

country of origin or take some other position. By that time, we can hope that peace will have returned to the world.

I place this Bill before members for their consideration. I had much doubt about bringing it down seeing that it will affect only one man, but on consideration I decided to introduce it and leave it to the judgment of members, knowing it is a matter on which there is room for difference of opinion. I feel, however, that a fortunate country like Australia can afford to extend to a refugee the opportunity to carry on his ordinary livelihood for a period of three, four or five years especially as there will not be such an influx into the calling as will make any material difference to the economic position of those already practising. I leave members to judge whether they desire to endorse the measure and extend this degree of hospitality in the way of earning a livelihood to this man and others in a similar position. We have already done something along the same lines in regard to refugee doctors. I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

On motion by Mr. Needham, debate adjourned.

MOTION—INDUSTRIAL ARBITRATION COURT.

As to Power to Order Improved Processes, etc.

Debate resumed from the 8th November on the following motion by Mr. North:—

Since modern conditions are gradually transforming the once useful Arbitration Court into a bottle-neck between industry and progress, action should be taken to increase the powers of the Court to enable it to—

- (1) order the installation of improvement of process in any particular industry;
- (2) certify that the funds necessary from time to time to give effect to No. (1) are for a purpose worthy of special rates of interest and amortisation, and
- (3) order that anyone losing employment because of the introduction of improved process receive full award rate of pay until further employment is obtained.

MR. NORTH (Claremont—in reply) [10.41]: I wish to thank the House for its reception of the motion. It represents a slight contribution to the political thought of the future, envisaging as it does condi-

tions that will probably arise after the war and that I believe will require close attention. If it is not possible to achieve anything under existing conditions, it may be that the ideas embodied in the motion will be found of greater use in future. The Minister raised a question as to where the funds would come from to meet the conditions set forth in the motion. My idea is that the funds will become accessible as a result of the use of the improved processes. The fact that funds are not available now is no different from saying that a beautiful lady has not a hand mirror. If she has not got one, she can as easily get one. In the same way these funds are the reflection of the improved processes which will be employed in the industry. With these few words, I thank the House for the reception accorded to my motion and have pleasure in asking leave to withdraw it.

Motion, by leave, withdrawn.

House adjourned at 10.43 p.m.

Legislative Council.

Thursday, 23rd November, 1944.

Bills: Transfer of Land Act Amendment, 2B., passed	1942
Legislative Council (War Time) Electoral Act Amendment, report	1942
Electoral (War Time) Act Amendment, report	1942
Constitution Act Amendment (No. 2), 2B.	1943
Mortgagees' Rights Restriction Act Amendment, Assembly's message	1948
Lotteries (Control) Act Amendment, 2B., personal explanation	1948

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

BILL—TRANSFER OF LAND ACT AMENDMENT.

Read a third time and passed.

BILLS (2)—REPORTS.

1, Legislative Council (War Time) Electoral Act Amendment.

2, Electoral (War Time) Act Amendment.

Adopted.

BILL—CONSTITUTION ACTS AMENDMENT (No. 2).

Second Reading.

Debate resumed from the previous day.

HON. H. SEDDON (North-East) [4.37]: Whilst from time to time it may be considered desirable that the Constitution should be revised, there is in the attitude of the present Government, which is bringing forward a series of Bills proposing amendments of the Constitution, a course of action which is very definite and which is directed to the objective of rendering this House impotent so far as carrying out its functions as part of the legislative system of this State is concerned. Constitution Acts Amendment Bills are the most important to which Parliament can give attention. On examining this Bill, together with the others, we may be pardoned for concluding that the Government has definitely abandoned any suggestion of the undertaking given at the beginning of the war that for its duration there should not be introduced any contentious legislation.

This Bill is both contentious and important. It is so important, and represents such an advanced step in the alteration of sections dealing with the system of government in this State, that I appeal to every member of this Chamber, every member without exception, to state his views on the floor of the House. I say "without exception" because I feel that every member should explain to his electors his views, and his reasons for those views, in order that the electors may take the lead members are entitled to give them in dealing with matters of this description. If one were inclined to be facetious, one might remind the Government that there is a shortage of rubber, and point out that the Bill is designed to turn this Chamber into a rubber stamp. At any rate, the House would be failing in its duty to its electors if it allowed the Bill to go through in its present form, because that would simply result in our abandoning any suggestion of usefulness as part of the legislative system of Western Australia. The ostensible object is to end deadlocks between the two Houses, but the real purpose is to reduce this House to impotence.

The Bill is noteworthy from another angle. It reflects very clearly the Labour idea that there is but one view of democracy and the Labour Party is its prophet.

Because the popular House can govern only by a stable majority, it disciplines and controls its members to a degree which this Chamber would not tolerate. It is therefore necessary that in order to perform an effective check, in order effectively to review legislation brought forward, there should be a Chamber which is freer and whose members are not bound as rigidly and disciplined as thoroughly as they may be in the other House. To such a degree has that discipline been exercised in the Assembly that there is many a man in that Chamber whose usefulness to the community has definitely been hampered, whose value has definitely been reduced by his having to subordinate his individual views to comply with his party's request for unity. It is devised to sustain the excuse Labour has offered its supporters over the years that the failure to lead them to the Promised Land has been due to the Legislative Council.

As a matter of fact, that contention rests on a most dangerous fallacy. It is a fallacy to which all executives and leaders are prone; a fallacy to which every man is prone who is placed in a position where he has to exercise authority and judgment in controlling the lives and actions of others. Many people contend it is the most dangerous fallacy that can affect any community or institution or section of people. It has brought untold suffering upon people down the ages and is the reason for which our democratic institutions had to be brought into existence. In this continent it can be termed "the Great Australian Blight." I intend to give illustrations of how it operates and has operated in this country, and how it will ultimately destroy the standards this country enjoys, unless the workers themselves wake up to what is being done and themselves put a stop to it before they lose their freedom and become the docile slaves of those who are trying to take control of them today.

