTH: That was a matter of largesse on the part of the Commissioners, who were giving cheques all round the place. However, as I said, the Commission mis-hit the boundary. My district, moreover, was not at that time making any claims. There are definite rules under the Act for the distribution of funds by the Commission. For my part I would rather see the Lotteries Commission placed under the Treasury. In old, well-established districts like Claremont, where all the pioneering work is over, not many demands would be expected to arise. I am sure the electors of Claremont are broadminded enough to acknowledge that the Commission's funds are being distributed in parts of the State where they are more urgently needed. However, it should not be a function of members of Parliament to approach a Commission of their own creation. In the ultimate, my justification for supporting the Bill is that it represents a form of indirect taxation. The only taxation that people will stand is taxation they know nothing about and do not feel. That is why I am jealous of the Federal Government, who collect so many millions without anybody being the wiser. In dealing with this Bill, or with liquor or tobacco taxation, we are dealing with taxation which means "Pay as you go" and therefore is less unpopular than the direct taxation which everybody dislikes. If the work of the Commission is to continue, I should like the donations to be put on a footing more satisfactory to all districts. On the one hand, the Commission should be seized of all the facts. It should not be a case of one member trying to beat another, but a reasonable thing all round. I feel sure that unless such a course is adopted, this business will in the long run become a sort of dogfight amongst all members to obtain donations. In any case, the Bill being the creation, as it were, of both sides of

the Chamber, I feel sure it will pass the second reading.

MR. WATTS (Katanning) [9.40]: I suppose there is one reason only that will really influence members to vote for the second reading of the Bill. It is that it will probably perpetuate an evil that is less than that which preceded it. That is the reason I propose to vote for the second reading of the Bill. Parliament passed the Lotteries (Control) Act in circumstances that are well known to the majority of us. It was because the position was in a fair way to becoming disastrous to the people of Western Australia. Crossword puzzle cards were being tendered for small sums at every street corner, and throughout the length and breadth of the State this tendency was rapidly increasing. The Minister of the day considered the Act would solve the problem to a large extent. I consider his belief and trust in the powers of the legislation to go a long way towards solving the problem cost him his seat in this House. I believe, too, that the carrying on of the Act has cost the Minister who was until recently charged with its administration, a good deal of his reputation for business acumen. I am sure of that after what we have heard from that hon. member and from others as well. From the reports submitted by the Government auditor on a number of lotteries that have been conducted, it is apparent that there have been irregularities that have not been dealt with as they should have been. We have not been informed specifically whether the first of the reports, which dealt with No. 2 Lottery, was actually brought under the notice of the Commission by the Minister. Assuming that it was, it is quite obvious that the Commission took very little notice of it. If it was not brought under their notice, it appears that the blame must lie at the door of the then Minister. I assume that he did send the Commission a copy of the report, and it is apparent from the next report that very little notice was taken of it.

The Minister for Police: Have you read the second report?

Mr. WATTS: I have read portions of it.

The Minister for Police: That is very evident.

Mr. WATTS: The reports regarding Lotteries 2 and 9 were very similar in some respects, if I remember the numbers correctly. In answer to a question the other day, the Minister for Police gave some information regarding the grant that had been made to the Wokalup Farm. I propose to refer to one item only that was embodied in his answer, namely, a donation of £2,500 on the 30th December, 1933. I shall not enter into any controversy as to whether the Wokalup Farm is an institution that can fairly be classed as "charitable" by the Minister. The proviso to the definition of "charitable purposes" gives the Minister the opportunity to grant sums of £250 at a time to institutions that are not specifically referred to in that section. In this instance it was not a matter of £250, but of £2,500, out of a total of £4,187 4s., which the answer to the question showed had been given to that institution. I do not think the Wokalup Farm can by any stretch of imagination be regarded as covered by the definition of "charitable purposes" except in so far as donations of £250 may be concerned. I do not see that anything included in that definition can apply to the Wokalup Farm, apart from the provision regarding £250 that may be donated at the discretion of the Minister. I do not intend to discuss the question whether the Wokalup Farm is deserving, or the extent to which it may be deserving along these lines. The point I am concerned with is the amount of the donation, and it seems to me that this is a definite instance where the law has not been complied with by those responsible for seeing that the requirements of the Act are carried out. It seems to me that the grant to the Wokalup Farm, however deserving that institution may be of support, was outside the Act. Further on, the Act provides that the Minister must give his approval before a lottery can be conducted. It is set out that the Minister may, subject to the provisions of the Act, grant a permit to conduct a lottery on such conditions, not inconsistent with the Act, as he may see fit to impose in order to guard against fraud and to ensure compliance with the Act. He may do that in his absolute discretion, and he may approve or reject any application to conduct a lottery. I am prepared to admit that the language of the Act is not so definite as some of us would like, and I am inclined to agree with

the ex-Minister for Police, who suggested it was not clear what the permit was intended to cover. However, any action was not consistent with the Act that would allow of distribution from the Commission's funds of money for an illegal purpose not contemplated by the Act. Later on in the Act it is specified what "charitable purposes" cover. It is agreed that the Commission are precluded from allocating money—

Hon. C. G. Latham: Before they get their permit.

Mr. WATTS: Yes. In those circumstances with regard to the donation of £2,500 it would seem that that condition was not observed. If it was not, then the Minister was not asked to grant the permit and the Commission broke the law. If the Minister was asked to permit that grant to be made and he approved, then I submit that the Minister himself broke the law. There are no two ways about that, so far as I can see. The ex-Minister for Police said something about the Act to the effect it was "loose-jointed." Possibly there is something in his assertion. Certainly it has been in my mind that the Act could well be improved.

The Minister for Works: There is nothing else like it in the world.

