

Legislative Council.

Tuesday, 29th November, 1938.

	PAGE
Questions: Railways, Diesel cars	2492
Taxation and Grants, State collections and Commonwealth payments	2492
Motion: Native affairs, to inquire by Royal Commission	2492
Bills: Bread Act Amendment, 1B.	2518
Friendly Societies Act Amendment, 1R.	2518
Jury Act Amendment, 3A.	2518
Lotteries (Control) Act Amendment, 2R.	2520
Leave of absence	2518

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

QUESTION—RAILWAYS.

Diesel Cars.

Hon. E. M. HEENAN asked the Chief Secretary: 1, Are the present Diesel rail cars operating satisfactorily? 2, Does the Government intend to construct additional cars for use in outlying centres?

The CHIEF SECRETARY replied: 1, Yes. 2, The matter is under consideration.

QUESTION—TAXATION AND GRANTS.

State Collections and Commonwealth Payments.

Hon. J. NICHOLSON asked the Chief Secretary: 1, What are the taxation figures for 1932-33 corresponding to the figures for 1937-38 shown in Treasury Return No. 15 printed with the Budget Speech in "Hansard" No. 7 of this year? 2, What are the figures of Commonwealth payments to and on behalf of Western Australia for the years 1930-31 and 1931-32 corresponding to the figures of Commonwealth payments for the years 1932-33 to 1937-38 shown in table on pages 29 and 30 of the Auditor General's report for 1938?

The CHIEF SECRETARY replied: The replies to these questions are in the nature of a return which I am laying on the Table of the House.

MOTION—NATIVE AFFAIRS.

To Inquire by Royal Commission.

HON. W. J. MANN (South-West) [4.36]: I move—

That in the opinion of this House a Royal Commission should be appointed by the Gov-

ernment to inquire into and report on—(1), the relationship between the Department of Native Affairs and all missions and missionaries; (2), the allegations made by the Chief Secretary (Hon. W. H. Kitson) and the Hon. H. Seddon in connection with the administration and control of natives.

I am taking this action mainly in consequence of statements and disclosures made by the Chief Secretary in this Chamber on Wednesday last when replying to a speech by Mr. Seddon, who had previously made certain allegations against the Department of Native Affairs. Members have already listened for over seven hours to speeches concerning the administration of the Department of Native Affairs, and I have no intention of joining in those marathon efforts. However, my remarks will occupy a little time, and I trust that members will show me the same forbearance as has been displayed towards other speakers on this subject. I must offer some justification for the motion and will do so as briefly as possible.

In the first place, I am fully aware that as recently as January, 1935, a Royal Commissioner (Mr. H. D. Moseley) reported upon the social and economic conditions of aborigines and persons of aboriginal origin. In the course of his investigations the Royal Commissioner examined the position of the missions very fully. Mr. Moseley's findings are outstanding by reason of the clear and unequivocal conclusions contained in his report and based on the widest possible evidence, on investigations made on the spot, and on personal contact. I view the report as an extremely human and valuable document. The suggestion for another Royal Commission does not in the slightest degree constitute a reflection upon the Royal Commission of 1935. Rather may the proposed Commission be regarded as supplementary, with a more limited scope. It is rendered necessary by statements and allegations of happenings that were not disclosed when the inquiries of the previous Royal Commission were made. The good name and reputation of missions generally has been attacked by the Chief Secretary as representative of the Government, despite his statement that the remarks he made did not apply to all missions or missionaries. He said—

I have been forced, much against my will, to make statements which have no doubt surprised members, which will surprise people outside and which will astonish many people associated with missionary effort in this State.

The question of the Chief Secretary's being forced to do something against his will is a matter of which he alone is judge. It is a question that concerns him. What concerns us is the seriousness of the statements and the fact that very much further evidence is necessary to substantiate them. The general impression, as I have been able to gather both in the precincts of this House and outside, is that the Chief Secretary said either too much or too little. As an approximate estimate I would say that when the Chief Secretary's speech in "Hansard" is measured up, it will be found to contain somewhere between 40 and 50 feet—not inches—of printed matter. Consequently it is not possible to refer to more than a very small portion of it. I make this observation because I may be charged with quoting only parts of the statement. Obviously unless I spend hours, I cannot do otherwise—if we are not to be here for a very long time indeed.

What concerns many people is that these serious and shocking allegations are made against missions to which this State is contributing, I understand, something like £40,000 a year. That is quite a large sum of money, and is provided by the State for the purpose of improving the lot of the natives and making their life somewhat more livable, or perhaps congenial, than it might otherwise be. I find it difficult to dissociate the Chief Secretary's remarks in support of the regulations around which this discussion has centred from his criticism of missions. In one place he said that the missions are really the crux of the objection taken to the regulations, and in the next sentence he added—

I believe the whole of the opposition to the regulations arises from one source.

The whole of the missions are indicted in one sentence, and in the next sentence the matter is narrowed down to "one source." Before I conclude I shall quote one or two statements which do not bear out that assertion. The Chief Secretary said:—

Anyone who has a knowledge of the North knows the source of trouble that many of the so-called missionaries have been not only to the department, but to the people in those districts. Frequently, the reason is the missionaries' lack of fitness for their work and knowledge of the natives. In many cases the so-called missionaries have not the ability to teach or train natives. They may have a knowledge of the Gospel, but I think I am correct in saying that such knowledge as they have is limited.

Later on he said—

Might I say too, with all respect to the missions of Western Australia, that the reputation of some of them is not very high. The department's desire is that the tone of those missions should be raised very materially.

He also quoted what he described as a civilised native who lives with his wife and children at La Perouse, New South Wales, as saying—

The second enemy—

We do not know who the first enemy is—

—is the white missionary who preaches to our people. Some of them are disgraceful.

The Chief Secretary followed this up by stating that most of the missionaries in New South Wales are attached to the United Aborigines Mission. All these statements made by the Minister, and presumably subscribed to by the Commissioner of Native Affairs, point to a definite lack of respect for and appreciation of missions and missionaries on the part of the department. Then, as if not satisfied with that kind of shooting at missions and missionaries, the Chief Secretary let loose a barrage of accusation the like of which has never before been heard in this State, and I hope will never again be heard. He went on to say—

I will now deal with some matters that might—

Note the qualification.

—might amount to charges against certain missions.

There is a very definite qualification, but it is not sufficient to remove from the minds of a great many people a very grave concern regarding the actual position of those missions. I would instance—

The exploitation of natives, sexual intercourse between staffs and inmates, homosexuality, impropriety, flogging, shooting, complete confinement and curtailment of freedom, forced marriages, expulsion for minor misdemeanours, the employment of irresponsible and unsuitable missionaries and workers, and the misuse of Government supplies. Other things that might be alleged against missions are—that sickness, disease and accident have not received the attention they deserve.

What a list! Capital offences, bestial charges, cruelty, inhuman and ferocious savagery! All made cold-bloodedly, and without malice! I repeat that the like of those charges has never been made in this State before, and I hope never will be again. They are all made against persons claiming to be servants of the God of love. The alle-

gations themselves are colossal, tremendous, and the fact that they are made against men—and, I presume, women—who are giving their lives to the work of uplifting the unfortunate makes the position even worse.

I contend that these things alone warrant the appointment of a Royal Commission in order that the people of the State may judge whether a department that has had, but has suppressed, knowledge of such happenings for years is fulfilling its proper functions. This list of charges will surely become historical; I am convinced that the accusations will go down in the history of this Parliament and of Western Australia as something to be ashamed of.

Hon. E. M. Heenan: If the statements are true, they should be made.

Hon. W. J. MANN: I am asking for the appointment of a Royal Commission in order to ascertain whether they are true. I am not making any allegations; I am merely repeating what has been said by the Chief Secretary. I wish the Chief Secretary to understand that there is nothing personal behind my action. I have a great regard for the hon. Mr. Kitson as a gentleman, as Leader of the House, and in his capacity as Minister formerly controlling the department. The Chief Secretary went on to say—

Few of the missions have properly equipped clinics or hospitals, and it has not been the rule to employ trained hospital nurses. Full advantage has, however, been taken by missions of native and Government hospitals for their charges at no cost to such missions. Some missions adopt the practice of ejecting inmates who make difficulties for them. Female inmates who fall are sometimes induced to enter into marriages of convenience. So-called marriages that are illegal take place, illegal inasmuch as they are not registered, and in consequence do not bring legal security to the issue thereof. This matter is being taken up by the Registrar General.

Mission natives convicted of misdemeanours are refused re-admission. The missionaries say, "Let the Government keep them." I will quote one or two instances by way of illustration. Whilst engaged in making bread, a native woman burned the bread. As a punishment she was refused rations, and with her husband and child, was expelled from the mission. A man, his wife and daughter were expelled from a mission because he broke the mission rules by leaving the place temporarily. This is indicative of the practice. I have, however, a list of more serious charges that could be made. At one mission, a boy was thrashed until he fell to the ground, and was then kicked by the missionary in charge, who had boots on. On the following day the same

boy was officially chastised before the assembly.

Another boy of 14 was similarly thrashed. For a breach of marital relations, a man was flogged with a doubled stock-whip, and chained by the neck with donkey chains to a post in the settlement. The wife of this native ran away, but was brought back and publicly thrashed in front of her husband and the assembled inmates. At the same mission, men have been chained by the neck to a post, and women have been chained for minor offences.

In reply to an interjection by me, the Chief Secretary said the Government had had no knowledge of these happenings until some time after they had occurred, and that the churches concerned had kept the matter quiet until the persons involved had left the State. I contend that if the statement is true, the church or churches concerned should be called upon to explain their attitude.

I do not propose to traverse the remaining allegations made by the Chief Secretary. They cover what will probably be found to represent several more pages of "Hansard," and members can look them up for themselves. Some of those allegations are positively revolting and all are serious. A perusal of the report furnished by the Royal Commissioner, Mr. Moseley, and of the annual reports of the Commissioner of Native Affairs made since the Chief Secretary's speech was delivered appears to indicate that there is very much room for better relations than at present exist between the department and the missions. How far either side is blameworthy cannot be assessed without a special investigation of the facts. I do not think that any person or any body of persons would be able to assess the true position until an investigation of the widest degree was made.

That there is a good deal to be said for the missions may be gleaned from a statement by the Royal Commissioner, Mr. Moseley. I wish to quote one or two of his statements. At page 9 he said—

Insofar as the physical well-being of the natives is concerned, I have already expressed the view that, generally speaking, the native on sheep and cattle stations is well cared for; his housing, clothing and food are adequate to his needs. The same may be said of the natives on missions . . . Those in charge of pastoral properties and missions do all they can to care for the sick natives; it is obvious, however, that their ability is limited. Each of the stations and missions which I visited carried a supply of medicines suitable for the treatment of ordinary every-day ailments, but serious

epidemics occur when something more than household methods are necessary.

Elsewhere the same gentleman made appreciative references to the splendid work done by the missions, and he did that with the same candour as he employed when he pointed out many faults in the departmental conduct of native stations. At page 16 the Royal Commissioner said—

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

I think that statement is very plain; there is nothing ambiguous about it.

Hon. E. H. H. Hall: I quoted that passage in my speech.

Hon. W. J. MANN: Those remarks will bear quoting again, because they were made by a gentleman whom we all respect as an impartial adjudicator, one who would not say what he did not honestly believe. One more quotation from his report will show that the Royal Commissioner did not adopt a view that could be challenged. He said—

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

That is something that has been said for the missions. The Chief Secretary adopted what to me appeared to be a peculiar viewpoint, and one which, in view of his allegations, calls for investigation when he said—

The department has never publicly criticised the missions. On the contrary I am afraid it has sought to hide their imperfections rather than bring them to light. The policy in the past has been to allow the churches to work out such matters for themselves. In view of what I have stated to-day, I ask: Just how have the churches done that?

Apparently the departmental officials have been aware of the revolting happenings that have been mentioned—or a good many of them—but have been satisfied to remain dumb. This quotation shows that the officials have made no serious charge against the missions, and I contend that with the know-

ledge they possess, they should have taken every possible step in order to bring about a cessation of such happenings.