The "Great Australian Blight" is the doctrine of the infallibility of Labour. As a matter of fact, the progress of Western Australia would have been much greater and the burden on its people much less if Labour Governments had taken the sounder and longer view of which history has given them so many examples; the view that every Government and every party makes mistakes and that the possession of

power does not confer on those who wield it the attribute of infallibility. Let me show how it operates. As in Parliaments, so in the industrial world, it works under the guise of unity; because unity is strength, everything must be sacrificed to unity. On it is based the power of those who have captured the movement and are using it to bring disorder and unrest to the community. Trouble is started. Some small friction is magnified; some anomaly is represented as deliberate discrimination; work is stopped! In spite of the fact that we have devised a system of arbitration whereby industrial disputes can be referred to an impartial tribunal, we find again and again that that tribunal is being set aside and that men are being led into industrial trouble and distress, thereby bringing privation on themselves and those associated with them.

In how many unions has this step been taken, especially during wartime, without the rank and file being given an opportunity to decide what action was to be taken? In how many unions is it obligatory for the rank and file to be consulted by secret ballot before a stoppage of work can take place? And do not let it be forgotten that once this step is taken, any worker who criticises or opposes the trouble-makers is called a scab or a rat, and the ascendancy is such that most Labour men would regard leprosy as a lesser evil. They would rather acquiesce than face that reproach. It requires a brave man to face such a stigma today. That is the principle behind this Bill.

Hon. A. Thomson: If he faced it, he would starve; he would not get a job at all.

Hon. H. SEDDON: Labour is controlled in its industrial field as never before. With the political implementation of Labour policy, workers who have been compelled to take part in industrial operations which have arisen as a result of the war have, through compulsory unionism, been brought under the control of the Labour industrial movement and have had to face that question of control, irrespective of their views. I would like to read to the House an extract from the "The Kalgoorlie Miner" of last week. It refers to an advertisement which

appeared in that paper a week before, and read as follows:—

Australian Labour Party. Important. Affiliated unionists or persons holding a yearly membership ticket of the above party who associate themselves with the Boulder Ratepayers' Association as at present constituted will automatically expel themselves from the Labour movement. (Sgd.) H. McCulloch, secretary.

Hon. A. Thomson: That is the freedom we are fighting for!

Hon. H. SEDDON: The letter is headed "Freedom. A.L.P. Version."

Hon. A. Thomson: There are a lot of things committed in the name of freedom as well as in the name of charity!

Hon. H. SEDDON: My word, there are! As a matter of fact, the insidious and dangerous nature of that announcement is this: It implied that every man who is a member of a union and who takes any step in the way of supporting this ratepayers' association automatically expels himself from the Labour movement. In 1916, the Labour Party was split from one end of Australia to the other because of the very same policy. Attempts were made to dragoon and control every person who was a member of a union affiliated with the Labour Party as to how he should vote and act politically as a unionist. The attempt was strongly resisted by a very large section of workers. Apparently the same old idea is being revived today. The workers are to be told that they shall have no freedom so far as political matters are concerned, but that they must fall into line with whatever may be decided by those people who claim to be in control of the unions.

Hon. A. Thomson: What was the object of the progress association?

Hon. H. SEDDON: The Boulder Progress Association, as evidenced by the advertisements, is an entirely non-political, non-sectarian organisation. It was formed with a view to securing representation in the Boulder Municipal Council, and was very successful in that respect. In connection with the forthcoming municipal elections, the progress association is running candidates and these advertisements and comments to which I have referred were inserted in the local Press during the last fortnight.

Hon. W. J. Mann: They are Nazi tactics!

Hon. H. SEDDON: I think it would be very hard to find a better parallel between Nazi tactics and those who claim to control workers as a whole.

Hon. J. Cornell: I do not think they are quite Nazi tactics.

Hon. G. Fraser: At any rate, that is like what the employers did in connection with the recent Referendum.

Hon. H. SEDDON: I do not know about that but I cannot find an example of any employer arrogating to himself anything comparable to the tactics indulged in by the Commonwealth Government in the recent Referendum. The attitude adopted by the controllers of the workers is that they must be right. What they decide is beyond question; it is sacrosanct. Therefore, this Legislative Council which dares to criticise and even amend legislation introduced by a Labour Government, must be done away with altogether or its powers severely restricted. I do not contend for one moment that the Legislative Council is in any way infallible. In fact, we have made mistakes. On many occasions we could be charged with inconsistency, but in most instances this House has been able to state reasons for its actions and decisions. Moreover, it is accountable to the electors for its actions. It can lay claim to a less limited outlook than that of the popular House. It can claim to adopt a wider and longer point of view than is apparent in many Bills introduced by the Labour Government.

Take the question of deadlocks. I have been associated with many conferences of managers during my membership of this House. In most of them a compromise has been arrived at after the discussions that have taken place. Those discussions very frequently allowed consideration of aspects that were not always ventilated on the floor of the House. As the result of the compromises arrived at, legislation has been preserved for the statute-book. How often has it occurred, however, whether on the floor of the House or at a conference, that Bills have been brought in and considered; Bills in which there have been valuable amendments agreed to by the Legislative Council but because the Council had rejected other amendments that the Lower House desired or inserted amendments that that House objected to, those measures have been lost? In consequence, those features

of the measures that met with the approval of both Houses were lost.

Surely if the real object behind the Bill is to overcome the evils associated with the so-called deadlocks between the two Houses, an amendment could have been brought in to cover just that particular aspect and to provide that where a Bill has been considered and amended, provided those amendments have been approved by both Houses, that part of the Bill should become law and points of difference upon which the Houses were not able to agree could be dropped from the legislation. That is no isolated experience. Members have been associated with conferences at which Bills have been lost because out of the six managers participating, one only has stood out against one particular point on which he has not been prepared to compromise? Perhaps the point in dispute really did not affect more vital features of the measure.

Hon. A. Thomson: And that attitude has always been adopted by a manager representing the Legislative Council.