Mr. WATTS: I am inclined to agree, and I accept the Minister's observation to advance another suggestion that has been in my mind for some time, and that is that the Act requires a thorough overhaul. That applies, not only to the Act, for it is now apparent, in view of what we have heard recently, that the Commission should be considerably overhauled and also the work that they have carried out. Whatever else we may say, we cannot derive much satisfaction from the information that has been furnished by the Government auditors in certain directions. Regarding the distribution of the amount referred to by the member for Murchison (Mr. Marshall) affecting the Reedy hospital, I have perused the section of the report dealing with that matter, and I am perfectly certain that those who referred to it did so bona fide in the belief that what they stated was correct. The reference in the report is to "Reedy Progress Association buildings." No one would gather from that that the reference was to a hospital. In view of the explanation made by the member for Murchison, we now know what the item refers to and the explanation by the hon. member was perfectly satisfactory to me. In fairness to those who con-

tended it looked a little extraordinary, that point should be made plain. What is more, hospitals in other instances are specifically mentioned so it was not at all apparent that this item was any more than was stated—the Reedy Progress Association building.

Mr. Marshall: The Reedy Progress Association does not possess a hut, they have their meetings in a private house.

Mr. WATTS: We know all about it now and are completely satisfied with the hon. member's statement. It seems to me that the Bill should not renew the existing Act, but the present legislation is the lesser of two evils. The greater evil was the unrestricted gambling by lotteries which was going on in this State. I believe the legislation is capable of considerable improvement, however, and that the administration is capable of improvement. It would not be amiss to give consideration to a different type of management altogether, to a different ratio of expenses to collections, on account of each lottery, and to many other subjects which are of considerable importance, if we are to preserve the fair name, as it were, of lotteries in this State to which the Government, by authority of this Parliament, have more or less given their blessing. I am going to vote for the second reading, but on the understanding that in my opinion the Bill should be referred to a select committee for the purpose I have mentioned.

THE MINISTER FOR POLICE (Hon. F. J. S. Wise—Gascoyne—in reply) [9.53]: Referring to the statement of my predecessor in this office, that this seems to be a fateful measure and one destined to get all those associated with it into some sort of trouble, I hope that I at least can avoid trouble on this occasion. I would like to refer briefly to many of the remarks of speakers on the second reading debate. I would first draw attention to the remarks of the member for East Perth and his colleague, the Leader of the Opposition, regarding whether all the papers concerned in the Auditor General's report were furnished to this House. I gave the Leader of the Opposition that assurance but in spite of that he seemed to have some doubts.

Hon. C. G. Latham: No, I did not.

The **MINISTER FOR POLICE**: The Leader of the Opposition questioned the numbering of the pages. When the member for East Perth first asked his questions, I

made inquiries at the Auditor General's department and asked to be furnished with these reports. I could not reply on the first day because I did not have them. They were handed to me and placed on the Table of this House on Tuesday last. All the reports submitted to me, the reports made by the Audit Department, were laid on the Table. Regarding the numbering of the pages, if the Leader of the Opposition were to think for one moment he would realise that they were numbered in a way that could not be avoided. They were reports spreading from 1934 to this year.

Hon. C. G. Latham: From 1933.

The **MINISTER FOR POLICE**: And they were from different files. I again assure the hon. member that every portion of those reports has been presented.

Hon. C. G. Latham: I did not say they had not.

The **MINISTER FOR POLICE**: The hon. member cast some doubt and I wish to clear that matter up. Regarding the private audits, the Leader of the Opposition stated that judging from the reports they were the work of some schoolboy, or were capable of being put up by some schoolboy. I make an absolute refutation of that remark. I find that a member of the firm of Coombs, Whyte & Lissiman—a gentleman named Packham—conducts an almost continuous audit of the affairs of the Lotteries Commission. That officer is a man who has been for 20 years with that firm and has the standing and qualifications of an officer who would be an inspector of the Audit Department of this State. That cannot be denied. I find on referring this matter to the Auditor General that not only does the name of that firm stand high, but in the Department's view the audit is made with meticulous care. There has not been a suggestion in this report before the House of any misappropriation. If the Leader of the Opposition were fair, he would have quoted, not only as he did, prolifically and profusely from the first report of the transition stage, but also from the last.

Hon. C. G. Latham: I never even referred to—

The **MINISTER FOR POLICE**: The hon. member suggested, when the Minister for Works was speaking, that the reports from which he quoted ranged from 1933 to 1936, but he omitted to mention the remark of the Auditor General, Mr. Taylor, on the

11th March, 1936. "The general system of internal check and audit of the transactions is good." That has not been mentioned in the Chamber prior to this moment. I wish to assure the hon. member that, in view of the desire of the member for Roebourne, to move for a complete and continuous audit by an officer of the Auditor General's department, I am prepared to arrange, and I am expressing the view of the Government in this matter, to have a monthly audit by an officer of the Audit Department, and for that report to be made available to members of this House. I desire to see that public confidence is maintained in connection with the conduct of these lotteries, and for my part, and on behalf of the Government, I would state that there is nothing whatever that we wish to hide. We would prefer that every action be disclosed. I want briefly to refer to the comments of the Leader of the Opposition on the matter of tightening up the conduct of lotteries, and the desire of the Government in that connection in the past. The Minister for Works quoted from a Bill that was brought before the House on the 31st October, 1933. Clause 4, to which the Minister referred, dealt with the distribution of moneys for charitable purposes being made with the approval of the Minister. I would have members notice the difference in the attitude of the Leader of the Opposition on that occasion as compared with his attitude now. Mr. Latham is reported as having said—

This is the clause which makes the lottery a State lottery because it hands the control over to the Minister. The Commission have proved that they are capable of, and competent to administer the funds, and we should leave them alone. It is now desired to saddle the Minister with the responsibility for the funds. That is wrong. The Commission will have to do just what the Minister tells them. In the hands of a man who desired to be unscrupulous, this is a tremendous power. He would be in a position to let the money accumulate, disburse it at the general elections, and so make himself exceedingly popular. I hope the Committee will leave well alone.