The Minister spoke of a conference at Canberra. I understand the department desired to implement the long-range policy that was decided upon there. I have not been able to obtain a copy of the recommendations of the conference, but have been told that the recent action of the department respecting the regulations and other matters was contrary to the decision of the conference. I have no knowledge of the position, but this is what I understand. The following remarks of the Chief Secretary afford evidence of the need for an investigation by a Royal Commission:—

Quite a number of communications have followed the holding of that conference, and there have been quite a lot of misrepresentations of certain utterances by our Commissioner of Native Affairs at some of the discussions of the conference. The people who have been most active in disseminating this very misleading comment—to speak of it in a very mild way—are organisations associated with mission and church work.

That the disclosures made by the Chief Secretary, and the publication of his speech at considerable length, have shocked most people is clearly indicated by some of the comments that have since been made. I understand on excellent authority that the salient points of these allegations against missions and missionaries have been cabled abroad. If that be correct, by this time Western Australia will have received a most unenviable advertisement practically throughout the world. We know that once news is cabled to the centre of the Empire, it is only a matter of minutes before it reaches other countries and is disseminated over the widest possible area. The information was sent also to the Eastern States. What shall we say when we think of the damning indictment against this State that the information conveyed? Our leading newspaper, the "West Australian," wrote thus on the 25th November—

Conduct of Native Missions: A public not greatly concerned about details of the regulations under the Native Administration Act which are now being debated in Parliament must be amazed at the allegations against missions, missionaries and their staffs which were made by the Chief Secretary (Mr. Kitson) in the Legislative Council on Wednesday. At a time when decent Britons are seething with indignation over German treatment of Jews it is humiliating to be told that in Western Aus-

tralia, at institutions which are supposed to be looking after the natives' spiritual and physical welfare, such things as sexual immorality and perversion, cruelty in diversified forms (solitary confinement, flogging, kicking, and even "shooting," whatever that may imply) have been alleged with sufficient probability to warrant their proclamation by a responsible Minister.

Possibly it is too much to ask the Minister to divulge against whom, as individuals, and against what missions these allegations lie, but it would not be too much to ask whether the department believes such things are still going on and to name any missions which, in its opinion, are and always have been above suspicion. It is not fair that well-run missions should be implicated in charges of a general nature; indeed the public might well demand a great deal more information, and especially some explanation of the department's long silence. If these things have been going on at institutions of any denomination then the public will agree with the Minister that "the department has been quiet too long"—far too long.

The "floggings" are a matter of degree, for it may be that circumstances may sometimes justify corporal punishment. Inattention to sickness, disease and accidents does not brand the missions as any worse than the Government until very recent times; but "shooting," immorality, perversion, drunkenness, cruelty and misuse of Government supplies are serious accusations to be made by a Minister of the Crown against ministers of religion or their employees, and, since these charges have been made Parliament should promptly endorse the motion for their investigation by a Royal Commission.

The PRESIDENT: Will the hon. member resume his seat. As members are no doubt aware, Mr. Mann has infringed at least two, if not more, of the Standing Orders. I take it that the importance of the speech justifies his doing so, and I assume that he is doing so by the leave of the House. Without going very far into the matter, I must ask whether the House will allow the hon. member to proceed as he has been doing with his speech. Is it the wish of the House that the hon. member shall proceed with his speech in the way he is doing?

Leave given.

The PRESIDENT: Any Standing Orders may be infringed by leave of the House, but I thought it advisable to obtain the leave of the House, so that the hon. member might be enabled to proceed along the lines he is following and other members may know the position.

Hon. W. J. MANN: I realise that I have been sailing close to the wind.

Hon. J. Nicholson: Well into the wind.

The PRESIDENT: It was more than that.

Hon. W. J. MANN: I think the importance of the occasion demands that this leave should be given. I desire to be very careful about what I say.

The PRESIDENT: The hon. member has the leave of the House to proceed.

Hon. C. B. Williams: Do not make it too hot. The temperature is high enough already.

Hon. W. J. MANN: The "Current Comment" of the "West Australian" is clear and concise. There is nothing ambiguous about it, and it definitely calls for the action I am asking the House to take. A day or so later, I read an article in "The Record," the official organ of Roman Catholic Missions in this State. Portion of that article appeared in another newspaper, but I propose to quote the original for the information of members who have not seen it—

The Government's bid for complete autocracy in regard to the control of natives and native missions has met with a solid front of opposition from all sections of the community. The popular disapproval of the new regulations has been reflected in Parliament by no fewer than four motions for disallowance of 54 of the regulations and one motion for withdrawal of all of them. On Wednesday evening, the Chief Secretary, who is sponsoring the regulations, made a defence of the administration of the Native Affairs Department, but allowed his exasperation at criticism of his department to carry him to extreme lengths in vituperation of the missions generally. Before examining the grave charges made by him, it is to be hoped that what has been alleged under parliamentary privilege will be repeated in public, so that the missionaries may have untrammelled opportunity to defend themselves and that the whole affair may be cleared up once and for all.

Mr. Kitson is reported to have claimed that some of the "irregularities" which might be alleged against some of the missions include immorality, flogging, shooting, forced marriages, exploitation of natives, employment of irresponsible and unsuitable missionaries and misuse of Government supplies. If these allegations can be sustained, and are as sweeping as Mr. Kitson infers, it would seem to argue criminal silence and laxity on the part of his department. It is notable that in the cases quoted by the Chief Secretary, subsequent investigations turned out very conveniently—too conveniently for the exoneration of the mission workers concerned. It is not a satisfactory position that "the department knew nothing of these matters until the person concerned had left the State." In another case, "the men had parted company." Always the department seems to have acted too late or to have

been ignorant of those very matters which it is the business and *raison d'être* of the department to have known.

If such great scandals have occurred and gone unpublicised and unpunished under partial Governmental control, it is extremely probable that, endowed with omnipotence under the new regulations, nothing will ever be brought to light. Moreover, when the new regulations were first mooted—so long ago as ten years according to Mr. Kitson—why was not the prevalence of these scandals aired so that the general public would be alive to the obvious common-sense of letting the Government control these irresponsible missionaries? Why leave exposure until one is goaded by universal criticism and not able to view the issue in a calm, dispassionate light? Was silence maintained out of consideration for the churches or because of the fear of what the public would think of ten years of governmental laxity or inefficiency? In any case, it is a well-tried principle that it is both unwise and unfair to generalise from the particular. If isolated scandals have occurred, that in no way strengthens the case for governmental control, nor does it reflect adversely on the general membership of the churches concerned.

Regarding the specific position of the Catholic missions, it may be said that Mr. Kitson's allegations will not cause a panic. Our missions do not have "superintendents" or "coloured men" claiming to be missionaries. The extraordinary feature of the whole business is, that once serious abuses had been proved and yet continued, why the mission was not closed down. Moral reform would certainly not be effected by extended Government control. It is to be doubted whether Catholic missions have ever received such munificent assistance from the Government as to be able to misuse Government supplies. As for hospitals and properly equipped clinics, it might be noted that the Sisters of St. John of God are performing outstanding work in the North, and are tending the lepers whom no one else could be found to care for. The educational calibre of our missionaries is beyond question, while the most distinguished names among anthropological authorities on the blacks are those of Catholic priests and bishops. Again the church has had a somewhat vaster missionary experience than the Department of Native Affairs, and will welcome any investigation into Mr. Kitson's extraordinary allegations.

As a refutation of the charges made by the Chief Secretary, the article I have just quoted is effective. During the last few days many letters have appeared in the Press expressing disapproval of the allegations, and calling for an investigation. I have copies of some of these communications, if members wish to read them. I will quote some of the views of the writers to indicate the indignation that has been aroused in the minds of many reputable men. I have just read an extract from "The Record" that

covers a statement made by His Grace the Roman Catholic Archbishop of Perth, Dr. Prendiville. I need say no more than that His Grace very clearly and definitely voiced his indignation and condemnation of the statements made. Then the Dean of Perth, the Very Rev. R. H. Moore, said—

It is a great pity that the Minister for Native Affairs should have indulged in so much "mud-slinging." After all, missionaries are but human beings and sometimes err, and agents of missions (that is, persons employed by missions) are not always of the right type, some of them having been recommended to the missions by the department. When, however, unpleasant things do occur, they are invariably dealt with, and the discipline of missions can compare favourably with anything the department can show.

If "mud-slinging" is to be the order of the day then much worse could be said about the administration of the department. The "Ladder" (organ of the Aborigines Amelioration Association) has published things which the Minister has described as libellous, but he has not attempted to contradict them and the "Ladder," as well as myself, has not the protection that a Minister has from his place in the House.

The Rev. George Tulloch had comments of a similar nature to make. He said—

Under cover of privilege, statements have been made by a responsible Minister of the Crown, and it seems to me that, as a reasonable man, he should now be prepared to move in the House that a Royal Commission be appointed to inquire into these serious allegations.

Mr. Tulloch suggests that the Chief Secretary himself should move for the appointment of a Royal Commission and not leave it to a private member. Mr. Tulloch continued—

In my view such a Royal Commission is absolutely essential in view of the statements made by the Minister and supplied by the Commissioner of Native Affairs (Mr. Neville). All missions and native institutions under the Government should be inquired into so that the whole matter may be cleared up in the interests of the natives.

I read Mr. Kitson's statements with great interest and a feeling of disgust. The statements in themselves form the strongest indictment conceivable against the department and against the Minister personally.

Later on in his statement Mr. Tulloch said—

Speaking from knowledge of the Presbyterian Church, I can say that the statements made are without foundation. One thing that impresses me is that Mr. H. D. Moseley, the Royal Commissioner who inquired into the whole native problem, and who had all the files referred to by Mr. Kitson, did not make

a single charge of immorality against any missionary or mission situated in Western Australia.

Then again Mr. Edward Hogg, the President of the United Aborigines Mission, published in the "West Australian" a long letter from which I shall quote some extracts. At the outset, Mr. Hogg said—

First of all, and emphatically, the charges of immorality, injustices, cruelty, etc., do not apply to the United Aborigines Mission.

Again he said—

In answer we say that we are not disposed to accept the Minister's judgment as to who are or are not really missionaries. We can understand some missionaries being a source of trouble in some areas just as we can understand some Ministers being a source of trouble where starting-price betting flourishes.

I do not quite see where the connection comes in, but that is Mr. Hogg's statement. He continued—

We are not prepared to appoint either Mr. Kitson or Mr. Neville examiner in biblical knowledge or theology.

There is much more that I could read, but I do not wish to weary the House. I have other phases that I should like to deal with. Referring to newspaper comments on this matter, I notice that the Chief Secretary, in an interview given to a week-end paper, was reported to have said—

He wanted to make it plain that his charges were not levelled at present-day missionaries.

If that be so, then I wish to know as, I presume, a Royal Commissioner would require to know, why the Minister made reference to one mission and practically to one person, and why, on the other hand, he mentioned missions in a general sense. At no time, so far as I can recollect, or ascertain from my reading, has he indicated which missions are those, if any, that are deserving of such condemnation. I shall not refer to Mr. Seddon's allegations against the Department of Native Affairs. They were of a general nature and have been dealt with by the Chief Secretary. Full details appear in the records of this House, and those charges are fewer in number and of much less gravity. Nevertheless, the allegations were such as to warrant investigation in order that we may know whether the statements made to Mr. Seddon and given by him to this House were true.

I think I have said enough to warrant the House asking the Government to appoint a Royal Commission to undertake the neces-

sary inquiries. If these assertions and charges are permitted to go unchallenged, unanswered or unexplained, then as the years go on the unsavoury and criminal stigma against the people of Western Australia will tend to grow rather than to diminish, and we shall deserve the odium that will follow. I am not concerned with the regulations that have been responsible for this unfortunate incident, but as four motions for their disallowance are under consideration in another place, it might be advisable for the Government to withdraw those to which exception has been taken, at any rate, for the time being.