Hon. H. SEDDON: Exactly. These considerations show that if the Government was sincere in its desire to overcome legislative deadlocks, and to provide that portions of a Bill that met with joint approval could find a place on the statute-book, it could have done so without introducing a Bill of this description. References have been made to the fact that this House has rejected a great number of Bills. I wonder what the effect would have been if this House had passed some of the Bills that were sent here from the Legislative Assembly. I wonder what the effect would have been, for instance, had we passed certain amendments to the Industrial Arbitration Act which were placed before this House and submitted to investigation, but were then amended or dropped. I think the effect would have been just as detrimental to the workers as any action that could be taken in other directions, even by the employers themselves. It could be seen that behind those amendments was this same old attempt to secure control in every degree over the workers, and to make them docile and obedient slaves to the people who have arrogated to themselves the right to say that this shall or shall not be the policy of this great country. I wonder if the people of this State have ever considered the tremendous burden that is placed upon

them, year by year, as a result of the financial policy of the Government.

I wonder if it has ever dawned upon the workers that the greater evils of all those associated with the last depression were due to the unsound financial policy adopted for so many years and supported by Labour Governments. I wonder if the workers of this State have realised the enormous proportion of the taxation imposed upon them year by year, which is simply imposed in order to make up the losses that the State has incurred in connection with its loan works. I wonder if the people have ever been told, or have taken the trouble to find out, just what proportion of the national debt is due to the losses incurred and which has resulted in such a burden being imposed upon them. These are matters that are imposing increasingly a burden upon the people of Western Australia each year. We in the Legislative Council have never tired, year after year, in pointing out to the people the results of this policy and the burden from which they are suffering. Yet this Legislative Council is today asked to stand aside and to act as a rubber stamp, accepting anything that may be sent up to it by the Legislative Assembly.

Hon. J. Cornell: Every easement in the income tax was made as a result of action taken by the Legislative Council.

Hon. H. SEDDON: The Council has been associated with the passing of all those Bills that have been claimed to be progressive measures and which have been placed on the statute-book of the State. Has any attempt been made to avert the lowering of efficiency in the entire community by the adoption of many of the so-called Labour principles? This war is full of examples of bottlenecks that have been created in industry, of instances where thousands of workers have been kept idle because of the lack of organisation and management in the supply of materials. Take the case of the Hatch's Creek wolfram mines! The original prospectors who knew the mines could have produced more wolfram than was produced by the army of workers that was sent up there at the instance of the Commonwealth Government. The cost of that army of workers was £300,000 and resulted in £90,000 worth of ore being obtained. The whole organisation is reeking with examples of inefficiency and mismanagement. Under legislation of the description before us, no-

one will be allowed to reflect upon or in any way point to the discrepancies that arise as a result of this policy, which is landing us so rapidly in that calamitous condition which awaits this country unless the present approach is altered.

The Bill is a blow at the very basis of parliamentary government. Parliamentary government, all down the ages, has been based on one important point. It has been rendered necessary because it was desirable that executives should be kept within bounds, and in order that those who were in charge of the active principles of government should be subjected to criticism and to a certain amount of revision and control by the representatives of the people. When we depart from that principle, when we place in the hands of one Chamber alone, one that can only exist by the control that is kept over its members for its majority, we create that very state of affairs which appertained before parliamentary government was created. In this way we strike at the very principles of freedom and inherent rights which have made the English parliamentary system what it is. This Legislative Council is not like the House of Lords; it is an elective body.

This Council is responsible to its electors. As Sir Hal Colebatch pointed out and Mr. Heenan also, not one half of the people who are entitled to be enrolled as electors of the Legislative Council have taken the trouble to enrol themselves. Every member of this Chamber in turn must go before his electors and give an account of his stewardship. That is the principle on which this House stands. If this Chamber took any steps which were regarded by the people as detrimental to the best interests of the State, the electors would soon rise against it, and amongst the electors are the men and women whose lives are associated with the Labour movement. They would soon take the opportunity to voice their feelings in no uncertain way concerning any action that was taken contrary to the best interests of the State. I point out that many non-Labour members are returned to this House from provinces that are for the most part working-class provinces. I have examined the amendments that have been placed on the notice paper by Sir Hal Colebatch. I have also examined the Bill. So far as I can see its ostensible objective, that of overcoming

deadlocks between the two Houses, could be attained by the simple expedient I have suggested rather than by the pointless method set out in the measure.

I do not think Sir Hal Colebatch's amendments will meet the position as well as he expects. For that reason I shall require to study them more closely before I announce myself as prepared to support them. I do not believe the Bill was brought down with the object of minimising deadlocks between the two Houses, and at the same time preserve the sovereignty of both Chambers. For that reason I am going to oppose the Bill. I think the interests of the State would best be served and the rights of the electors would best be preserved by their having representatives in this House who will be free to criticise legislation that is brought down and do their best to review it no matter from what Government, which holds the majority in another place, it emanates. The best interests of all will be served by our rejecting the Bill in its present form.

HCN. J. CORNELL (South): My remarks will be brief, although I could speak for hours regarding the hypothetical block this House is said to be with regard to another place. My long experience shows me that all our difficulties are and have been capable of adjustment under the present Constitution. Let us analyse our Constitution in regard to money Bills! As far back as 1921 Sir Hal Colebatch was Chairman of a Select Committee of this House. I, too, was a member. That committee brought into line our Constitution with the Constitution of the Senate so far as Bills, money and otherwise, were concerned. On that occasion it was brought out that in the drafting of the Commonwealth Constitution recourse was had, so far as the Senate went, to the Constitution of Western Australia. So far as the set-up between the Commonwealth Parliament and our Parliament is concerned, there is only one fundamental difference, namely, the franchise of the Senate. That franchise is the same as the franchise of the House of Representatives. There is no bar, if this Parliament would agree to embody in its Constitution what is embodied in the Commonwealth Constitution.