That is an entirely different viewpoint from the one expressed by the hon. member this evening, when he said the Minister should have control, should have responsibility and should be responsible for every action of the Commission.

Hon. C. G. Latham. I said he already has it in the existing Act.

The MINISTER FOR POLICE: In regard to small sweeps, the Leader of

the Opposition questioned whether Sections 5 and 6 of the Act are being complied with. I agree with him that there are too many of these small sweeps permitted. I have requested the chairman of the Lotteries Commission that when the festive season is over—there may be some reason just now for a little tolerance—a very strict control should be exercised in the reviewing of all people making applications to conduct small sweeps. For my part, I can assure the House that that is not going to get out of hand. In regard to the remarks of the member for Subiaco (Mrs. Cardell-Oliver) it is very obvious that the hon. member has not a knowledge of the Act under which the Lotteries Commission works. I as a young member of this Chamber, would say to one who is still younger, the member for Subiaco, that it is not wise to become famous in this Chamber as one responsible for making irresponsible statements. I would not like to see the hon. member dubbed as one possessed of ignorance in matters of public affairs such as this. I agree with the member for Subiaco in a remark she made in reference to the encouragement of gambling and the effect it was having on the youth of the community. I find in the daily Press of this State, in an important newspaper, page after page devoted to many varieties of sporting information.

Mr. Sleeman: Which paper is that?

Hon. C. G. Latham: Your own official organ—the "West Australian."

The MINISTER FOR POLICE: I have taken note of the hypocrisy, of how the favoured Press, the opulent Press, does its utmost to encourage the youth of this State in this connection. Here are some of the headings and remarks to be seen on this page: "Hot Tips," "Double Trotting Meeting," "Fremantle Tips," "Belmont Tips," "Gloucester Park." Then there is a big advertisement from a starting-price book-maker, and the very advertisement the member for Subiaco spoke of as one of those on the screen, which carries the line, "It might be yours—£2,500." The hon. member objects to that form of advertisement, and I support her objection.

Mr. Styants: That is not "The Groper," is it?

The MINISTER FOR POLICE: Yes it is "The Groper." It is a wealthy company with a nominal capital of £50,000, and I find that the provisional directors comprise Mr. Franklin, M.L.C., Mr. Hughes,

M.L.A., and Mrs. Cardell-Oliver M.L.A. and others. This is a paper from the profits of which the member for Subiaco is probably drawing handsome emoluments, and in sheer hypocrisy she says to this Chamber that such action on the part of the newspapers is ruining the young life of this State. I suggest to the hon. member that she puts her own house in order. One other reference to a remark made by the hon. member in connection with the allocation of funds. The same objection was raised to the sums given for the purchase of school books for children of indigent parents. I heartily endorse the action of my predecessor in supporting such allocations. Feeling that there were very many to whom the privilege was not extended in schools other than district schools represented by active members able to get such assistance, I learnt that there were many children of indigent people who needed that form of assistance. Consequently I have arranged for a committee to be appointed from the Education Department and from among reputable citizens to see that there is no discrimination in the schools, no matter whether denominational or State, if there are children deserving of assistance in that direction. If that is not a charitable act I am a very poor judge. Before dealing with other matters raised during this debate, I desire briefly to review the history of lotteries and sweeps in this State. In 1915 the Hon. J. M. Drew, then Colonial Secretary, decided to regulate the operations of those who were professionally engaged and interested in the running and control of sweeps. There is on the file a minute from him stating that he did not desire to close up any avenues of benevolence, nor did he desire that his decision should over-ride the decisions of previous Governments, but that he wished to do the right thing and see that proper control was exercised. Subsequently the decision was reached that one art union per year in one district by the one person was permitted. It was well known that there were professional organisers of sweeps in those days, and there were many charitable objects to which Cabinet gave approval for the conducting of sweeps. I find that Cabinet gave approval and that the Leader of the Opposition was a Minister of that Cabinet.

Hon. C. G. Latham: That was before the Act came into operation.

The MINISTER FOR POLICE: That was one of the reforms which the hon. member introduced. So he arranged with his Government that close scrutiny by Cabinet should be given to every application and to the intention of the person promoting the sweep before permission was granted. A further tightening up became necessary as the years proceeded, and there are indications on the departmental files that Mr. Hughes was interested. There was one minute to the effect that sweeps should not be farmed out to a professional organiser or to any person who would conduct or organise more than one sweep per year. Mr. Scaddan then took up the matter. Action was taken by the present Leader of the Opposition in an endeavour to tighten up the practices then in vogue. I applaud the action of the hon. member. It was a very desirable object that he sought to attain, and I hope to prove to the House before I sit down that a set of circumstances existed that made it very necessary for the Leader of the Opposition, then a responsible Minister, to see that every avenue was tightened up where there was almost proof of misdeeds in connection with the running of sweeps. Then the member for Irwin-Moore (Hon. P. D. Ferguson), who was then Minister for Agriculture, came prominently into the picture. I find that he was approached by Mr. Hughes in connection with the running of certain games such as 'hoop-la, roll 'em, housey-housey and other games which the hon. member himself applauded and supported and which he obtained permission to run. There was nothing wrong with that. The hon. gentleman saw that proper supervision was exercised over those in control of sweeps at that time. I feel sure the member for Toodyay knows something about the matter. He would probably like me to quote a case in which he was particularly interested.