HON. J. M. DREW (Central) [5.23]: I rise to second and support the motion. In my opinion the allegations made against missions by the Chief Secretary should be probed to the very bottom. I was astounded, and I think every member of the House was astonished, too, at the number of offences, some of the very grossest character, laid against the native missions in this State. Perhaps I was more astounded than anyone else, because the charges indicated something contrary to my experience during a period extending over many years—up to 1927—during which, from time to time, I was in ministerial control of the Aborigines Department. I was the Minister entrusted with that responsibility by the Daglish Government, and during the period I was in control I introduced a Bill to amend the Aborigines Act. The measure was initiated in this Chamber and accepted by both Houses of Parliament. For three years under the Scaddan Government the administration of the Aborigines Act was in my hands, and from 1924 to 1927 under the Collier Government I discharged responsibilities affecting the natives but solely in connection with the North-West, because I was in charge of the North-West Department.

During the whole of that time, unless my memory is sadly at fault, not one instance of improper conduct alleged against missions was brought under my notice. However, about three years ago, while I was in temporary control owing to the absence of the responsible Minister, such an instance did come under my notice. I would have been loth to deal with it, if it could be said afterwards that I was unconsciously biased in favour of the party accused. In the circumstances such a thing could not have been

said. I gave careful and conscientious consideration to the matter. I was not satisfied with the capabilities or calling of the person chosen to make the investigation; I was not satisfied with the statements made, and I was much less satisfied with their source. I had grave doubts as to the guilt of the person who had been charged, and I informed Mr. Neville accordingly and gave him my reasons. Mr. Neville then said he would get a resident magistrate to make the inquiries. I do not know whether that was done, but apparently my decision was reversed, for it seems to be included in the charges that have been made against missions. I may be mistaken; it may not be so. It seems to me, however, that it is so. Even if after that long course of years, one man at a mission had been proved without doubt to have been guilty of some act of impropriety, surely the mission itself should not be loaded with odium!

In such circumstances, the charges made against the missions by the Chief Secretary are of the gravest character. Some of them constitute the worst of crimes. If there was proof, neither time nor distance should have stood in the way of bringing the culprits to justice.

Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. J. M. DREW: This course of conduct is alleged to have occurred over a period of ten years. I ask, did the Chief Protector of Aborigines or the Commissioner for Native Affairs, by which title that officer is now known, bring these matters before the responsible Minister, and if so, with what result? An opportunity occurred to make a searching inquiry when the Royal Commissioner, Mr. Moseley, was appointed in 1934 to advise on matters in relation to the conditions and treatment of aborigines.

Hon. L. B. Bolton: That is when these matters should have been cleared up.

Hon. J. M. DREW: In paragraph (g) of Mr. Moseley's Commission he was specifically required to investigate, report and advise upon missions. On page 16 of his printed report he spoke of the wholehearted desire of the missionaries to benefit the natives, and added—

Beyond doubt amongst the natives of Western Australia they are doing, without exception, a work of great self-sacrifice.

I believe Mr. Mann quoted portion of that report.

[Resolved: That motions be continued.]

Some of the sites selected for missions were criticised by Mr. Moseley. He thought that the elements of civilisation should be introduced before Christianising began; but the worst word he had to say against the missions was—

They are prone to be too indulgent with the natives.

In contrast to this, the Royal Commissioner was anything but flattering in his reference to the punishment of natives at the Moore River Settlement controlled by the Government. On page 12 of his report, he said—

I was not entirely satisfied with the evidence of the superintendent on this point. I was shown a place of detention, commonly called "the boob," and I disliked its appearance very much. A small detached "room" made of posts driven into the ground, floor of white sand, scarcely a gleam of light, and little ventilation, and I was told that inmates have been incarcerated in this place for as long as 14 days. It is barbarous treatment and the place should be pulled down. If detention is necessary, and at this early stage in my investigation I do not propose to express an opinion, it should be carried out in a more suitable place and the maximum period of 14 days prescribed by regulations, considerably reduced. Records of such punishment should be sent to the Chief Protector.

Mr. Moseley, as Royal Commissioner, characterised such treatment as barbarous and said the place of detention should be pulled down. This is a native settlement, not in the far North, but quite close to Perth—in fact, almost within a stone's throw of Perth. I do not blame the Chief Secretary or the Commissioner of Native Affairs. Shortage of money is responsible; but let me add that no such strictures have been passed by the Royal Commissioner on any of the missions.

The charges against the missions cannot be allowed to remain where they are. They call for investigation by a Royal Commission. They affect not only the native mission authorities, but every Minister who has been in control of the department during the last ten years; and they reflect on the Commissioner of Native Affairs if he failed to bring the offences before the notice of his Minister as soon as he gained a knowledge of them. Only by means of a Royal Commission can all this be discovered.

HON. C. F. BAXTER (East) [5.35]: This motion is in two sections. The first deals with the relationship between the De-

partment of Native Affairs and the missions and missionaries: the other with the allegations made in this House. Under our Constitution we are charged by the Imperial Government with the protection of the natives of the State. It is regrettable that such charges as were voiced in this Chamber last week should have been made. Year in and year out, societies within the Commonwealth and in other parts of the world, notably Great Britain and America, are continually printing articles in their journals and disseminating information in other ways about the bad treatment of natives in Western Australia. Unfortunately, charges of the kind I have mentioned lend colour to the action taken by the societies to which I have referred. It might almost be said that the native question is an international one. The charges reflect greatly not only on the people of our State, but on the Commonwealth of Australia. We have missions established here working under the direction of various religious bodies, whose object is to protect and assist in caring for the natives of the State. On the other hand, we have a Government department costing a huge amount of money each year, presided over by a Commissioner of Native Affairs.

Consider the charges that were made in this House last Wednesday evening. The Minister said that, in addition to the charges that he made, the Commissioner of Native Affairs could have brought other charges, thus proving conclusively to me that bitterness exists between the Commissioner of Native Affairs and the missions. Consequently the necessity for a thorough inquiry to ascertain the cause of the trouble is apparent. We should try to discover the reason for the bitterness between two bodies that should try to work in harmony. Possibly the bitterness is responsible for some of the later regulations that have been framed. The average person concerned with the regulations seems to be of the opinion that they would not be objectionable if they were administered by some person other than the Commissioner. Personally, I have been unable to ascertain the reason for the bitterness; but there does seem to be very strong feeling against the Commissioner of Native Affairs which I cannot say is justified. My experience does not show me the justification.

We have had one of the most able investigators to inquire into native affairs. He

is a man of an analytical turn of mind, competent, trained to sift evidence and arrive at decisions. He has the full confidence of every person in the State. This gentleman made a thorough investigation into the question less than four years ago. He travelled over an enormous area of the State and got into touch with every person concerned with the natives. He made every inquiry. He assured himself of the rights and wrongs of everything connected with the natives, and finally presented a report. There is nothing in his report to justify the charges that have been made. Charges appear to have been laid aside for some considerable time by the department, for what reason goodness only knows. Had the Commissioner known of them, I feel certain he would have reported upon them and that action would have been taken.

We have been told that the charges go back over a period of ten years. During all that period the missions have been carrying on their work and it must be admitted they should receive encouragement for the good work they are doing. They may be misguided in some aspects of their work; but is it not a matter of trying to work with them to overcome those difficulties and assist them? The missions may have had an officer, or even officers, who have transgressed; but is it not a human failing to transgress? That does not warrant such a bitter attack reflecting on all the missionaries and upon their control of the natives of the State.

There is only one way in which this matter can be dealt with satisfactorily and that is by the appointment of a Royal Commissioner competent to sift thoroughly every allegation that has been made regarding the natives and the administration of native affairs. The sooner that is done, the better. The present feeling is that some of the existing regulations should be disallowed. Public confidence has been shaken, and the greatest care should be exercised regarding the regulations. Some of them have been in existence for a long period of years, practically since the Department of Native Affairs was inaugurated. These regulations are necessary, but I am referring to the new regulations, on which I am in agreement with the two previous speakers that particular inquiry should be made. I also agree with them upon the necessity for the appointment of a Royal Commission. The greatest care should be exercised in the ap-

pointment of the Royal Commissioner and the appointment should be made forthwith to reassure the people that, whatever has happened up to date, the first opportunity is being taken to clear the matter up for all time and to put the control of our natives on a much better footing than has obtained in the past. I support the motion.

HON. G. B. WOOD (East) [5.43]: I cannot claim, like the two previous speakers, to have had experience in the administration of native affairs; but I have for a great number of years come into contact with natives not only in the North-West, but also in the Great Southern and eastern districts. At the outset, I wish to say that I deeply regret the allegations made by the Chief Secretary against the native missions. I do not believe most of those allegations. I do not know why anybody should think that missionaries go to the North for motives other than those that are sincere. The missionaries are sincere in their efforts to uplift the native community. What other object could they have in going to the North?

Member: There is nothing else they can get out of it.

Hon. G. B. WOOD: That is so. We heard about an ex-jockey who went as a missionary to the North with a harmonium. What could he hope to get out of acting as a missionary? He may have been bad in the past, but he would have only one objective in view in proceeding to the North, namely, the uplift of the natives. The charges that have been made are general, not specific, and, in my opinion, the only way to clear the matter up is to agree to the appointment of a Royal Commission to make a thorough investigation.

Most of these charges could only be based on native evidence. My knowledge of the native leads me to believe that he is not too reliable. I do not say this to the detriment of the native; he does not know much better, but a native will generally say what he believes the questioner wants him to say. Again, a native will give two or three different versions of the one thing in the one day if he thinks that a particular answer will please the questioner.

I have no intention of traversing all the charges that have been made. The charge against the missions of supplying liquor to natives is, I consider, absurd in the extreme. One of the things that was absolutely

tabooed when I was in the North was the giving of liquor to natives. Such a thing might have been done by a few very low people, but I cannot imagine that any missionary would do it. A missionary would have no motive in supplying liquor to natives. As I said, I have no intention of dealing with all the charges, but I thought I would mention that one matter.

I consider that the Chief Secretary's speech has done a tremendous amount of harm to Western Australia. As one that has the interests of the State at heart, I take great exception to such charges being given out to the world. Whatever the finding of the Royal Commission may be, assuming that a Royal Commission is appointed, the Chief Secretary's statements will take a lot of living down. Years ago Dr. Roth made a lot of charges against the squatters. Some of them might have been true, but, generally speaking, they were not true, and the making of those charges did the State a lot of harm. There are people in other parts of the world who are looking for matter of this sort; they want to hear of things of this kind, and we are playing right into their hands by supplying it.

The statement has been made that the missionaries sought to learn the native language. What chance has any man to learn the language except by going out and living amongst the natives? The missionaries after being amongst the natives soon pick up the language. When I went to the North-West I started to learn the language, but the natives were so keen to speak English that I experienced great difficulty in learning the native language. I consider it unnecessary for missionaries to learn the language, but if it is necessary, that is the time and place to learn it. I do not know whether the University attempts to teach the native language, but if it does, I am afraid it is confronted with a very difficult task. I knew a good many of the native words used at Roebourne, but I found that quite a different dialect was spoken by the natives at Carnarvon. That suggestion I consider to be one of the silliest that was ever made.

Apparently the Chief Secretary, in his speech, set out to justify the department, and did not care how many innocent people he hurt in the process. His whole objective was to justify the department at the expense of the missionaries. I cannot approve of that. There may have been missionaries who

misbehaved themselves, but I will not have it that that charge can fairly be levelled against all the missionaries in Western Australia. I hope the House will approve the motion and that the Government will give effect to it.