What is good enough for the Commonwealth should be good enough for us. The

Chief Secretary has outlined the Commonwealth Constitution and the machinery for overcoming deadlocks. The machinery is simple. We could take the powers of the Senate and apply them to all Bills. Never at any time has this House gone so far in butchering money Bills as has the Senate. In the Senate the Budget is discussed and the Estimates are discussed, but that does not happen here. I was in the House of Representatives in December, 1916, on the occasion when the Senate reduced the amount of the Supply Bill by £1,000,000. At that time the Labour Party had a majority in the Senate and a minority in the House of Representatives. I was present at the sitting when the message came from the Senate, which insisted on its request that Supply be reduced by the sum I have mentioned. The Rt. Hon. W. M. Hughes was then Prime Minister. He declared that the Senate had gone far beyond the powers it possessed or were contemplated by the framers of the Constitution.

Reference was made by the Chief Secretary to what a docile majority here does sometimes in connection with Labour Party Bills. What did the Labour Party do to the other fellow's Bills in the Senate? When the opportunity offers it cuts both ways. Why do we want to go beyond the machinery provided in the Commonwealth Constitution? What advantage is to be derived by doing so? If members will look up the Commonwealth Constitution they will see that it is almost identical with our comparable sections in regard to all Bills. In the whole history of the Commonwealth there is only one instance where the provision for a double dissolution was resorted to. That was resorted to against the wish of the Labour Party at the time. Members will recall the occasion of the fire in Chicago which it was said was caused by a cow kicking over a lamp. Senator Gardiner and Senator Rea kicked over the lamp and upset the applecart of the Joseph Cook Government. On that occasion Sir Joseph Cook induced the Governor-General to grant a double dissolution, and the Fisher Government came back with a majority in both Houses. That was the only time in 44 years in the history of the Commonwealth when the machinery for dealing with deadlocks was resorted to. I follow closely the history of the Commonwealth, more

closely than I do that of my own State. I have yet to learn that the system of joint sittings provided for in the Commonwealth Constitution on the occasion of deadlocks has been resorted to. Why go to the British Parliament? There is no analogy between that Parliament and this one.

It has already been pointed out that the House of Lords is both a nominee and an hereditary Chamber; consequently, the machinery provided by our Constitution could not be used in the British Parliament, unless the House of Lords were re-constituted. I am not in favour of Sir Hal Colebatch's proposal, as I think it is a sort of patchwork quilt affair. Like the curate's egg, it is good in parts. My suggestion is that we should adopt the Commonwealth machinery. I consider that what is good enough for the Commonwealth is good enough for the State. It may be argued that this House is a continuous House, but so also is the Senate. Half the members of the Senate retire every three years; a third of the members of this House retire every two years.

What happened in the Senate after the double dissolution was similar to what happened when you, Mr. President, were first returned. The Senate started afresh; half of the Senators had a tenure of six years, while the other half had to stand for re-election after three years. In the case of this Chamber, if there were a double dissolution and the Federal machinery applied, one-third of the members would have a tenure of six years; the second third, four years, and the next third, two years. I can see no necessity to go beyond the machinery provided by the Commonwealth. I hope we will not experiment with this legislation; if we consider there is necessity for machinery to overcome a deadlock, let us adopt what has stood the test of 40 odd years in the Commonwealth Constitution. I support the second reading.

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

BILL—MORTGAGEES' RIGHTS RESTRICTION ACT AMENDMENT.

Assembly's Message.

Message from the Assembly received and read notifying that it had agreed to the Council's amendments.

BILL—LOTTERIES (CONTROL) ACT AMENDMENT.

Second Reading.

Debate resumed from the previous day.

HON. J. G. HISLOP (Metropolitan) [5.19]: There are obviously many people prepared to support the lotteries. There are many—but the number is difficult to gauge—who are opposed to the lotteries. However, I am sure there is a bigger number than in either of these groups who are opposed to making a permanency of lotteries as a method of meeting the Government's responsibilities in regard to hospitals and charities. As I have stated previously, my opposition is not to the lotteries as such, because I believe that gambling is an inherent weakness of our race and that if that weakness can be controlled and utilised, so much the better. I do not think, however, any Government is entitled to go beyond that. Certainly, I do not think, because permission has been given for the conduct of lotteries, every effort should be made to appeal to the inherent weakness of our race by making the lotteries a commercial venture, designed more and more each year to relieve the Government of its responsibility.

Each year the amount of advertising increases, and lately citizens have been advised to hurry because a lottery is closing. Perth is fast becoming a city strewn with lottery tickets. Almost every small shop one enters has a book of tickets lying in a prominent place on the counter. Surely by now the fact that lotteries are conducted is sufficiently well known to all. Could we not leave it, then, that application be made to a central office, or at least to one area in each town? I would not be opposed to extending the life of the Lotteries Commission for three years, but no longer, because I feel it is the duty of Parliament to watch and check the growth of any form of gambling; and I would only grant this extension of three years if the measure were brought forward as one which could be amended. A simple continuance Bill would not give this House the right of review, but simply the right of rejection. My real objection, however, is to the method of the distribution of the funds, and my objection has always been on the same grounds.

I believe that the Commission is exceeding its powers in supporting financially

Government undertakings which should be financed from either the hospital fund or from Consolidated Revenue. Here I would like to make my point clear, because I realise that the major portion of the money which has been expended to date upon the Perth Hospital has been provided by the Lotteries Commission. The Chief Secretary told us in his speech that, with interest, the money given by the Lotteries Commission to the Perth Hospital has reached the sum of £192,000. As a member of the committee which takes a great deal of interest in the Perth Hospital and as the liaison officer of the honorary medical staff of the Perth Hospital, I can make the positive statement that to date the amount of money spent on the Perth Hospital is £280,000. This means that the Lotteries Commission has provided £192,000 of the £280,000 expended up to date. I do not think that was intended when the Lotteries Commission was brought into being.

Hon. C. F. Baxter: It certainly was not.