Mr. Thorn: I do not mind.

The MINISTER FOR POLICE: In 1930, the Leader of the National Party endorsed the action of the present Leader of the Opposition in an endeavour to tighten up control and ensure that the privileges granted by the Police Department were not abused. Mr. Scaddan, in the same year, decided to introduce legislation to deal with sweeps and art unions. In the following year, Mr. Scaddan and Sir James Mitchell

conferred, and resolved to introduce legislation. Apparently it was too late to do anything that year. Subsequently Mr. Scaddan appointed a committee to control lotteries. That was done by the Mitchell-Latham Government, as outlined by the Minister for Works. The members of the committee appointed were Messrs. Clydesdale, Mann, Gibson and Hearty, and they were the nucleus of the Commission ultimately authorised by the legislation we are discussing. The legislation was introduced to give legal status to the Commission, and at the time the Labour Party expressed a desire that it should be a State lottery. Obviously there was necessity to safeguard the public interests because there were so many irresponsible people then running sweeps. I endorse the remarks made that the present Government were not responsible for the form the legislation took. We desired that it should be unequivocally a State lottery. There is no doubt of that. Members of the Labour Party did their utmost to secure that desired reform. Power was sought to have proper control, rigid control, Ministerial control, but that was vetoed by members opposite and their colleagues in another place. However, the Commission were vested with complete powers. Members are aware that the Minister in control cannot authorise a lottery save on the recommendation of the Commission. We believe it is true that the Labour Party and successive Governments found the whole scheme of control unsatisfactory and it is still unsatisfactory, for the reason that it is not Government control. The member for East Perth (Mr. Hughes) on Tuesday evening made a great play with words regarding control and supervision, and repeatedly stated that what had been done would not be permitted in any other Government department, or under Treasury regulations. The hon. member knows full well that the Commission are not in any way a Government department; nor are they in any way controlled by such regulations as must be observed by officers of the Treasury.

The Minister for Lands: The Commission are a body corporate.

The MINISTER FOR POLICE: That is so. The administration, therefore, is necessarily not in conformity with Public Service rules and practices. The responsibility for that devolves upon the framers of the Act, upon those who formed the majority that

sanctioned the form of control. That is where the blame lies. As regards the audits, the instructions contained in the Act have been observed. Under Section 15, the Minister has power to authorise an audit if he so desires. That being so, the Audit Department were requested on four or five occasions, as has been well ventilated, to make an audit. The report presented to the House is the result of the audits. The benefits of those audits are well known and very easy to observe in the altered conditions of to-day. As the Minister for Works said, the responsible Minister has not even control over the appointment of staff. As Parliament intended to place all responsibility on the Commission, that has been done and has been religiously observed. If any other point is necessary to prove that the lotteries are not in any way a Government department, I may mention that the audits by officials of the Auditor-General's Department were made in pursuance of a power vested in him. He had no authority whatever to audit the books of the Commission without the special request of the Minister. There was nothing obligatory on him or on the Government to present those reports to Parliament. They were presented as an act of courtesy. We had nothing to hide; we desired to hide nothing. Let me make the fact quite clear that in any review of the report or of the remarks of the member for East Perth, I shall not be speaking as the mouthpiece of the Commission. I am not concerned in any way with the report of the audit made by a responsible and trusty officer on affairs as he saw them and as he interpreted what should be done in accordance with the spirit of the Act. What do matters mentioned by him amount to? In the main they amount to the late banking of money and the late payment for tickets, not the non-banking of money or the non-payment for tickets. Those points were never in question. The auditor raised points that many important decisions of the Commission were not recorded in the minutes. As has been clearly explained, that was simply the result of the gradual process of absorption of those who were accustomed to running the sweeps in other days before there was any legislation to circumscribe their activities. The statute to-day makes a certain demand upon the Commission to perform certain duties in a certain way. Members and the public generally may rest assured that there

has been a wonderful improvement in the control, and that all associated with the lotteries are gradually learning just what it means to work within the confines of an Act of Parliament rather than in the free and easy fashion of other days. The member for East Perth raised a point particularly about an amount expended for furniture. I submit that the hon. member must have been severely disappointed in what he discovered in the reports of the Auditor-General's Department. With the knowledge he has of the scope for malpractice in the running of sweeps he knew it would be possible for a great deal of malpractice and misappropriation to occur. Nothing of that kind is referred to in the report. In connection with the amount of £1,439 to which the auditor drew attention, the member for East Perth visualised a sumptuously furnished apartment with cosy nooks and beautifully appointed parlours in which the Commission worked. I took the trouble to-day to get a detailed list and audited statement of the value of the furnishings and furniture belonging to the Commission. I found what any reasonable minded man would expect to find that the £1,439 represented in furniture, and listed as an asset and therefore shown in a mistaken way by the Commission as being something in hand when it was not liquid cash, is not only furniture and furnishings in the way of chairs, tables and the like, but includes the very necessary barrels, which are costly things, marbles and cabinets, and also the appurtenances necessary for the successful, thorough and complete running of such a sweep as this. Everything is included. The hon. member endeavoured to show that the money had been misappropriated and misdirected. He endeavoured to send on to the public the impression that the Lotteries Commission had misapplied these funds, had wilfully, wastefully and extravagantly spent them in sumptuously appointed offices. The whole of the £1,439 is not only accounted for, but if desired I can produce a statement of valuation made by one in authority, able to speak on such matters. The Auditor General did not query the nature of the expenditure nor its necessity, but the nature of the entry insofar as its being represented as an asset, and that was indicated rather than complained of. There is a vast difference in the interpretation the hon. member would endeavour to place upon that sum spent on furniture,

etc. His dramatic remarks that the cash was not there, that this extraordinary amount had been spent on furniture, amount to very little. The hon. member used as a scathing indictment the fact that the financial emergency tax and all its implications did not extend to the staff of this particular organisation. Surely he is not grieved about that. Surely he cannot be sore because those who are appointed and employed by the Commission did not suffer the reduction he would have liked to see them suffer. That is not the only indictment against the operations and control of the Commission. Another point is the comment made by him regarding the secretary of police being an auditor. That is a misconstruction of the position. He knows that the secretary to the Commissioner of Police attends the Commission before the taking of any lottery, checks all the marbles and sees that they are in the barrel, and attends all drawings as representative of the Minister.