HON. J. A. DIMMITT (Metropolitan-Suburban) [5.49]: The other evening I congratulated the Chief Secretary upon his speech, because it struck me as being an excellent piece of oratory in which he marshalled his matter very well, but I cannot congratulate him upon the subject matter advanced by him in defence of the regulations, mainly because the serious accusations must have been known to the Chief Secretary for some years, and the time to make the disclosure was during the sittings of the Royal Commission a few years ago. I suggest that the only reason why that course was not taken was that the accusations were not supported by evidence that would be accepted by the judicial mind of the Royal Commissioner. If that was not so, what was the justification for silence? The Chief Secretary owed it to his department; he owed it to himself as the Minister then controlling the department, and he owed it to the natives to disclose the position at that time as he has disclosed it now. As he did not do so on that occasion, I suggest that he failed in his public duty. The Minister, having made those charges of abominable conduct against certain missionaries, cannot take exception to the demand now being made by those he has accused for an opportunity to defend themselves. I have pleasure in supporting the motion for the appointment of a Royal Commission.

HON. J. CORNELL (South) [5.50]: I took no part in the debate on the motion for the disallowance of the regulations following the long stretch of oratory indulged in by Mr. Seddon in putting one side of the case and the Chief Secretary in putting the other side of the case. I consider that sufficient has been said to warrant the holding of an impartial inquiry. As regards the Minister, we have to be just and we have to be charitable. I presume that what he put before the House in refutation of Mr. Seddon's statement—we can take it that Mr. Seddon presented the case as it was supplied to him—was merely matter supplied to him by the department. What he has told us in justifi-

cation or refutation is merely the case of the department, and the only way to sift the wheat from the chaff and ascertain whether there is any foundation in fact for the allegations against the missionaries and other people is by holding an impartial inquiry. Many years ago I had to do with natives in New South Wales and I think one can say that, taking them by and large, they are inveterate liars. As Mr. Wood stated, however, that is occasioned largely by the fact that natives desire to please the questioner and to give the answer that they think he wants. I hope the House will agree to the motion and that, in justice to all concerned, the Government will appoint a Royal Commission without delay to make a thorough inquiry.

HON. C. H. WITTENOOM (South-East) [5.52]: I shall support the motion. In the first place, I inclined to the view that, with the report of the Moseley Commission and the statement of the Chief Secretary, we should have all the information that we could desire, but the questions raised have assumed such importance in the public mind that I am disposed to vote for the motion. I listened with great interest to the speech of the Chief Secretary last Wednesday evening, and, I might say, with some amazement, and while I commend him upon the able manner in which he delivered it, I greatly regret that the speech was made at all. However, the Minister's desire was to secure the defeat of the motion moved by Mr. Seddon for the disallowance of the regulations, and while, in my opinion, he will be successful in that, I am confident that the same result could have been achieved by less drastic measures and without besmirching the fair name of Western Australia in the eyes of the world as regards missionary work amongst the natives. I do not like using the word "besmirching," but it certainly is an appropriate word in this instance. I feel that the disclosures made by the Minister were totally unnecessary and that the matter could have been dealt with in quite a different manner.

Hon. J. Cornell interjected.

HON. C. H. WITTENOOM: Never before, to my knowledge, has such a scandal been created in connection with the care of natives in Western Australia, that is, provided the statements made by the Chief Secretary are correct. If those statements have

not been exaggerated, all I can say is that it places the Department of Native Affairs in a very poor light indeed. A stranger reading the Minister's speech in "Hansard" could not be blamed for accepting the position therein detailed as being almost general amongst the missions and missionaries in this State. That, we know, is not the case. Those of us who have lived in the North-West—I have and so has Mr. Wood—have come into contact with the missionaries, and we can say that nobody by the wildest stretch of imagination could believe that life on a mission station, with the severe climatic conditions and often privations, is an attractive one. The missionaries must certainly be imbued with an earnest desire to benefit the natives, or they would not take up that life at all. Therefore one thing or the other must be done; either the names of the missions that have been properly conducted must be published, or those that have been culpable should be exposed. No doubt many of the missions have been properly conducted, and when I speak of a mission being culpable, I do not include instances of perhaps isolated offences in which the culprit has been dismissed or otherwise punished and prompt measures have been taken to rectify the wrong. For the Chief Secretary to generalise, as he did, was not at all fair to many of the missionaries.

The most extraordinary part of the Minister's speech was that indicating that although the files have been in the hands of the department, in some instances for quite a long period, and the unfortunate details have been known to the various Governments, no reference was made to any attempt to improve matters. If the acts of some criminal missionaries have been known to the department, why have those offenders not been dealt with by law? Why has not the Commissioner of Native Affairs recorded those happenings? Surely he must have been aware of what was going on? Natives cannot keep matters of that kind to themselves, but must talk about them to others. True, a native will give any answer that he thinks his questioner might like, but I cannot believe that such happenings could have been kept quiet, or that the inspectors have not had a good deal of information. Had a few public exposures been made, the unsavoury state of affairs mentioned by the Chief Secretary would have been ended years ago, and there would not have been

any need for thus advertising Western Australia all over the world. Anyway, why this hush-hush attitude?

Hon. A. Thomson: It would have been much better had affairs been allowed to remain that way.

Hon. C. H. WITTENOOM: I am inclined to agree with the hon. member. The Labour Party has been in office for 12 of the last 15 years and has had control of the department. During the three years the National Party and Country Party were in office, a considerable amount of emergency legislation had to be passed, and it was a time full of worry and trouble. Still, that would not absolve them from responsibility.

Hon. J. Nicholson: No, that would not exonerate them.

Hon. C. H. WITTENOOM: The fact remains that they had a more trying time during their period of office—

Hon. G. B. Wood: Do not you think that the whole show was controlled by one man?

Hon. C. H. WITTENOOM: I do not know; I would not like to say. There is another point to be borne in mind. Year after year has passed and on our desks have been placed copies of the annual reports of the Department of Native Affairs. Those reports have revealed the number of natives and half-castes in the State, the accommodation provided for them, and all sorts of information, but no reference has been made to such matters as those mentioned by the Chief Secretary. Yet that information must have been available, and if such occurrences were taking place, the House should have been informed of them through the annual reports. If more information had been given, the hands of the Government would have been strengthened. In spite of the Chief Secretary's speech, however, I am inclined to think things are not quite as bad as he would have us believe, though quite probably—in fact, it is almost certain—the majority of missions have had isolated experiences of an unpleasant kind. It is quite on the cards that they have all had one or two cases of the type referred to by the Chief Secretary.

We must not forget that the Australian native is of an extremely low type. To suggest that he is not is futile. He cannot be treated like a white man. A remarkably small percentage of natives, either full-bloods or half-castes, rises above the normal level, which is not high. A few perhaps are a little superior to their fellows; but very

few. We are told all about such cases. We are informed how good they are in school, and how excellent they are at games. I am afraid, however, that there are very few of that calibre. I have seen natives in the North-West, on the Murchison and in the South-West, and in spite of the fact that they live in dirt and in squalor, and in-breed and have intercourse with whites, they always appear to be happy and laughing, and apparently in good health.

Hon. J. Cornell: That is their salvation.

Hon. C. H. WITTENOOM: I cannot help thinking that it is not in their nature to be unhappy at all.

Hon. A. Thomson: I do not think they could be otherwise than unhappy under present conditions.

Hon. C. H. WITTENOOM: I am sure the hon. member must have seen very few natives or half-castes who were unhappy or miserable. Eating, smoking, etc., represent the apex of their emotions. However, as Christians, as I suppose we all are, we must care for these natives whose country we have taken. We have also deprived them of their means of livelihood, namely, the hunting of game.

Whatever is done for the natives, I hope that we will not have one single policy for the whole of the State. Let us have three or four divisions. The natives in the South-West, with whom Mr. Thomson, Mr. Piesse and I are acquainted, are entirely different from those in the Lower Murchison and the Upper Murchison, and those in the Murchison are different from those in the Kimberleys and the North-West. There are really three different problems, and I hope that, as time goes on, the natives in the State will be divided into three groups, for whom separate regulations will be provided. I intend to support the motion, because I do not think that anything short of an inquiry will satisfy the public.

HON. L. B. BOLTON (Metropolitan) [6.5]: Although generally opposed to the appointment of Royal Commissions and select committees to undertake work which, in my opinion, should be done by members of Parliament, I feel that the present is an occasion on which I am justified in supporting the proposal for the appointment of a Royal Commission. So much has been said about the native question within the last few days that for me to cover the ground already

traversed would be unnecessary; but I should like to say that my experience of the natives of this State extends over 50 years. Although I cannot claim North-West experience, like Mr. Wittenoom and Mr. Wood, I have seen quite a lot of natives in the Midland district and in other centres.

I remember the first native I saw on my arrival in this State in June, 1887. There are some things that live in one's memory, and the appearance of that native is still fresh in my mind. I recollect asking, in my early youth, who was in charge of natives in Western Australia, and being informed that there was a protector. After having heard the statements made by the Chief Secretary, while I have no desire to do an injustice to the Commissioner of Native Affairs—formerly known as the Chief Protector of Aborigines—I feel that somebody has fallen short in his duty. Speaking on the native question in this House in August last, I expressed the opinion that quite a lot of the trouble experienced in the control of natives in this State was due to the fact that one man was in control of natives from the north to the south and from the east to the west.

Hon. A. Thomson: It is too big a task for one man.

Hon. L. B. BOLTON: I agree that the job is too big for one man.

Hon. G. B. Wood: Hear, hear!

Hon. L. B. BOLTON: I expressed that opinion in August, when, like other members, I was asked carefully to review certain regulations that were being gazetted for the control of natives, and I still hold that opinion. Had more of the recommendations of the Royal Commissioner, Mr. Moseley, been given effect to, and separate control established as between the north and the south, not nearly the amount of trouble would have been experienced that has occurred in the administration of native affairs. That does not exonerate those in control for having allowed to occur the wrongs the Chief Secretary alleges have been perpetrated. I agree with Mr. Wood that what the Chief Secretary told us is possibly the worst advertisement the State has ever had, or could ever have. I will support the appointment of a Royal Commission in the hope that justice will be done. If the charges can be proved, those responsible for the evil should be brought to book, even now. I also desire

that the names of the missions doing honourable work should be cleared of the accusations made by the Chief Secretary.

HON. J. M. MACFARLANE (Metropolitan-Suburban) [6.10]: I intend to support the motion. One point in the Chief Secretary's speech should be noted; that is he quoted from files. The case he submitted was not entirely his own, but that of the department. I would like him to be dissociated as far as possible from the odium now being poured on the administration. There has been something very wrong in the administration of native affairs for the department to allow such happenings to occur, without their having been brought under notice in order that they might be dealt with by Parliament, or by the Royal Commissioner. Having heard the statement of the Chief Secretary who, I believe, was perfectly honest in the case he put forward, and having also heard the remarks of Mr. Drew, so long associated with this department, I feel that the appointment of a Royal Commission is justified. The publicity given to this matter is bad for the State as a whole. Mr. Drew stated that he had had no evidence of such occurrences, and I feel there is something wrong in the administration of the department. Because of that, and because the charges made against the missions have been so roundly denied, I feel that the representatives of the missions have a right to appear before a Royal Commission, and be given an opportunity to refute the allegations and clear themselves of the reflection cast upon them. I support the motion, which I feel sure the House will carry, and trust the Government will give effect to it.

HON. E. H. H. HALL (Central) [6.12]: Mr. Macfarlane has struck a note to which members should give attention. The Chief Secretary the other evening told members of this Chamber that he was basing his remarks on files in the possession of the department, and he invited members to peruse those files. This afternoon I asked Mr. Mann whether he had taken advantage of the Minister's offer. He replied in the negative. He gave me to understand that he did not think it worth his while.

Hon. W. J. Mann: No such thing!

Hon. E. H. H. HALL: That was the impression he gave me—that it was not worth his while.

Hon. W. J. Mann: That is a wrong impression altogether.