Hon. J. G. HISLOP: If members will examine the Act controlling the hospital fund and compare its wording with the wording of the Act controlling lotteries, they will find that the moneys in the hospital fund shall be applied by the Minister, firstly, in payment of the costs of collection and administration as declared by the Minister and thereafter in the ways set out in the Act. In paragraph (c) of Section 15 we find that one of such ways is—

Erecting, adding to, altering, or renovating any public hospital.

It would therefore appear to me that the cost of the erection of a hospital should come out of the hospital fund. The wording in the Lotteries Act is as follows:—

In this Act the following terms shall have the following meanings, unless inconsistent with the context:—

“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.

My reading of that provision is that the moneys required for the erection of a hospital are to come from the hospital fund. Contributions towards such matters as maintenance and patients' comforts and the like come under the heading of “charitable purpose” as defined in the Lotteries

(Control) Act. A little further we find that the term “charitable purpose” includes any free ward at any private hospital in the State.

To be logical, it must be possible for the Lotteries Commission to provide a free ward in a private hospital. The Commission has undertaken the erection of the Perth Hospital. I believe that to be so, because it has taken over the interest and sinking fund. But we find that the Lotteries Commission only makes a donation annually to a free ward in a private hospital. Reference has been made by members to the hospital fund, and it has been said that we have lost the hospital tax. The two, I take it, are synonymous terms. The true position respecting the hospital fund is set out in the fifty-fourth report of the Auditor General, at page 95, as follows:—

The hospital tax became merged in the uniform taxation measure enacted by the Commonwealth and, as from the 1st July, 1942, the annual grant to the State under the Commonwealth Statute—the State Grants (Income Tax Re-imbursement) Act—includes £275,750 in respect of hospital tax.

We are still therefore receiving as hospital tax, which constitutes the major portion of the hospital fund, the sum of £275,750 a year. What has actually happened is that we are still receiving exactly the same amount from our hospital tax, since it has been included in the uniform taxation scheme as we received from it in 1942. Whereas at that time we were receiving towards hospitals 1½d. in the £, I should think that, with the rise in income, we are today receiving ¾d. in the £. Personally, I think we did a very unwise thing, as a Council, to allow the hospital tax to be merged in the uniform tax.

Hon. H. S. W. Parker: Hear, hear!

Hon. J. G. HISLOP: I feel that the proper method of conducting our hospitals is to point out to the Commonwealth that, by the Commonwealth taking over uniform taxation, it has automatically deprived our hospitals of the extra amount which we would be receiving from the added income of the people today. The income of the hospital fund in 1943-44 was £279,131. The expenditure was somewhat greater, amounting to the sum of £285,682. We have since learned that the Lotteries Commission has had for disbursement amongst hospitals and charities this year the sum of £160,000. No business organisation

would be able to conduct its affairs for very long if one-half of that business expended roughly £300,000—because it has been that high—and the other half of the business expended about half that amount on similar or allied objects. There must be considerable overlap in the expenditure of this money. That is one of the reasons why I asked for a Royal Commission to investigate the future financial arrangements and administration of our hospitals. My feeling is that this money should be disbursed by one body with a State-wide interest, knowing the needs of all and prepared to call for budgets from all those requiring assistance. It could then disperse the money on the basis, of which I spoke in commendation, of the Charities Board of Victoria. It was something of the same sort that I envisaged when I suggested there should be a permanent commission in this State to deal with the financial and other administration of hospitals.

I cannot altogether dissociate other charities from hospitals because various forms of sickness are often linked together. An orphan is possibly a sick individual simply because he has lost his parents, whereas an aged person is sick because of the vicissitudes of life, and a hospital patient is sick because of some infection or accident or he may be psychologically sick. The Victorian body found that it could link all these together much more successfully than by allowing any overlap to occur. I would again like to point out to members that I consider the present form of allocation of money, even for the extension of hospitals, is not as satisfactory as we could make it by other methods. Members will recall a letter I received from the Lotteries Commission in which it advised that I should not give advice regarding matters outside the province for which I was elected. I take this as a very great courtesy, because it is quite obvious that the Commission does not wish that members of Parliament should offer advice on matters other than those in their own electorates, whereas I, as the only qualified medical practitioner in either House, could give advice in general terms for the State. I shall not read the whole letter, but I recall one or two paragraphs that are appropriate at the moment. Referring to my connection with

the Medical Co-ordination Committee, the letter from the Lotteries Commission states—

It would appear, however, that hospital administration does not come within the ambit of your charter, and further Mt. Magnet is not situated within the boundary of your parliamentary province. In the absence of advice to the contrary, I must assume that the parliamentary representatives of the Mt. Magnet district—both Council and Assembly—if approached, would be fully capable of adequately presenting the requirements of their constituents to the Lotteries Commission.

I oppose entirely, and always will, any parochial idea of controlling the hospitals or the charities of this State. To give an example of how this works out, let me refer to the letter which Mr. E. H. H. Hall read to this House concerning the hospital at Lake Grace. I take from it one short extract because I want to make it quite clear that this parochial attitude of receiving advice from a local hospital board through the Medical Department—which we now know has no medical control in the administration of hospitals—and through the Lotteries Commission, which has no professional advice, can only lead to disaster. I have been assured, in replies given to me when I have questioned this lack of medical advice, that the advice of the doctor on the spot is always taken. It is for this reason that I read this extract from a letter written by Dr. Margaret Clark—

Plans which the committee and I have disliked intensely have been drawn up by the department for alterations to the existing block (general) and tenders were called—unsuccessfully.

That was done despite the advice of the doctor and despite the wishes of the local committee. In order to confirm that, the chairman of the Lake Grace hospital, referring to Dr. Clark's letter, wrote as follows:—

I understand the deplorable condition of the building has been mentioned. This is quite true and we are afraid that the plan for which tenders have been called, will not improve certain aspects, and actually has little to recommend it.