Hon. C. G. Latham: He cannot check all the marbles.

The MINISTER FOR POLICE: The hon. member referred also to the purchase of materials. He said, using the words of the auditor, "That this practice was liable to abuse," not that this practice was abused. In the next sentence the hon. member refers to "this malpractice having been going on for years"; he very quickly changes the word "practice" to the word "malpractice." As a fact, every purchase of material in the way of X-ray plant for hospitals has been made in consultation with the Under Secretary of the Health Department in an endeavour to make the best possible bargain. I have a statement from the Under Secretary of the Health Department on this subject. When asked for his version of the matter to-day he replied, "I will take the full blame if any blame is attachable to anyone, for recommending the newly instituted system of buying to the best advantage." Rather than have £200 or £300 voted to a hospital for any portion of its equipment many hospitals requiring similar articles even if they are far apart from each other, are being grouped together, and the best deal possible is being made for them by bulk purchasing. The Auditor General refers to that as a practice that should be stopped. It is dangerous, he says. Possibly it is dangerous if it be not properly controlled. The fact is that in connection with the purchasing of X-ray plants, by deal-

ing with the only firm that can supply them, a saving was effected in the purchase of seven plants equal to a reduction from £300 to £265 for each plant. Is there anything wrong in conserving the funds contributed to and made possible by the public? Yet the saving of money in this way is referred to as a malpractice. The auditor commented upon it as a practice, and said it was liable to abuse. What would we have done if he had found that the practice was being abused? Would not a charge have been suggested? That, however, was never suggested, because the practice was never abused.

The Minister for Lands: With the member for East Perth there is always a scandal about something.

The MINISTER FOR POLICE: I would not disparage any of the comments of the auditor. I would make no comments derogatory upon the auditor who conducted the audit. From his point of view everyone of his comments is justified. A review of his remarks shows that there is little left to be desired in the conduct of the sweeps. I am not expressing any view in support of the gradual process adopted by the Commission to become accustomed to working within the four corners of the Act. I merely say that the old methods have been discarded. They have been merged into the new system until the present thorough and complete methods have come into vogue. In all instances the auditors merely advise corrective measures in regard to things that could well be corrected in the proper administration of the affairs of the Commission. I make no apology for submitting this report to Parliament. The Government feel that the public should know just what has happened in the transition stage from the old methods to the new. What do we find in a review of the conduct of lotteries in days prior to the Act? We all know of the scandal associated with the Tearoom Girls' Sweep of 1931. We have all heard of that sweep. Many reports were published concerning it. The balance sheet, certified to by a chartered accountant, shows that the receipts amounted to £1,463 1s. 5d., wages and salaries to £89, printing and stationery to £83, reserve for bad debts to £5 14s., advertising to £126 1s. 6d., postages to £81 13s. 11d., prize money to £700, and profit to appropriation account to £376 14s. 7d. That was the statement certified by an accredited auditor. But that amount of £376 14s. 7d. was not the amount received by

the tearoom girls' club. Several deductions were made, and they received a cheque for £30 7s. 4d.

Mr. Hughes: Will you make that statement outside?

Ministerial Members: Ah!

Mr. Hughes: No, you won't!

The Minister for Employment: You are showing yellow.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! Hon. members will keep order.

The MINISTER FOR POLICE: Mr. Hughes received £94 3s. 6d. in commission alone, among other charges on appropriation account which I have no doubt the hon. member can explain. But not only have the figures I have quoted been taken from the account certified to by a chartered accountant; they have also been taken from a newspaper of the day, whose remarks went unchallenged.

Mr. Hughes: I went before a jury, and the man was fined £100, which he made sustenance workers pay.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! The hon. member will keep order.

The MINISTER FOR POLICE: I am merely endeavouring to show how the gross takings of a sweep can be eaten up. That is my desire. Many complaints were made at the time in regard to the running of that sweep. One accusation—I do not know how authentic it would be, but it appeared in the Press—which Mr. Hughes did not explain, was that only 29,147 tickets were accounted for whilst only 40,000 out of the 100,000 tickets issued were advertised as not being in the draw. That, of course, is another detail; but it shows something which the Leader of the Opposition aimed at in the remedial measures he endeavoured to adopt so that these practices would not continue. I consider that the hon. gentleman is to be commended for his action. The history of this and of similar sweeps shows the difficulties in dealing with promoters, and the public dissatisfaction, and the trials and tribulations, and perhaps the profits, of promoters in those days. There is very much evidence such as this. If hon. members desire it, I shall be pleased to lay all the papers on the Table of the House. If the Leader of the Opposition will move for them, I shall—

Hon. C. G. Latham: You would not give me what you gave to the member for East Perth.

The MINISTER FOR POLICE: Would the hon. gentleman like me to quote from some of these papers?

Hon. C. G. Latham: I do not want you to quote from anything.

The MINISTER FOR POLICE: On second thoughts, perhaps it might not be safe to place these papers on the Table of the House, because an experience made in connection with one file was that after it was submitted to a court as an exhibit, it disappeared. It would be unfortunate if such records as these disappeared. In connection with the particulars of some lotteries of those days, I would like to show the House the percentages of receipts, prizes, and profits. There is the case of the Hamilton Hill Memorial Hall sweep. That was promoted in 1929.