Hon. E. H. H. HALL: Before speaking on Mr. Seddon's motion for the disallowance of regulations made under the Native Administration Act, and after having been shocked by the statements made by the Chief Secretary, I endeavoured to get in touch with him personally in order to make myself conversant with the files to which he had referred. Unfortunately, the Chief Secretary had other duties to perform, and was out, and it was not until 3 o'clock in the afternoon that I was able to establish contact with him. In the limited time available to me, I read certain of the files, and was more than ever puzzled. I am sorry that no other members have seen fit to go to the Chief Secretary's office and endeavour to obtain some idea of the difficulties surrounding this perplexing problem. Although the Chief Secretary was speaking from a knowledge of the files, that to my mind did not justify him in referring to the shocking occurrences that took place some years ago. As the files indicate, the people concerned have long since left the State, and, as I said on Thursday, the Minister was not justified in raking up incidents of the past in order to endeavour to establish a case for the continuance of the regulations.

Sitting suspended from 6.15 to 7.30 p.m.

Hon. E. H. H. HALL: Undoubtedly the question of native affairs is most complex, and requires a great deal of study. People set out with good intentions to uplift the natives and improve their condition, but it is not difficult to conceive that if they have not a good grip of native psychology, their efforts may have the opposite effect to that intended. The Department of Native Affairs must have had many difficulties to contend against. During my ten years in this chamber it has been brought home to me that Government departments—I speak from a quarter of a century's knowledge of three of them—encounter extreme disadvantages. We know from the reports of Royal Commissions that diverse opinions exist between two important sections that have the welfare of the natives at heart—the department and the missionaries. Whilst I consider that further inquiry on the lines of the second part of the motion would prove absolutely futile, I do hold that great need exists for clarifying the position.

Exhaustive inquiries should be made as to the best methods by which the department may function as it is intended to function. The Department of Native Affairs, the permanent head of which is styled the Commissioner of Native Affairs, is the department controlling the natives. It is not the function of any missionary to dictate to that department how the welfare of the natives shall be attained. We cannot obtain anything like the efficiency we have a right to expect until and unless we get those two sections, the department and the missions, working amicably together.

Let me recall the extensive inquiry made by Mr. Moseley, and the fact that members of this Chamber and members of another Chamber, and also the general public, acclaimed Mr. Moseley's report. The Government is blameworthy for not having striven to give effect to more of the recommendations contained in that report. I feel sure that if the Government had done so, we would have been spared many hours of debate given to this subject. But as regards the second part of the motion, a continuous Royal Commission would not improve the position. There is room, however, for improvement in regard to the first part. As I am not able to divide my vote, I shall cast it for the Royal Commission, though well knowing the futility of the proceeding unless the Government will carry out the recommendations made.

HON. H. SEDDON (North-East) [7.35]: As I intend to vote for Mr. Mann's motion, it is only right for me to make a few remarks. My own motion was based on certain documents which are available. When the Minister finished his speech last week, I congratulated him on his courage in making such specific statements. The Minister is seized with a sense of responsibility, and certainly realised the effect which his statements would produce. He himself mentioned that he had files containing the grounds for his allegations, and to those files he referred members. He was also careful to point out that he did not include all missions and all missionaries in the charges he made. He expressed the fullest sympathy for those doing their best to uplift the natives. Unfortunately, however, the impression he has created is that all missions are left under the charges, as no exceptions have been made. Therefore the matter cannot remain where it is now, and the House asks, in the

interests of the missions and of the missionaries covered by the Chief Secretary's lengthy and definite speech, that an opportunity should be given to the missions and the missionaries to place their contentions before an impartial tribunal. That is the stand I take in connection with Mr. Mann's motion.

HON. E. H. ANGELO (North) [7.37]: Many members have expressed the desire that the missions and missionaries should have an opportunity of clearing their name, and I fully agree that there should be a Royal Commission to investigate thoroughly the Chief Secretary's allegations. I contend, however, that we as members of Parliament have another duty, and that because of this other duty we should emphasise the demand for a Royal Commission. In my opinion, it is the duty of every member of Parliament to facilitate, whenever he can, the administration of the law. Every department of State should be protected when we can protect it. The genesis of this trouble is the issue of certain regulations under the Native Administration Act. The matter is nothing new, because only about four months ago one set of regulations came before Parliament, to be followed by a second lot.

Hon. C. F. Baxter: They were not laid on the Table.

Hon. E. H. ANGELO: But they have been gazetted and discussed. It is said that those regulations were far too drastic. The chief objection to them seems to have come from people interested in the missions. Their greatest objection is, "Why should we be asked to take out a license before we can go on native reserves?" For four months the department has been practically silent, but lately it has been driven by the very strong opposition—four or five motions in another place, and already two here and a third one, objecting to all the regulations, withdrawn—to put up a vigorous case why the regulations should be drastic. What appeals to me is whether that statement is correct. Was the Chief Secretary right in the allegations he made?

Hon. A. Thomson: Was he wise in making them?

Hon. E. H. ANGELO: The Chief Secretary himself is the best judge of that. He may have been driven to make them by the strong opposition to the regulations. At any rate, the position remains that he

launched a most serious indictment against missionaries of this State. He says that in making that indictment he is supported by files which he can produce. On the other hand we hear that his statements are not correct. His predecessor in office this afternoon gave us to understand that if some of them are correct, others are grossly exaggerated. For that reason I think we should have a Royal Commission to determine exactly who is right. If the Chief Secretary is right, it is the Government's duty to support the Commissioner of Native Affairs. If he has been forced into taking strong action, forced into issuing such strong regulations, the Royal Commissioner will tell us so; and then we as members of Parliament should back up the department and see that the laws we make are carried out. But if the position is not as stated by the Chief Secretary, if it has been grossly exaggerated and the Royal Commissioner tells us so, it will be necessary for the Government to change the administration of the Department of Native Affairs. The Royal Commissioner, whoever he may be, should be a man able to sift evidence, to understand departmental files, and to return findings such as may be expected from a man of judicial mind. I support the motion.

HON. J. NICHOLSON (Metropolitan) [7.44]: Mr. Mann, I feel sure, will be congratulated by every member of the House, and also by the Leader of the House, for bringing forward this motion calling for the fullest investigation into a matter of the gravest character, a matter reflecting not only upon the State of Western Australia but also upon those connected with the control and management of the aborigines. When speaking to another motion a few days ago, I stated that I welcomed the motion of which notice had been given by Mr. Mann, and I repeat that statement. If the Government realises the need that really exists for a thorough investigation of this important question, it will be for the benefit of all of us. The control of the natives is one of those sacred duties which the Government undertook and which devolves upon the Government, aided by voluntary effort. The fact that the work of the missions has been of benefit has been manifested throughout the years, and if the Government were deprived of that assistance, its task would be rendered the

more difficult adequately to meet the responsibilities. Therefore we are entitled to ask the Government to grant the request contained in the motion, and I hope it will be granted.

I had in mind the desirability of extending the investigation, because I incline to the view that when the opportunity arises to investigate the operations of any department so important as this one, we should look into every phase that might be of advantage in assisting the Government to discharge more satisfactorily the duty devolving upon it. I allude to the desirability of including a reference in the Commission to review the Native Administration Act in the light of the experience gained since the measure was passed in 1936, and consider whether some wise amendments cannot be suggested. There could be added to the motion a clause to this effect—

(3) The provisions of the existing Native Administration Act, 1905-36, and the introduction of amendments being desirable in the interests of the State and in the control and management of natives.

That would embrace something of a far-reaching nature. We have heard the statement made by several members that when the Act was passed, we embodied provisions outside of those recommended by the Royal Commissioner, Mr. Moseley, after his inquiry into the matter a few years ago. We have had the benefit of further experience. We have seen the Act in operation, and we have had before us not one set but two sets of regulations, and on each occasion when the regulations have been tabled Parliament has been confronted with motions for their disallowance. From that, is it not palpable something needs adjustment? I am sure the Minister will be the first to recognise the desirability of securing smooth running in the management of such a department. The dissent to the regulations is not confined to this House: it has also been raised in another place. Undoubtedly something is wrong and needs to be righted. If provision for investigation into the Act were included in the motion, recommendations could be made regarding the form the regulations should take—the scope of the regulations and the extent to which they should operate.

In view of what has been said by members here and in another place, the question of

leaving under the control of the Commissioner of Native Affairs the whole management of such a huge department might be seriously considered. He has to roam over practically a million square miles of territory. The idea of giving the sole control of such a vast area to one man, an area with a native population very great as compared with that of the other States, demands consideration.

Hon. G. W. Miles: The Royal Commissioner recommended a division.

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: The hon. member is quite correct. The churches, for administrative purposes, divide the territory, and thus we have a northern diocese, a southern diocese, and so on, each presided over by a bishop.

The Chief Secretary: But they all conform to one policy.

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: Let me point out that the bishop controlling a diocese in the North must familiarise himself with the conditions there in order to apply the policy in the way most beneficial to the people under his jurisdiction. If that were not done, one could understand the grave disability that one individual would experience in endeavouring to control so vast a territory as that of Western Australia. It is not as if this were a small State such as Victoria or Tasmania, with only a limited number of natives. In fact, I believe that in Tasmania there are now no aborigines at all. If we can transform the native population into useful citizens, we shall have achieved something worth while, but this cannot be done, I contend, without the aid of the missions and of the people who have interested themselves and are prepared still to interest themselves in the welfare of the natives.

There is another aspect. Some members possibly are inclined to misunderstand the position of the Minister. I was glad to hear Mr. Cornell make his remarks: we must be just and examine the causes that led to the Minister making his speech. I repeat that in the circumstances that confronted the Minister, he was justified in making his statement to the House. Let me point out why I maintain that is right. We as members of this House are asked to adjudicate between the case most ably presented by Mr. Seddon and the case in answer put forward by the Chief Secretary. The Minister, necessarily, had to bring to light certain facts—he did not bring to light all the facts, and that is

where an inquiry by Royal Commission will be of great advantage—in answer to the case advanced by Mr. Seddon, so that he might be able to justify the regulations submitted by the department. I advance a more important view, namely, that if we had not been furnished by the Minister with information such as he did supply, we could not have adjudicated between the two cases.

How could we have formed an opinion in favour of, or contrary to, Mr. Seddon's motion had we not heard both sides of the case? In an ordinary court trial the judge has before him the fullest evidence and information that can be presented on behalf of each party. In the circumstances, the Minister restrained himself in the information given, and we are not justified in blaming him for giving those facts. Had he not given us the information, and had it come to our knowledge subsequently that the information was available, we would have said to him, "Why did not you give the House that information, so that we could adjudicate on the motion?"

Hon. G. W. Miles: Why did not the Commissioner of Native Affairs bring those facts to light when the Royal Commissioner was inquiring?

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: I agree with the hon. member on that point. The proper time at which to bring up facts relative to the conduct of missions was when the investigation was previously held. That time would have been far more appropriate than the present. We all regret the necessity for these disclosures, but we as a House must be armed with the facts to enable us to arrive at correct conclusions. Mr. E. H. H. Hall suggested he would prefer to support only a section of the motion. Mr. Mann has given every justification for the support of his motion as a whole, but I would like him to consider the addition of certain words which I have suggested in the interests of this State and the welfare of the natives. I support the motion.

HON. L. CRAIG (South-West) [8.2]: I am afraid I am one of a small minority. Mr. Mann is deserving of credit for moving for the appointment of a Royal Commission to inquire into the allegations made by the Chief Secretary, but I do not think such an investigation would get us anywhere. Let me review the charges made by the Chief Secretary. He was endeavouring to prevent

the disallowance of certain regulations made under the Native Administration Act. With a view to convincing the House how necessary it was that the regulations should be maintained, he stated that certain misdemeanours or crimes had been committed at some Western Australian missions over a period of ten years.

Hon. C. F. Baxter: Do you think that is the case?

Hon. L. CRAIG: That is the interpretation I put upon the situation.

Hon. G. B. Wood: Some of the incidents occurred ten years ago.

Hon. L. CRAIG: They all occurred over a period of ten years.

Hon. J. Nicholson: And some were more recent than ten years ago.