He goes on to say—

I wrote to the Under Secretary on the 31st ult. and asked him to have fresh plans drawn which would embody the ideas of the board which are to build a new general hospital and to utilise the old building for quarters. There has hardly been time for a reply before this.

That may appear to have nothing whatever to do with the Lotteries Commission, but I felt that, having been advised as to the

method by which hospitals were extended in the State, the Lotteries Commission must have agreed to some portion of the finance for this Lake Grace extension. I find that the Commission promised £1,018 towards the hospital extension, which was going to cost £2,880, yet both the local doctor and the local committee entirely disapproved of the extension. That is surely sufficient to show that in one instance this parochial scheme has not worked, and that is one of the reasons why I put to this House the request for a Royal Commission. It was so that the control of hospitals could be State-wide. Again, I object to the present method of distribution of the funds of the Lotteries Commission. I make it quite clear that I have no personal grudge or grouch whatever against the members of the Commission. If I pass the chairman in the street, I know him sufficiently well to say, "How do you do," but I do not think I would recognise any of the other three members unless they were introduced to me. I have seen them only once or twice.

What I am saying is purely in the interests of the health of the community. I do not think the present system is a correct method of distributing the funds. I hope that if a new Bill is brought down some other method of distribution will be suggested. I shall give one example. I drew the attention of this House to the fact that it was desired to extend the Home of Peace. I also advised members that the authorities controlling the Home of Peace did not know how to proceed about the extensions because they did not know what place the institution was to take in the future of hospitals in this State. I have been advised by them that the Lotteries Commission has agreed to assist in the erection of a new building. There again is evidence of lack of planning. It is quite right that the Lotteries Commission should assist the Home of Peace in its extension, but assistance is to be given to a body to extend it knows not how. Actually, that is a further example of the need for better planning, and for a body that will distribute the funds when it knows the whole of the needs of the State. At the same time, we find that the Lotteries Commission has decided to build homes for aged people. I cannot see in the Act where permission to do this is given. In paragraph (f) of Sec-

tion 2, "charitable purpose" is defined as—

Any home or institution in the State for the reception of dying or incurable persons in indigent circumstances.

I assume that that was introduced into the Bill in order to cover the Home of Peace and similar institutions. But the mere fact that one is aged cannot be taken to come within the scope of the word "dying" because from the moment we arrive in this world, we can be regarded as having to make provision for dying. Paragraph (i) of the same section provides—

Subject to the limitations imposed by Section nineteen any object which in the opinion of the Minister may be fairly classed as charitable.

If one looks at Section 19, one finds that the amount is limited to £250 from each lottery. If there were 40 lotteries in a year, the amount would be limited to £10,000 per year. This is only the second year that we have heard of this, and yet £37,000 has been laid aside. I have a feeling that all this money that has been expended by the Lotteries Commission on the Government and governmental institutions, such as the erection of the Perth Hospital and the erection of homes for the aged, would be regarded as having been illegally distributed if challenged in the court. I do not believe it is in conformity with the Act. If it is necessary that it should be done, then I consider that the Act should be amended. But never in the years since I have been in the House has a Bill been brought forward allowing members to amend the Lotteries (Control) Act. In each case there has been a continuance Bill, and now we have one asking for permanent control.

Members may also be interested if I ask a few questions to which I cannot supply the answers. The Lotteries Commission has agreed so far as I remember for the last two or three years, and it may be permanent, to contribute 3s. per week for the children of the orphanages. I would like to ask: On what basis was the 3s. arrived at? Was it after a survey of the needs of the orphanages? Was it after the orphanages had made requests for that amount? Was it after a survey had been made of the dietary of those institutions? If it is the latter, I may inform members that I have been making some quite interesting investigations in a limited way into the

dietary of children of that age, but as yet I have not been able to make any entry into the field of investigation offered by the orphanages. To give members an idea, I have a letter which was written by a well-educated woman and a keen observer of child life, who has taken from numbers of children in boarding schools their general idea of their dietary. My next step will be to ascertain from the principals of the boarding schools exactly what the diet is. The following is a summary, more or less, of the inquiries made of a number of children at one boarding school:—

Once a week they have an egg for breakfast. Once a week they have an apple or an orange. Their breakfast consists of sometimes weeties and a little milk and bread and not even their ration of butter, the children having two thin wafers and the teachers four, and jam which is bought in kerosene tins, usually raspapple or peach, and this is used until the tin is finished. For their mid-day meal, the cheapest cuts of meat are bought, and consists mostly of sausages at 7d. per lb., mincemeat, and stews made from flaps of mutton, with white cabbage and blue peas, and sometimes spinach which is served not even washed properly. Sweets are mostly blanc mange made of water. For tea they sometimes have watery soup and the same bread and jam. After this meal, they study again until 9 o'clock and then go to bed very hungry. The only salad they ever see is an occasional limp lettuce leaf.

The PRESIDENT: I must ask the hon. member to connect his remarks with the question of making permanent the Lotteries (Control) Act.

Hon. T. Moore: If he can.

Hon. J. G. HISLOP: I am opposed to the Bill proposing to make the Act permanent, and if I am out of order in opposing the measure on account of the distribution of funds and am allowed to speak only to the question of making the lotteries permanent, I have nothing more to say.

Hon. H. Seddon: You are giving reasons.

Hon. J. G. HISLOP: Yes, I am giving reasons why I would not make this legislation permanent while the present method of distributing the funds is in vogue. I have given details of the dietary at a boarding school and I am asking these questions: If that is the dietary as detailed by numbers of school children, is it any better or worse than the dietary of children in orphanages? Has the Lotteries Commission, in fixing the sum of 3s., taken into account the dietary of the children in the orphanages? Has any study

been made of it? Is 3s. a week sufficient? Is 3s. a week all that the Lotteries Commission can afford to give orphanages while it can afford to set aside £37,000, as it has done in the last two years, for aged people? Is 3s. a week all that the Lotteries Commission can afford, while it can, in two years or a little over, subscribe £192,000 towards a new hospital in Perth? If the 3s. has been fixed after a statutory investigation into the needs of the orphanages, then I have no complaint whatever. I am asking that this information be supplied to the House because, to my own knowledge, the cost of fruit and vegetables has increased very considerably in the last year, and yet the amount of 3s. to the orphanages has not been raised.