Hon. C. G. Latham: I had nothing to do with it. Why are you looking at me?

The MINISTER FOR POLICE: The files disclose the difficulties of the Leader of the Opposition in those days in dealing with promoters. Experiences recorded on the files also show, in the words of an official, that one promoter—Mr. Hughes it was—treated all inquiries regarding returns and balance sheets with profound silence.

The Minister for Employment: How unusual!

The MINISTER FOR POLICE: Let us examine this particular sweep. We find that on the 9th January the president of the Hamilton Hill Memorial Hall Association applied to the Commissioner of Police for permission to conduct a sweep. Incidentally it was mentioned that arrangements had been made with Mr. T. J. Hughes, secretary of the East Perth Progress Association, to organise the sweep. We find that advertising and the usual arrangements were made in connection with the promotion of this sweep. It was drawn in May, and the organiser forwarded to the Commissioner of Police a statement that the sweep had been drawn and that in a month from that date it was expected to have everything finalised and a complete balance sheet forwarded. We find that when the balance sheet did come forward, it revealed these things: By cash sales, £1,524 0s. 3d. Tickets were 1s. each, so I presume that commission was deducted prior to that amount being credited as cash sales. Sundry debtors brought the total to £1,531 18s. 3d. Prizes amounted to £599 19s. 6d., postages to £70 19s. 3d., advertising to £146 12s., printing, stationery and

incidentals to £89 8s., and wages to £65 13s. 4d. The net profit stated was £559 6s. 1d. Hon. members would assume from that, perhaps, that £559 6s. 1d. was the sum the Hamilton Hill Memorial Hall committee received—a net profit of £559 6s. 1d. But that was not so. The profit and loss appropriation account shows that the commission taken by the organiser, Mr. Hughes, after all these other expenses had been deducted was £139 16s. 6d., equivalent to 25 per cent. of the £559 6s. 1d.

The Minister for Employment: Real racketeering!

Mr. Hughes: I am rather glad you brought that up. It will suit me.

The MINISTER FOR POLICE: Yes. I understand that the hon. gentleman will also have other margins, in that I believe he had an interest in a printing establishment in those days. I think that any margins which could be received would be enjoyed, and would not be missed by the hon. member. But I want to show the House a comparison between the wasteful methods of those days and the methods of to-day. I wish to show what a comparison between yesterday and to-day reveals.

Mr. Thorn: Of course you are only quoting those things to reveal that!

The MINISTER FOR POLICE: Just so; just to draw a comparison. I find that the profit and loss account does not state the number of tickets sold, but the price was 1s. each. The difference might be between 30,000 and 40,000. The member for East Perth would probably know the correct number. The amount under the heading of appropriation account, £1,531 18s. 3d., suggests that that is a net figure after deduction of commission. For the purposes of comparison I have taken a recent lottery, No. 45. The commission to sellers has been deducted before arriving at the percentages I am about to quote to the House. The amount of commission allowed in connection with these lotteries is 10 per cent., as has been well ventilated to-night. In the case of lottery No. 45 the commission amounted to £1,830. Now, a comparison of expenses and approximate percentages to collections between lottery No. 45 and the Hamilton Hill sweep organised by Mr. Hughes shows that the Lotteries Commission sold 152,401 tickets, as against between 30,000 and 40,000 sold in connection with the Hamilton Hill sweep. The collections were £17,237 in the

one case, and £1,532 in the other. Postages in the case of the lottery amounted to £51, and in the case of the Hamilton Hill sweep to £71. Advertising, printing and incidentals represented £550 for Lottery No. 45 as against £236 for the sweep conducted by Mr. Hughes. There was £366 for remuneration, including salaries and fees, for Lottery No. 45 as against £205 for Mr. Hughes's sweep, making a total of £967 for No. 45 Lottery, which was equivalent to $5\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. as against a total of £512 for the Hamilton Hill sweep, representing $33\frac{1}{4}$ per cent.

The Minister for Employment: What a great success the member for East Perth would have been in Chicago!

The MINISTER FOR POLICE: We have there an opportunity to contrast the outgoings with the collections and these represent $5\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. as against $33\frac{1}{4}$ per cent. Including commission, we find that the profit for distribution amounted to £6,750 in one instance and £420 in the sweep conducted by Mr Hughes. That means to say that in the former instance 39 per cent. was distributed from the profits and in the other $27\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. No audit fees were mentioned, and although there are several references on the file to promises of an audited statement, no such statement reached the Police Department. I leave the matter to hon. members. When we consider the costlier methods adopted in the earlier days, it is no wonder that the Leader of the Opposition took certain action in an endeavour, in conjunction with the member for Nedlands (Hon. N. Keenan), properly to control these lotteries. It is no wonder that anyone who had benefited in such a lucrative way from the organising of such sweeps, should feel very vexed at being deprived by the Leader of the Opposition and his colleagues of such a lucrative means of income. To-day we certainly have lotteries under control by means of the Lotteries (Control) Act on a basis that gives the greatest margin available for distribution as prizes, and gives very satisfactory balances for allocation to all charities, as against the very unsatisfactory position of other days. In spite of the remarks of officers of the Auditor General's Department, which I have referred to as amounting to suggestions for improving the administration of the business of the Lotteries Commission, I think members would be wise in the light of what used to happen, in not turning down some-

thing that has the confidence of the people of the State. We can all applaud the Leader of the Opposition and the member for Nedlands for doing what they did in submitting legislation that, although it was referred to by my Ministerial colleague as "weak-kneed," has at least given some satisfaction in the control of such matters. I feel, therefore, it is with the confidence of the House that I support all those who have spoken in favour of the second reading of the Bill.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

To Refer to Select Committee.