Hon. L. CRAIG: The Chief Secretary said that, over a period of ten years, certain things had happened that should not have happened. It would be surprising in these outback places if certain things of this nature did not happen. I look upon missionaries or clergy as f.a.q. samples of ordinary human beings. During the war I had a lot to do with parsons. Some were greatly to be admired and some were greatly to be despised; some were very strong and some were weak. I do not think they are greatly different from any other sections of the community. In work of this nature it is inevitable that at some time over periods of years things of this nature should happen. We know that in Berlin and Madrid things are happening every day that are worse than the incidents referred to by the Chief Secretary. Things happened during the war much more gruesome than have occurred at missions. And they happened not only against the enemy. I have seen men tied to gun-wheels, with their arms and legs spread out, and left in the sun because they had committed a crime. One has sometimes to be drastic. To chain a native by the neck sounds a bad thing to do, but it is better to do that than to chain him by the hands.

Hon. J. Nicholson: Mr. Moseley pointed that out.

Hon. L. CRAIG: With his arms free, a man may keep the flies out of his eyes.

The Honorary Minister: You would not tie up a person with donkey chains?

Hon. L. CRAIG: No. These things have happened occasionally over a long period of years. In my opinion, the interpretation placed upon the statement of the Chief Secretary was a gross exaggeration of the

facts. An altogether wrong interpretation has been placed upon what he said. Odd things have happened that will happen in any walk of life; in whatever strata of social life to which one may belong one finds misfits, the weak and the strong. I think it was Byron who said, "Oh religion, what crimes have been committed in thy name!" Things do happen. Unfortunately, to my mind the Press has exaggerated the statements of the Chief Secretary, and published to the world that missions have been almost cesspits of iniquity. No such interpretation could be put upon the statement. What could a Royal Commission do? On the file will be found particulars of certain misdemeanours or crimes that have occurred over a period of ten years, many of them being actually ten years old. I understand that in nearly every case the misdemeanour was committed by someone who has left Western Australia.

Hon. A. Thomson: What a pity these things were brought up.

Hon. L. CRAIG: The Chief Secretary pointed out how necessary it was to control missionaries so that, if necessary, the department could say, "You shall not be a missionary." He merely pointed out what had happened to show how necessary it was to have authority over all these things. This House cannot enforce the appointment of a Royal Commission. When the motion is carried, it will be only a recommendation to the Government that an inquiry should be held, but it will rest with the Government to appoint the Royal Commission. The Commissioners, on being appointed, would get hold of the files, and in them find these unsavoury statements. Would they visit the North and endeavour to take evidence from people who were no longer there? Will an inquiry do any good? Will it not rather create a lot of publicity over something that happened years ago?

Hon. G. B. Wood: We have had that already.

Hon. L. CRAIG: No one has a greater regard for the missions than have I, nor for the great work many of them are doing. Is it unreasonable to expect that there should be some weak men connected with them, that things should happen that ought not occur? Is there any institution in the world concerning which unsavoury incidents have not occurred? From our knowledge of history, we know what dreadful things have happened in certain parts of the world in connection with the church.

These things are inevitable, whether it be a mission, an orphanage or any other institution. I do not agree that the Chief Secretary has cast a slur upon all missions and church workers in those places where natives are congregated. Whilst appreciating all the speeches that have been made in favour of the motion I feel that, although it may be carried, neither the State, the Government, nor the natives will derive any good from a further inquiry. Only a short time has elapsed since a very full inquiry was made into the whole question by a particularly competent officer. I am, therefore, compelled to oppose the motion.

HON. E. M. HEENAN (North-East) [8.10]: I associate myself with most of Mr. Craig's remarks, but differ from him in the matter of voting. Rightly or wrongly, this matter has received more prominence than apparently was either intended or justified. Mr. Seddon detailed a number of instances of hardship in the course of his speech last week. My mind on this subject is more or less open. I visit my province and come into contact with members of the police force, station owners and others from whom I may seek and hope to obtain reliable information. I assure the House that the information I received concerning certain missions in my electorate is very conflicting and confusing.

Hon. C. B. Williams: Have you paid a visit to the mission?

Hon. E. M. HEENAN: Unfortunately, the remarks of the Chief Secretary were very general. I can appreciate the indignation with which they were received by numerous religious bodies, which probably take a great pride in the conduct of their missions. From the Minister's remarks, however, it is fair to assume that all missions do not maintain the high standard expected of them by the Government. The remarks of the Minister were made in justification of the maintenance of the regulations that were the subject matter of the debate last week. Some control ought to be exercised over missionaries, and regulations should be framed that can be enforced by the department with a view to securing the maintenance of that Christian standard which is so much desired.

The remarks of the Minister have been published all over Australia, and I dare

say in other parts of the world. An inquiry into the relationship between the department and the missions and missionaries will no doubt be welcomed by all concerned. Certainly it will be welcomed by the missionaries who have maintained a high standard, and I think, in fairness to them, an inquiry should be held. Although some of the charges mentioned by Mr. Seddon and the Chief Secretary may be true, difficulty may be experienced in sustaining them. No great harm could be done by holding an investigation. Since I have been in the House and come into contact with the Chief Secretary and Mr. Neville, I have arrived at the conclusion that they are doing their best to carry out the obligations imposed upon them to look after and safeguard the interests of this unfortunate race. Apparently the problem is one that no Government has solved, but I trust members of this Chamber will believe that the present Government has made an honest and conscientious effort to deal with it. The regulations under the Native Administration Act have been submitted in a bona fide effort to give effect to that purpose. I support the motion for the appointment of a Royal Commission.

THE CHIEF SECRETARY (Hon. W. H. Kitson—West) [8.16]: First of all, let me say how pleased I am that so many members of this Chamber have exhibited such keen interest in the problems associated with the natives of Western Australia. That has not always been so, and I am reminded that on previous occasions when matters affecting the administration of native affairs have been before this House, somewhat different expressions of opinion have been uttered by some who have spoken to the motion to-day. Mr. Mann proposes the appointment of a Royal Commission to inquire, first of all, into the relationship between the Department of Native Affairs and the mission authorities throughout the State, and, secondly, into statements made in this House by Mr. Seddon, who desired certain regulations to be disallowed, and into remarks I made when set the task of justifying those particular regulations. As one member remarked to-night, we have already spent about seven hours in dealing with this subject on previous occasions, and now many members have expressed themselves in one

way or another on the motion before the House.

If I were to reply to all the points made this evening I would have to talk for another three or four hours. I do not propose to do so. Members will understand that when a point is raised in criticism a few words only may be used, but they may be very effective. The probabilities usually are that to reply effectively to those few words, much detailed explanation is necessary; otherwise members would not understand the pros and cons of the question. That was my position the other evening. I said on that occasion, and I repeat now, that, in my opinion, not one of the regulations issued under the Native Administration Act is not amply justified. I express that opinion after having been in charge of the Department of Native Affairs for a good many years. I also repeat that, had it not been for the opposition of the various mission authorities to one or two regulations dealing with the so-called control of missions, we would have heard very little regarding any one of the regulations that have been the subject of so much debate.

In my opinion, I rightly pointed out the other evening that those particular regulations represented the crux of the argument, and the question arose as to whether the department was to have any supervision or control over the institutions and people who are established and working in the interests of the natives. While I can appreciate very much the fact that so many members have shown keen interest in this subject, I have a feeling that quite a number of those who have spoken have approached the subject from an entirely wrong angle. I particularly desire to express my appreciation of the remarks of Mr. Craig. How often have I been told in this House that I have spoken in generalities? How many members interjected the other night before I said anything specific, wanting to know what the facts were? On previous occasions when this subject has been dealt with, how many members have criticised me because I have not been prepared to give the House, and therefore the public and the world at large, particulars regarding the unsavoury incidents that I was compelled to mention in my defence of the regulations the other night?

Even this evening, two separate and distinct ideas appear to actuate members. Some say that the Minister was to blame for not

having disclosed those matters much earlier, while others asked why those particulars have been disclosed even now. They ask whether I was wise in making the so-called disclosures, by doing which it is said I have damaged the prestige of Western Australia. Replying to that contention, while I regret very much having been forced into the position of saying what I did the other night, I feel I acted properly. That is the point with which we should be concerned. Was it right for me to speak as I did? I endeavoured to emphasise that point the other night. I felt on that occasion the necessity for doing something more than merely dealing with the two or three regulations that were the subject of the motion for disallowance. I considered I should endeavour to the best of my ability to give the House a survey, as I knew it, of the activities of the Department of Native Affairs in association with missionary efforts in various parts of the State. As one member rightly put it a little while ago, there is no more complex matter for any Minister of the Crown to deal with than the administration of the Department of Native Affairs.

Hon. W. J. Mann: It is more than one man's job.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: Several members suggested that if the Government had taken notice of the report of the Royal Commissioner appointed in 1934, little need would probably have arisen for the motion under discussion. I disagree entirely with that view. In the first place, I am sure from the remarks of some members that, while they may have looked at the Royal Commissioner's report in a very casual way, they have not studied the report or read the evidence. The Royal Commissioner made 26 recommendations, the great majority of which have been adopted by the Government. Many were included in the Native Administration Act, and I had to use the fact that the Royal Commissioner had recommended various proposals to induce members to agree to the inclusion of certain provisions in that measure.

Much has been said of the necessity to divide the State into sections, and the point has been made that the task is too big for one man in view of the various problems arising from the far North to the extreme south. While the Government did not adopt in its entirety the Royal Commissioner's recommendation on that point, good reasons

can be advanced for not doing so. First of all, the adoption of that recommendation would have meant the equivalent of setting up three separate departments with their various staffs. A good deal of overlapping would have followed and much unnecessary expenditure would have been incurred. Undoubtedly in some instances there would have been conflict on points of policy. Instead of adopting that recommendation, the Government got as near to it as possible. Some members are aware that we have appointed one man to take charge in the far North.

Hon. G. W. Miles: And a very good man, too.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: I do not know whether the hon. member refers to the one I have in mind. He is probably thinking of the man who has been acting for the past 12 months and who has practically reached the retiring age. Through ill-health he is unable to carry on at the moment.

Hon. J. Nicholson: Was that appointment made recently?

The CHIEF SECRETARY: He was appointed 12 months ago. Quite recently, through the Public Service Commissioner, the Government has gazetted a new position. Members will see, therefore, that the Government is, to the best of its ability, endeavouring to give effect to that particular recommendation. By the means I have indicated we shall ensure that many of the matters that previously were referred to Perth will be dealt with in the North by a man who is acquainted with the position there and has an understanding of the native problem. He is a man I believe who is held in the highest respect by all sections of the community in the North.

Hon. G. W. Miles: Who is the man?

The CHIEF SECRETARY: Mr. Woodland holds the position now.

Hon. G. W. Miles: He is the man to whom I referred.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: As the appointment of his successor has not yet been gazetted, I can hardly mention his name at this stage. On account of ill-health Mr. Woodland has found it impossible to carry on. We have had to make another appointment and I believe the new man will be found to be in the same category as Mr. Woodland. The appointee has the respect and confidence of the people in the North

with whom he has been associated. I could speak in detail of what we are doing in the south and middle south. What we are attempting cannot be accomplished, in a day, a week or a month. There are many difficulties that we have to overcome; frequently, of course, the difficulty is a financial one. I am pleased that the Government has seen fit to make a little more money available in order that the department might, as I said the other night, do more than we have done in the past.

I could refer to many of the recommendations of the Royal Commissioner which have been adopted and included in the present Act. Yet Mr. Nicholson says the time is ripe for the appointment of a Royal Commission to inquire into the working of this Act, which was passed only in 1936. The department has not had an opportunity of proving that the Act will do all that is claimed for it. May I say here that the regulations about which all this argument has centred are strictly in accordance with the Act? In many cases the wording coincides with the particular section of the Act to which the regulation refers. In other cases, the regulations are the result of what has been found to be necessary over the years for the proper administration of institutions of various kinds. Members may be surprised to know that previous to the tabling of these regulations, the Commissioner of Native Affairs and I had many interviews with various leaders of missionary societies in this State.