Hon. T. Moore: Do the proceeds of the 3s. represent their only funds?

Hon. J. G. HISLOP: No, the Lotteries Commission contributes that amount. I would like to ask whether it is the job of the Child Welfare Department to make such an investigation. It seems to me that, when roughly £10,000 a year is being allocated by the Lotteries Commission to orphanages, it should have in its possession considerable information about the orphanages. I ask the Chief Secretary whether the dietary of those children is all that it should be, or whether the Lotteries Commission can afford more for those children, or under what conditions we, as a people, are ensuring that those children are being properly cared for. It would appear that the amount of 3s. has been definitely fixed as a contribution. It was the contribution when the lotteries were receiving only one-half of the money they are receiving today. I should like to know whether, in the opinion of the Lotteries Commission, this amount of 3s., together with the money received from other sources, is sufficient to guarantee the well-being of these orphans.

I very much doubt whether we, as a body legislating for orphans as well as for other sections of the community, really know under what conditions these children are living, and for that reason I am asking these questions. If the Chief Secretary can give answers to the questions that are interesting me, he will be doing a service, not only to the orphanages, but also to the Lotteries Commission. I repeat that I do not consider the method of distributing the

funds is correct. While some members have spoken against the Bill on the ground that the lotteries should not be made permanent, I am speaking against it for the reason that I believe the distribution of the money is not in the best interests of the people. Again I enter a plea for something more to be done in this regard, even though I run the risk of being accused of adding to my plea for a Royal Commission to inquire into hospitals. For the reasons I have stated, I shall vote against the second reading.

HON. T. MOORE (Central): I feel that I would be lacking in my duty to the people I represent if I did not express their views on this question. I travel in the country much more extensively than does Dr. Hislop, though he does make periodical visits here and there. The hon. member must have a very sharp eye, because he takes in quite a lot of things during his travels. I wish the House to know that the people I represent are perfectly satisfied with the conduct of the lotteries. I never hear a complaint about the Lotteries Commission from one end of my province to the other, which is a very large one. I wish the House to understand that the people in that large province are pleased with the work of the Lotteries Commission, because they know, as has been pointed out by Mr. Thomson, that they have had much better hospital facilities than were available before the Commission came into being. Dr. Hislop paid a visit to Mt. Magnet and was asked at a meeting what he thought was required.

He had just arrived there and taken a look around the place, and offhand he told the people just what they needed. What experience has he had in a business way? Perhaps I would be right in suggesting that he oversteps the mark if he goes around the country telling the people exactly what he wants in the way of hospitals. There is no doubt that he has certainly been drawing the long bow. I have received a long telegram from Cue, and I can only express the hope that the statements in it are wrong. I am informed that Dr. Hislop has been there and that he has recommended the closing of the Cue hospital.

Hon. J. G. Hislop: I rise to a point of order. Has anything I have done for the Cue hospital anything to do with the continuance of this legislation?

The **PRESIDENT:** The hon. member is certainly wandering from the subject matter of the Bill.

Hon. T. MOORE: Not more than Dr. Hislop did when he dealt with the dietary at orphanages.

The **PRESIDENT:** Dr. Hislop connected up his remarks.

Hon. T. MOORE: I will connect up my remarks with the Bill. Dr. Hislop has been to Mt. Magnet and has put forward a certain proposition. This has caused consternation amongst the people at Cue, and they have asked me to do everything in my power to prevent Dr. Hislop's suggestion from being carried out. I daresay that other members for the province have received similar telegrams.

The **PRESIDENT:** Has that anything to do with the Bill?

Hon. T. MOORE: I should say it has. Dr. Hislop has said that the Lotteries Commission is not spending the money in the way he wishes it to be spent. If he is going to set himself up as an authority on the opening or closing of hospitals, that is beyond his province. I want the House to understand that he is going beyond his province. The Lotteries Commission is doing excellent work in the direction of keeping hospitals open.

Hon. J. G. Hislop: I protest.

The **PRESIDENT:** I ask Mr. Moore to resume his seat.

Hon. J. G. Hislop: I again protest against the statement being made by the hon. member because I shall not have an opportunity to reply to it, and it must be replied to if members are inclined to accept it as being true.

Hon. T. MOORE: If it is not true, I will take back what I have said. I prefaced my remarks by saying, "If the statements are true."

The **PRESIDENT:** I am sure that Mr. Moore will accept Dr. Hislop's denial.

Hon. T. MOORE: The hon. member has not denied that it is true, so I take it that what I have stated is a fact.

The **PRESIDENT:** I understood Dr. Hislop to say it is not true.

Hon. J. G. Hislop: If I have to reply to the statement it will take quite a long time, but I think it is quite irrelevant to the Bill.

Hon. H. S. W. Parker: Hear, hear!

Hon. T. MOORE: The hon. member does not say that the statement is not true.

The PRESIDENT: Perhaps Mr. Moore will now continue his discussion of the Bill.

Hon. T. MOORE: The Lotteries Commission has been instrumental in assisting for years to keep the Cue hospital open.

Hon. J. G. Hislop: I ask whether that is a fact.

Hon. T. MOORE: I have no doubt it is a fact; the Commission has been assisting our outback hospitals for years, and everybody knows it. Every hospital in my province ranging from Ballidu to Wiluna has received assistance from the Lotteries Commission, and I am grateful to the Commission for that aid. But there is an offsetting influence that is causing me considerable worry. On a previous occasion, there was a move to close the hospital at Cue, but we managed to keep it open.

Hon. H. S. W. Parker: Better to close up the lotteries.

The PRESIDENT: Order!