MR. WATTS (Katanning) [10.44]: It is my intention to move that the Bill and the Act be referred to a select committee.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Act cannot be referred to a select committee.

Mr. WATTS: Then I move—

That the Bill be referred to a select committee.

I would like to have your guidance, Mr. Speaker, on the matter of dealing with the Act. The committee may decide that it would be advisable to extend the scope of the inquiry beyond the Bill and perhaps deal with the Act. It is not necessary for me again to stress the reasons why I think an inquiry by a select committee should be held. Much has been said regarding the Act by the ex-Minister for Police to indicate that it is capable of improvement. Much has been said on both sides of the House to indicate a desire for some alteration in the administration of this legislation, in the methods adopted to control lotteries, and for a reconsideration of the powers of the Minister. It seems to me that reference of the Bill to a select committee need not delay the passage of such legislation as is necessary. It should not take much time for a select committee to inquire into the various matters that I consider require investigation and to arrive at a conclusion that will enable the necessary legislation to be brought before Parliament in due course.

Mr. SPEAKER: I know of no way by which the hon. member can refer the Act and the Bill to a select committee. The only method I am aware of by which a select committee could consider the ramifications of the Act

and the affairs of the Lotteries Commission is by way of a special resolution. We have only the Bill before us.

MR. HUGHES (East Perth) [10.46]: I second the motion. I am rather glad that the Minister for Police brought forward certain matters.

Mr. SPEAKER: I hope the hon member does not intend to reply to the Minister for Police on this motion.

Mr. HUGHES: No. I do not.

Mr. SPEAKER: It is merely a question of referring the Bill to a select committee.

Mr. HUGHES: I wish the Minister had laid on the Table of the House some papers from the Police Department, particularly with regard to money—

Mr. SPEAKER: I am not going to allow the hon. member to discuss that question. He knows enough about Parliamentary practice to know that he cannot do that.

The Minister for Lands interjected.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. HUGHES: The Minister for Lands can show how righteous he is. He and his smug self-righteousness!

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! The hon. member will address the Chair.

Mr. HUGHES: We shall have an opportunity to disclose some of the smug righteousness of the Minister for Lands.

Mr. SPEAKER: The member for East Perth must not proceed in that way.

The Minister for Lands: You should—

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! Will the Minister for Lands keep order.

Mr. Thorn: Put him out!

Hon. C. G. Latham: You will have us here all night.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! There is too much cross-firing between the front benches.

Mr. HUGHES: I will have an opportunity to speak at the third reading stage, and will not deal with these matters on the motion to refer the Bill to a select committee. A select committee should be appointed. It was wonderful to observe how the Minister glossed over the statements made in the auditor's report. He put the irregularities down to the fact that the Commissioners were amateurs. On a previous occasion we were told that one man had been put in charge because he was a specialist. He was put there for no other purpose. The Minister glossed over the matter. He referred to some X-ray plant purchased—

Mr. SPEAKER: I hope I will not have to rise every few minutes to tell the hon. member that he cannot reply to the Minister at this stage. The hon. member knows that. Why try to carry on? I will be reluctantly forced to ask the hon. member to resume his seat.

Mr. HUGHES: If on a motion for a select committee a member cannot show from the substance of the matter before the House why a Bill should be sent to a select committee, there is little that can be said except formally to second the motion.

Mr. SPEAKER: As a matter of fact, we have only dates to send to a select committee, and the hon. member knows that.

Mr. HUGHES: I would like to draw your attention, Sir, to Standing Order 287. I am rather sorry that this Standing Order is not well indexed and I was not able to put my finger on it when I was on my feet previously. The Standing Order which is on page 61 states:—

After the Preamble has been agreed to the Title shall be read, and, if any amendment shall have been made in the Bill, not coming within the original Title, such Title shall be amended and the question put "That this be the Title of the Bill," and the amendment thereof shall be specially reported to the House.

Mr. SPEAKER: What has that to do with referring the Bill to a select committee?

Mr. HUGHES: You raised the point that this Bill merely refers to the alteration of a date. I take it that this is a ruling to the effect that apart from discussing the date, the substance of the Bill cannot be discussed at all.

Mr. SPEAKER: May I point out that the Standing Order, as quoted, has the provision "after any amendment shall have been made to the Bill." We can only amend a Bill in Committee, and we have not yet reached that stage.

Mr. HUGHES: I think—

Mr. SPEAKER: What is your point of order? I will give a ruling on it.

Mr. HUGHES: I am not raising a point of order, but am answering your statement that only dates can be discussed.

Mr. SPEAKER: At present, yes; I adhere to that.

Point of Order.

Mr. Hughes: Then on a point of order I ask your ruling if on this motion we can discuss nothing but the Bill

as merely amending the date. I submit that on this continuance Bill the whole substance of the parent Act is before the House, and that in any debate concerning a continuance Bill, members are at liberty to discuss all subject matter and every section of the parent Act. I ask for your ruling on that.

Mr. Speaker: As a matter of fact, the second reading discussion has finished. It has been discussed from one end of the country to the other, and I have not said anything against it. All I say is that you are not going to reply to the Minister for Police on this motion. You can do so on the third reading if you like.

Mr. Hughes: I will undoubtedly.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member can do that then and not try to do it now.

Mr. Hughes: On the motion for a select committee, I was proposing to discuss things that are the subject matter of the parent Act with a view to showing why we should refer it to a select committee.

Mr. Speaker: I tell the hon. member that the only thing before the House to go to a select committee is this Bill, and there is nothing about the parent Act in the Bill.

Dissent from Ruling.