I hope I shall not be misunderstood when I say that the delay complained of in this House arose because the department found it impossible to get those people themselves to come to a decision as to the form the proposed board—for which we have provided in the regulations—should take. I refer to the board to which any mission worker can appeal if he is objected to by the department. As I think I mentioned the other evening, I was forced in the end to determine what the constitution of that board should be. Now we find a person disapproving of a regulation empowering the department to object to issue a permit to an individual, either male or female, who desires to be charged with the responsibility of caring for the natives, more particularly the younger natives. I said to myself, "Why should they object, when I have agreed that if the department raises an objection they shall have

the right of appeal to a board composed of men who have been engaged for a long time in this very field? What is wrong with the regulation giving the department certain authority, when the parties affected can appeal to such a board? Why should they take such strong objection to the board?"

Some members made particular reference to the fact that my speech had been published not only in the State, but throughout the Commonwealth and also overseas. Nobody regrets that more than I do, but I have no control over those responsible for the publication of the details in the form in which they have appeared. While I have not had the opportunity of reading the report of my speech in "Hansard," I feel that any reasonable person who takes the trouble to read the report carefully will come to the same conclusion as did Mr. Craig. After hearing what I had to say, Mr. Craig said I was faced with the position of having to justify two or three regulations in particular. This is the kind of thing that I and the department have objected to for some considerable time past. Mr. Mann, in moving the motion, quoted from certain newspapers. He also quoted from the official organ of one of the religious bodies in this State. I forget for the moment just which quotation it was which made some reference to another publication known as "The Ladder." There was some comment upon myself and my attitude towards that particular publication. I believe I am quite justified in the attitude I have taken to the methods disclosed by that particular magazine, if I may so call it, because what has been done on previous occasions has been done on this occasion.

Hon. W. J. Mann: You are referring to Dean Moore.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: Extracts have been taken from my speech and have been used in a way that was never intended. These statements have been published, not only in Western Australia, but throughout the length and breadth of the Commonwealth and also in the Old Country. Without exaggeration, I have a file, inches thick, containing communications from organisations interested in the welfare of the natives of this State, also from organisations interested in the welfare of natives in all countries of the world, but particularly from hundreds of church societies throughout the State that have carried resolutions—based on the statements to which I take exception—sent

on to the department, to myself, or to the Premier. These last-mentioned organisations assert that the department is desirous of having authority to license persons to preach the Gospel. That is the basis of resolutions referred to. Members who read the Press—as I think we all do—will not require me to remind them that for months past, up to the last few weeks, hardly a day passed without some reference appearing in the Press to a motion carried by some church body protesting against the regulations that have been the subject of our present discussion. The resolutions, as I say, have been based on the argument that the Government is anxious or is seeking power to license persons to preach the Gospel. Eventually, I got tired of replying to these communications, which arrived day after day, week after week, and month after month. As I told members the other evening, the communications came through the Lieut.-Governor or the Premier, or reached me or the department direct. One gets heartily sick and tired of having the same thing brought up day by day, when one knows full well that the basis of the resolutions of protest is incorrect.

I object to the remarks of some people who suggest that I am taking advantage of the privileges of this House. I made my position quite clear when I said I had no desire at any time to disclose the unsavoury side of a person's character. Members who have been associated with me in the deliberations of the House for a fairly long period will find it hard to quote instances in which I have gone out of my way deliberately to malign any person in that way.

The Government is faced with this position: Is it to carry out its policy in regard to native affairs, or is it to allow some other person or persons to run counter to that policy and dictate what the policy shall be? If so, there is only one thing left for me to do. When I find members are insisting that I shall supply them with the knowledge I have and I find that that is the only way in which I can justify the stand I have been forced to take, I shall supply the information. Instead of charging me with having committed a grave blunder, I think members will then agree with Mr. Craig when he said that on this occasion I did the right thing. I have nothing to be afraid of. I made perfectly clear

that any instance I quoted was given as the result of my knowledge of the department or from files that have come under my notice from time to time, and also as a result of discussions that I have had at different times with one or two leaders of missionary effort in this State.

While one might attempt to minimise the seriousness of some of the things I have mentioned and might say, "This is the kind of thing that happens in the North or is inevitable in any large institution," I took this step in order that I might show this House that the department had a knowledge of things that members could not be expected to possess. When I told the House that those things had come to my notice or had occurred within the last 10 years, I deliberately made that statement in order to cover the whole of the period over which those particular incidents were spread. I said that not one of those instances went back 10 years. I think the first of them occurred in 1930, one or two of them between 1930 and 1933, and the others are of far more recent date.

Hon. J. A. Dimmitt: What is the most recent?

The CHIEF SECRETARY: Some of those things are occurring at the present time, but not with regard to the major cases I referred to. Take the matter of dog scalps and the exploitation of the natives and things of that kind where certain authorities are endeavouring to act in direct opposition to the expressed policy of the department. I do not wish to enter into those details at this juncture. We are now dealing with a motion which, if it is agreed to and the Government is prepared to accept the decision of this House, would lead to a repetition of what I have already stated, together, perhaps, with some other disclosures or facts that would be of no good to anyone at the present time—no good at all. I have to point out that while it might be quite easy to criticise me as Chief Secretary for having made those statements, this House and Parliament are not altogether blameless in the matter. Members will recall that as far back as 1929 I introduced a Bill to amend the Aborigines Act. Unfortunately the Bill did not become law. Although I was successful on that occasion in getting this House to agree to the Bill, and although the House made quite a number of amendments that certainly altered the Bill to a great extent, the measure passed this House so late

in the session that another place could not possibly give it consideration.

Hon. C. F. Baxter: You are not blaming Parliament for that, are you?

The CHIEF SECRETARY: I say that Parliament has some responsibility.

Hon. C. F. Baxter: Where is the responsibility in that?

The CHIEF SECRETARY: Parliament was advised of the necessity for amending the Act.

Hon. C. F. Baxter: You brought the Bill down so late in the session.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: In order that we might deal with some of the matters to which reference has been made during this debate.

Hon. C. F. Baxter: This House passed the Bill. Why blame this House?

The CHIEF SECRETARY: I am not blaming this House. What I said was that this House and Parliament generally are not without responsibility in the matter. In February, 1934, the Government of which I was Honorary Minister—I was then in charge of this department—appointed a Royal Commissioner, Mr. Moseley, with very comprehensive terms of reference, and the Government subsequently based the amending Bill of 1936 to a great extent on his recommendations. The debate on that occasion will show an entirely different attitude on the part of some members as compared with their attitude at present. Nevertheless I am very pleased that eventually, following a conference of managers representing the two Houses, we were able to obtain what is now known as the Native Administration Act.

More than one member has said that, as a result of what I stated in this House, I have shown that the department was to blame and that the Government was to blame for not having dealt with these matters earlier. In view of all the explanations that have been made on various occasions, I am rather surprised to find that those members do not know even now that previous to the amending of the Act in 1936, the department did not have the power which those members assume it possessed. Only since the amending of the Act have we been able to deal with many of those offences included in the statement that I gave to the House. It was an unfortunate state of affairs, and I was just as keen as anyone could be to have that state of affairs rectified as early as possible. I made particularly clear here and elsewhere exactly what the position was. I do not wish

to traverse the remarks made at that time. Repeatedly the Commissioner of Native Affairs has stressed to me the need for regulations and repeatedly we have endeavoured to reach the stage where it would be possible to promulgate regulations that would cover all the matters now included in the Native Administration Act.

Hon. J. A. Dimmitt: I should say that many of those charges could have been dealt with under the Police Act.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: The hon. member is mistaken. In the circumstances, action under the Police Act was not possible. I wonder whether the hon. member appreciates that before 1936 we could not prosecute for sexual intercourse offences.

Hon. G. B. Wood: What about the offence of supplying intoxicating liquor to natives?

The CHIEF SECRETARY: We could always deal with that offence provided we could obtain the evidence. We could not place a check upon undesirable marriages and those contrary to tribal law. Are members aware that we could not compel the missions to supply the department with the information desired or required? Are members aware that we still have great difficulty in securing convictions against whites accused of offences against natives? Those are some things that members should bear in mind. In order to rectify those and other weaknesses, we desired to include in the Act power to allow the department to take the necessary action in cases of that kind.

I am not exaggerating when I say that the Commissioner's requests for information regarding doings on certain missions were repeatedly flouted. If members care to read the annual reports of the Commissioner of Native Affairs, they will find in almost every issue a statement of his inability to obtain information about the activities of some of the missions, at any rate. I think I would do well to repeat that in my original remarks on this subject, I made the fact perfectly clear that I was not referring to all missions or to all missionaries. Again may I draw attention to the fact that many of those incidents did not come to the notice of the department until months after they had occurred. We have instituted prosecutions regarding some of the matters to which I referred, and we have also had inquiries, departmental and other. Members will realise that I am not talking without some

knowledge of the subject. Unfortunately our experience only too often has been that owing to the long delay before the information has reached the department and the inability on occasion to trace some of those who would have been very valuable witnesses, we have not been able to secure the results that the cases warranted. But in other cases we did succeed. One case was mentioned to-night.

I referred to the activities of two so-called missionaries in the far North. So far as I know, they were not with any established mission, but still, according to them, they were missionaries. One hon. member referred to the fact that I said when we made inquiries we found they had separated and only one was left, he being a man of coloured blood. While the hon. member did not say in so many words, I think he inferred that we had a very poor case indeed and should have had more knowledge, and that it was of no use quoting an instance of that kind. Let me inform the House that we sent out a police expedition in that case at very large cost, and what is more, we were able to secure convictions and put a stop once and for all to the particular practices of which those two so-called missionaries had been guilty. I wonder whether members realise just what difficulties the department is faced with in matters of that kind.

Hon. A. Thomson: Were those two missionaries associated with any of the church missions?

The CHIEF SECRETARY: I have just stated that they were not associated with any established mission. They were not and are not the only ones roaming about this country claiming to be missionaries and unassociated with any mission we know of. Are we not to have the right to say that men of the calibre to which I have referred, posing as missionaries, must obtain a permit from the department? So far as the established missions are concerned, some of the incidents I quoted were the subject of inquiry and some of the documentary evidence makes very sorry reading indeed. There are no representatives of the department at these missions or in these institutions. Only when information filters through to the department is action possible.

I have already received several letters from various people expressing apprecia-

tion of the fact that at long last somebody has found courage to make the so-called disclosures that I have made. Some of the occurrences to which I referred were common knowledge in the districts where they happened. The department must necessarily take some notice of its responsible officers. When the results of inquiries are submitted to the department—even though it may be some months after an occurrence—the department must take cognisance of them. In certain instances, only the lack of legal authority prevented the department from going to the utmost extent of prosecuting.

Having the needed power incorporated in the new Native Administration Act, the department is naturally anxious to ensure that the regulations are such as will provide the method whereby action can be taken in such cases and in other cases to prevent the possibility of a repetition of such offences. The department feels that the regulations to which objection has been made comprise the least that the department could do to give effect to the provisions of the Act that provide power for the control of missions and missionaries. I do not, however, propose to enter into the pros and cons of those particular regulations.

Hon. J. Nicholson: They do not affect this motion.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: No. In most of the instances to which I referred, and particularly where they concerned established missions, the offenders have been withdrawn. According to the information supplied to me by the department, they have mostly left the State. There may be one or two still resident in the State and possibly living the lives of decent citizens. The department has done all that is humanly possible to bring these incidents to light and the perpetrators to justice. Why, therefore, at this stage should members endeavour to blame the Commissioner, or myself or the department for not having given publicity to those occurrences earlier and for not having taken proceedings in a court of law at the time?

The appointment of a Royal Commission will not achieve very much. That is evident when one realises that most of the missions are situated in isolated parts of the State and most of the people concerned, even though the incidents may have occurred only three or four years ago, are not now in the

service of the missions. Those people are in the Eastern States or probably in the Old Country, and to inquire exhaustively into these particular cases would involve the taking of evidence from them. In many instances the natives concerned would also have to be found, and I can quite imagine some difficulty would be experienced in that regard. Not only would a good deal of time be absorbed by the Commission in travelling about the country, but huge expense would also be incurred, and where would it get us? It would get us nowhere, except to verify what I have already told the House.