Hon. G. Fraser: It seems to be all right for one member to speak on the subject, but not for another.

Personal Explanation.

Hon. J. G. HISLOP: I must ask you, Mr. President, to give me leave to reply to the hon. member's statement.

The PRESIDENT: Does the hon. member wish to make a personal explanation?

Hon. J. G. HISLOP: Yes, because this matter involves, not me, but a committee over which I have no control. My explanation is that all I have done in the district referred to by Mr. Moore is to give advice regarding the doctor, not concerning the hospital, over which I have no control and which I have no desire to control.

Debate Resumed.

Hon. T. MOORE: I am pleased to hear that Dr. Hislop does not control and has no desire to control the hospital. Unfortunately his statement does not bear that out. I am on safe ground in saying that he has been interfering in the running of that hospital.

Hon. J. G. Hislop: I object to that statement and ask that it be withdrawn.

The PRESIDENT: I am sure that Mr. Moore will withdraw the statement objected to by the hon. member.

Hon. T. MOORE: I have no objection to withdrawing it if it is offensive to the hon. member. However, that is exactly

where we stand. This has been put up on a little Bill. We get a lot of stuff now. Dr. Hislop said he could wish that the Lotteries Commission would go into the question of the diet at orphanages. I hope those who are in charge of orphanages will take note of the doctor's statement. I do believe that outside what the Lotteries Commission gives to the orphanages, there are many avenues by the help of which those institutions exist. I hope that the diet, after all, is all that might be desired. To me it seems very wrong for the hon. member to bring in that stuff by way of argument in connection with the extension of the existence of the Lotteries Commission. The people in my district are perfectly willing, and even anxious, to contribute to charities, but there would be consternation in the country if the Lotteries Commission was voted out. As regards the letter which the doctor received from the Commission, I wish he had read the whole of it here.

Hon. J. G. Hislop: I read the whole letter at a previous sitting of the House. Mr. Moore may not have been present.

Hon. T. MOORE: The whole of it?

Hon. A. Thomson: It was bad luck that you were away!

Hon. T. MOORE: I was not away. I was here. At the end of that letter there is a paragraph. The doctor was taken to task by the Lotteries Commission. Members have frequently been asked to see the members of the Lotteries Commission and put up cases for their districts. I have done it, and doubtless other members have done it. I have, however, gone only on very few occasions to the Lotteries Commission; but that body has been very helpful. In this case a member of Parliament from outside made an application to the Commission. The Commission thereupon did the right thing, for what the member should have done was to approach the hospital board of the district if he wished to have some different arrangement made. Then he could have told the members of the board, "This is what I suggest you should send to the Lotteries Commission." That would have been the correct procedure.

Hon. J. G. Hislop: I rise again to make a personal explanation. The letter which was sent by me to the Lotteries Commission was a request from the Mt. Magnet Hospital Board.

Hon. T. MOORE: I have not said that it was not. I have said that the doctor should have said to the secretary of the board, who no doubt was present, "Here is what you ought to state, because I am a representative of another province, and other members deal with matters affecting this province." The doctor may laugh. I desire no kudos, and my name has never been mentioned in connection with any attempt to get money from the Lotteries Commission. I defy contradiction of that statement. I am inclined to think that the paragraph I have alluded to may have been left out from the letter, but that will not matter if it is read again. The concluding paragraph of the letter which the doctor read is as follows:—

The inadvisableness of accepting additional responsibilities with the consequent sidetracking of other equally representative persons may possibly suggest to you that your better course would be to forward the request to the people beforementioned, or to suggest to the secretary of the Mt. Magnet Hospital that if and when he approaches the Commission through the usual channels sympathetic consideration will be given to any request so submitted.

Member: Is that in "Hansard"?

Hon. J. G. Hislop: I did not read that.

Hon. T. MOORE: I thought it was omitted. The advice given was very decent and well put. I consider that the Lotteries Commission did the right thing. After all, it has been dealing with members of Parliament for years and years. It may be dealing with Dr. Hislop perhaps for the next few months. Therefore it was not necessary for him to intervene. I fear that the numbers in the House are against the Bill. At the same time I declare that if the people in the country had a vote on the question of whether they wanted the Lotteries Commission continued or not, they would certainly vote for its continuance. On that account I think members should vote for the extension desired.

On motion by the Honorary Minister, debate adjourned.

House adjourned at 6.7 p.m.

Legislative Assembly.

Thursday, 23rd November, 1944.

	PAGE
Questions: Workers' compensation, as to premiums for additional benefits	1955
Commonwealth drought relief, as to application to Western Australia	1955
Swan River fishing, as to licenses, catch, and offences	1956
Bills: Mortgagees' Rights Restriction Act Amendment, Council's amendments	1956
Transfer of Land Act Amendment, returned	1958
Metropolitan Milk Act Amendment, 2nd, Com., report	1960
Workers' Compensation Act Amendment, 2nd	1963
Natives (Citizenship Rights), Council's amendments	1965
Loan Estimates, 1944-45: Message, Com.	1954

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

QUESTIONS (3).

WORKERS' COMPENSATION.

As to Premiums for Additional Benefits.

Mr. LESLIE asked the Minister for Works:

(1) Will the workers' compensation premiums charged by the State Government Insurance Office need to be increased to cover the additional benefits proposed in the Workers' Compensation Act Amendment Bill now before Parliament?

(2) If so, what are the increases like to be?

The MINISTER replied:

(1) The likely effect upon premium rates is now being investigated.

(2) An increase in premium rates is considered likely, but it should not exceed 15 per cent.

Generally speaking, premium rates now charged by the State Government Insurance Office are 20 per cent. below those charged by the associated private insurance companies.

COMMONWEALTH DROUGHT RELIEF.

As to Application to Western Australia.

Mr. LESLIE asked the Minister for Lands:

(1) Has he noticed a report published in "The West Australian" in which Mr. Chifley, Federal Treasurer, is stated to have given an assurance that should farmers in Western Australia suffer total crop failure