Mr. Hughes: I must respectfully and regretfully move to disagree with your ruling. It is time we got down to some basis on this particular question. I raised the point in this House before, that the rigid interpretation of Standing Orders would preclude any discussion at all. The basis of your ruling, I gather from previous rulings, is this: that when one comes to discuss a Bill, one cannot discuss anything outside the Title of the Bill.

Mr. Speaker: I never said such a thing in my life.

Mr. Hughes: I think that has been the effect of rulings previously given.

Mr. Speaker: I said that you cannot amend other than what is the subject matter of the Bill, which is quite a different matter.

Mr. Hughes: You have stated the case more perfectly than I could. What is the subject matter of the Bill before the House?

Mr. Speaker: Changing the date from 1936 to 1937.

Mr. Hughes: I respectfully disagree with that. The subject matter of the Bill before the House is to continue the Act in

its entirety. In order to effect that object, the Bill is brought down merely to alter one word in the existing Act. By altering the word "thirty-six" to "thirty-seven" we re-enact the existing Act, and the continuance Bill is nothing less than a measure which says that the Lotteries (Control) Act shall be re-enacted for another year. I am sure there is nobody—not even the self-righteous gentleman occupying the portfolio of Lands—who would suggest that if we brought down a Bill re-enacting the Lotteries Act for a year we would be precluded from discussing any one of the numerous sections in it. The continuance Bill provides that by striking out one word and putting in another the whole Act shall be continued for another year. If we pass this amending Bill, we re-enact the whole measure. Standing Order 287 specifically provides for the contingency of a Bill coming before the House and, during the currency of its progress, amendments being made that do not conform to the Title of the Bill. There is a specific Standing Order providing that if amendments are made in Committee that go outside the Title of the Bill, the Committee can amend the Title. Surely that postulates that during the progress of the Bill in Committee amendments may be made that are outside the original leave given to the Bill, and outside the Title of the Bill. I will read Standing Order 287 again:—

After the Preamble has been agreed to the Title shall be read and, if any amendment shall have been made in the Bill not coming within the original Title, such Title shall be amended and the question put "That this be the Title of the Bill," and the amendment thereof shall be specially reported to the House.

Surely that postulates that during the progress of the Bill there may be made amendments which come outside the scope of the original Bill and outside the Title, that after practically remaking a Bill we can alter the Title and retrospectively validate what has been done. If the Bill gives us no more power than to discuss the merits of 1937 as against 1936 there is no need to go into Committee, for there is nothing to discuss. I regret having to move to disagree with your ruling, Sir, but I believe with the member for Yilgarn-Coolgardie that we ought to follow the practice of the House of Commons, where particular care is taken that the rights of private members shall not be whittled away. If

we allow that, there will be no need for private members at all. Therefore I move—

That the House dissents from the Speaker's ruling.

Mrs. Cardell-Oliver: I second the motion.

Mr. Speaker: I point out that Standing Order 287, quoted by the hon. member, does not come into the argument.

The Minister for Lands: Not at all.

Mr. Speaker: I can carry on without the assistance of the Minister for Lands. I defy the member for East Perth to point out that at any time I have ruled that members cannot amend a Bill in Committee outside the Title of the Bill. I have never ruled that; it would have been idiotic on my part, knowing that the Standing Order was there: What I save said was that a member is unable to move an amendment irrelevant to the subject matter of the Bill. I anticipated something of this nature to-night—although in another direction—and so, to make it clear to hon. members, I have had this ruling typed out. The member for East Perth said he agreed with the member for Yilgarn-Coolgardie that we should adopt the practice of the House of Commons, and not allow the privileges of private members to be whittled away. The House of Commons practice is bound up in volumes of May. May's "Parliamentary Practice," 13th edition, page 406, states that it is not within the scope of a committee on an expiring law's continuance Bill to amend the provisions of the Act proposed to be continued or to abridge the duration of such provisions; or to make permanent the Act proposed to be continued. The Lotteries (Control) Amendment Bill is a continuance Bill; no other provision is contained within its compass than that of date; "thirty-seven" being substituted for "thirty-six." This being the case, no other amendment is permissible. Standing Order 277 provides that "Any amendment may be made to a clause, provided the same be relevant to the subject matter of the Bill. "Subject matter" has been defined in the Standing Orders of the Legislative Council as "the provisions of the Bill as printed, read a second time, and referred to the Committee." This, in my opinion, is a good definition and for all purposes can be taken by this House. It is a very important principle of Parliamentary practice, that when the House has agreed on the second reading to the provisions contained in a Bill,

the Committee to which the Bill is referred shall not introduce into the Bill provisions that the House itself might not agree to. Some confusion exists in the minds of members that the Title governs the admissibility of amendments. Standing Order 277 disproves this. It is the wording of the clauses, not the Title, that the Committee are directed to consider. That is the position so far as my rulings have been given, not the Title in any shape or form. That is my ruling now.

Mr. Lambert: When a member moves to send this continuation Bill to a select committee, it may be that the select committee will extend the life of the Act by one or even two years. The position referred to by you, Sir, is not quite analogous.

Mr. Speaker: What is the question?

Mr. Lambert: The Bill is to continue the life of an existing Act for a year. A private member moves to send the Bill to a select committee. The question is whether it is not competent for him to do that. It is not in any sense dealing with the subject matter of the Bill.

Mr. Speaker: I have already ruled that a member can move to submit the Bill to a select committee, but that the select committee can only deal with the Bill as it is submitted to it.

Motion (dissent) put and negatived.

Question (to refer to select committee) put and negatived.

BILLS (2)—RETURNED.

1. Bunbury (Old Cemetery) Lands Revestment.
 2. Vermin Act Amendment.
- Without amendment.

House adjourned at 11.10 p.m.