I am very sorry to have to say that I used the illustrations I gave last week to prove that these regulations are necessary because I was forced to do so by the church authorities. I am sorry that that is the position, but we cannot get away from the facts. I have asked for co-operation between the department and the mission authorities in order that there might be that harmony between the department and individuals and organisations whose first duty should be the welfare of the natives.

Hon. J. Nicholson: Would not the proposed investigation be of assistance in that direction?

The CHIEF SECRETARY: I am afraid it would not; it would merely revive the subject and introduce quite a lot of controversial matter and a number of circumstances that in the present state of affairs perhaps would be better left alone. Mr. Nicholson has suggested that we should extend the scope of the inquiry by the Royal Commission, which should examine also the provisions of the Act. I have already pointed out that the Act has not had a chance of being tested and that until the regulations have been tried out, nobody will be able to say whether the Act will operate successfully, although I believe it will. I repeat that the department has been very anxious to fall into line with the views of the conference which was held in Canberra last year to deal with the administration of native affairs throughout the Commonwealth and at which a so-called long-range policy was laid down. The Act under which we are operating is accepted by the other authorities in the Commonwealth as being a very good contribution towards the ideal subscribed to by the conference. There is no need for me to go into the particular points to which I have already

referred. The Act is in existence and members have a fair knowledge of its scope.

There is little more I wish to say except to remark that the department has endeavoured to get the churches and mission authorities to see its point of view. I know of no occasion on which the department has not been prepared to meet those best fitted to speak for the missions in order that the points at issue might be discussed. I had quite a number of conferences with interested people, and in all the discussions there was not one regulation—exclusive of the regulation dealing with the question of permits for missions and missionaries—to which strong exception was taken after an explanation of it had been given. When I agreed to appoint a board of appeal, I was under the impression, from what I was told, that all objections to the regulations had ceased, but when I endeavoured to meet the position as I saw it, this strong opposition arose, and propaganda was spread throughout the Commonwealth designed to indicate that the department was not in sympathy with missionary effort in this State. I have said before, and I repeat, that we are just as anxious as the missionaries themselves to do the best that is possible for our charges. To that end, after having secured an amendment of the Act, the department has adopted a policy, and has asked for co-operation in giving effect to that policy. Surely we are entitled to seek co-operation, and surely the department that is responsible under the Constitution for looking after the welfare of the natives is entitled to demand that when the ideas of other individuals conflict with those of the department, the policy of the department should prevail. I know of no country in the world where such a state of affairs does not obtain. There may be room for a difference of opinion on some points. We have always been prepared to discuss those differences. I venture the assertion that after the regulations have been tried for about six months, there will be no opposition to any of them. I shall be very surprised if there are more than one or two objections in any one year to the regulation dealing with permits for missions and missionaries. There are instances at the present time that in my opinion reveal the necessity for the department having power of that kind.

The motion seeks the appointment of a Royal Commission. The department has

nothing to fear from any inquiry that may be made, but such an inquiry would be futile. What has been said for years past would simply be reiterated. The Commission would be very costly and the investigations would extend over a long period. In the meantime the department would have to carry out its duties under the Act. In order to do that, and do it satisfactorily, there must be regulations; and those are the regulations which are the subject of discussion.

Though I could say a great deal on this motion, I propose to conclude by again stating how greatly I regret the wide publicity given to my statements, especially as that publicity is associated with so-called allegations or charges made by me against missions. I prefer to call them illustrations of the difficulties the department has had to meet. My hand has been forced.

Hon. J. Nicholson: That is what I said; I said you were justified.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: It has been forced by this House. Consequently I contend I was justified in making the statements. The majority of the persons concerned are not now in the service of the missions. The majority of the people concerned are not available. Therefore a Royal Commission to cover the ground suggested by the motion would, in my opinion, prove futile. Certainly its investigations would not be of any value for many months to come. In the meantime there is a need for the department and the mission authorities to get on with the good work in co-operation with each other—not pulling one against the other, but in co-operation. If that could be brought about, it would be found that the Native Administration Act, as we know it to-day, was of great benefit to all concerned.

HON. W. J. MANN (South-West—in reply) [9.18]: I believe I may say that every member of the Chamber has been touched by the Chief Secretary's sincerity in his reply to the various speeches made on the motion. I am sure, too, that we all appreciate his admission of regret that the charges made on Wednesday last should have received such wide publicity and caused such wide repercussions. At the same time, I feel so much has been said that we must proceed with the object we have in view, to assist in making the administration of the Department of Native Affairs function in

the manner that we all desire. By his attempted justification to-night the Chief Secretary has actually challenged further inquiry.

I do not agree with the hon. gentleman that the inquiry is likely to be one of immensity; I believe that it could be confined within reasonable limits. Therefore, without replying to any of the speeches that have been made, I leave the matter in the hands of members. It has been thoroughly ventilated; we have spent nearly four hours on it; and I am convinced that whatever the result of the vote, it will be of advantage to the natives and to the State. I wish it to be clearly understood that on my part—and I believe I can say as much for almost every member of the House—there is no desire to embarrass the Chief Secretary. Rather would we, although possibly disagreeing as to methods, be glad to assist him. I do not wish to prolong this already very lengthy debate.

Question put and passed.

BILLS (2)—FIRST READING.

- 1, Bread Act Amendment.
- 2, Friendly Societies Act Amendment.

Introduced by the Honorary Minister.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

On motion by Hon. G. W. Miles, leave of absence for six consecutive sittings granted to Hon. J. J. Holmes (North) for family reasons.

BILL—JURY ACT AMENDMENT.

Third Reading.

HON. J. NICHOLSON (Metropolitan)

[9.27]: I move—

That the Bill be now read a third time.

HON. G. FRASER (West) [9.28]: I adopt the unusual course of speaking on the third reading because I believe hon. members have been slightly misled in regard to the Bill. Many members have an idea, because of remarks made while the Bill was under discussion, that the measure would place women in a position similar to that held by Queensland women in the matter of juries. The sponsor of the measure was asked whether the Bill coincided with the measure introduced in England.

Hon. G. W. Miles: And he side-stepped the question.

Hon. G. FRASER: Quite a good term, "side-stepped." At any rate, the question was not answered. Doubts remain as to the measure coinciding with the English Act. I have dug up the English Act and compared it with the Bill. I have also compared the Bill with the Queensland Act. I find that the Bill does not coincide fully with either of those statutes. It narrows the selection of women jurors considerably more than does the enactment of either Queensland or England. I shall not weary the House by reading the qualifications for jurors in England beyond saying that whilst there is a certain stipulation in the English Act as to property and so forth, that Act is much more liberal than the Bill. Indeed, the English Act even goes so far, under certain conditions, as to permit householders to serve on juries. Permission for women to serve was extended by the Sex Qualification Removal Act of 1919. The qualifications there are more liberal than those proposed in this Bill. The only other observation I desire to make about the English Act is that all women having qualifications are included on the jury list and can be exempted only under certain conditions, namely by application on the ground of illness or by a judge in Chambers deciding that the particular case shall be tried by a full panel of women or men jurors. In some respects the measure now before us accords with the Queensland Act, namely as to women writing in to be placed on the jury list, but the qualification is entirely different. The qualification in Queensland is any person entitled to be enrolled on the Legislative Assembly roll; there is no property qualification whatever. This measure, therefore, narrows considerably the choice as compared with the Act in Queensland or that in England. During the course of the debate, we have been told that there has been a certain amount of clamour for the measure. Although I am a resident of the metropolitan area, I have never heard any clamour.

Hon. G. W. Miles: And not one per cent. of the women want the privilege.

Hon. G. FRASER: I suppose the same thing was said in Queensland in 1923 when the law there was altered. No doubt it was represented to Parliament that women were

clamouring for the concession. Let me quote some figures. The Queensland Act has been in operation since 1923, when the number of females in the State numbered 379,583. In 1935 the number had increased to 462,338.

Hon. H. S. W. Parker: Including children?

Hon. G. FRASER: Those are the complete figures of females, and we can safely estimate that 50 per cent. would be adult females entitled to be enrolled as jurors. I have some figures from the supplement to "The Australian Law Journal" of 1936, and because of those figures I have quoted the female population for 1936 and for the year in which the Queensland Act was altered. The journal states—

The most interesting statistic as to the Queensland jury system is that, since the Jury Act of 1923, only 52 applications were made by female jurors of the State to be placed on the jury list.

Think of it, 52 applications in 13 years!

Hon. J. Cornell: You will get about 13 here.

Hon. G. FRASER: What is the use of placing legislation of that kind on the statute-book?

Hon. H. S. W. Parker: Who introduced the amendment in Queensland?

Hon. G. FRASER: That does not matter. I am dealing with the operation of the Act. The quotation continues—

The result is that, at the present time, only 36 women are eligible to serve as jurors, 30 for the Brisbane district and six for the other districts of the State.

Hon. L. B. Bolton: Women there cannot be so enlightened as are those here.

Hon. G. FRASER: The quotation continues—

Although at intervals a female juror has been summoned for a sitting of the Queensland court at Brisbane, no female juror has ever been sworn as a civil juror in Brisbane or in any other part of Queensland.

I fully expect that the so-called clamour here will end similarly. In another State women have had the opportunity to serve for 13 years and no one has served as a civil juror, while, in the whole period, only 52 have applied for registration. Many other laws are required; why place unnecessary legislation on our statute-book? The female population of Western Australia in 1935 was only 210,516, not one-half of the number in Queensland.

Hon. H. S. W. Parker: Very select.

Hon. G. FRASER: That is the point; it is too select.

Hon. J. Cornell: There are more sticky-beaks here.

Hon. G. FRASER: If the Bill had provided for all women to serve on juries no exception would have been taken to it.

Hon. G. W. Miles: This is not the Bill that Mr. Nicholson introduced.

Hon. G. FRASER: No. Did members ever witness such a Gilbertian performance? The sponsor of the Bill accepted an amendment entirely altering the principle of the Bill. Where the law has been operating, we have evidence that it is not desired by the women; the opportunity has not been availed of by the women to become enrolled. This Bill would narrow down the selection to a much greater extent than in England or Queensland. After reviewing the whole of the facts, I feel quite satisfied that there has been no request for the measure, except from half a dozen women. I have no apologies to make in opposing the third reading of the Bill and I hope members will assist me—

Hon. G. W. Miles: To vote it out.

Hon. G. FRASER: To relegate it to oblivion.

HON. J. NICHOLSON (Metropolitan—in reply) [9.36]: I am somewhat surprised that the hon. member should adopt such an attitude on the third reading. The matter to which he has referred was fully explained on the second reading. The fact of his having been absent at the time was certainly not my fault. The hon. member must blame himself for that and should not make it an excuse for asking members, on the third reading, to change their votes and reject the Bill. I should certainly be astonished if members did anything of the sort.

Hon. G. Fraser: I read your speech in "Hansard."

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: The Bill, as amended in this Chamber, will bring the Act more into line with the law of Queensland and with the existing provisions of our own Act.

Hon. G. Fraser: Every woman on the electoral roll in Queensland is entitled to serve.

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: That is true. Under our Act every man between 21 and

60 years of age residing in Western Australia having either in his own name or in trust for him real estate valued at £50 sterling clear of all encumbrances or a clear personal estate valued at £150 sterling or upwards is qualified and liable to serve as a common juror in all civil and criminal proceedings or in any inquisition within a radius of 36 miles from his residence. The Bill provides that any woman between 21 and 60 years who has the property qualifications required of a male juror and notifies in writing the resident or police magistrate that she desires to serve, shall be qualified and liable to serve. This measure is restricted to women who make the application, and the restriction is a wise one. In Queensland, if a woman desires to serve on the jury, she must make application. If we followed the course suggested by Mr. Fraser, and compelled every woman to serve, then every woman desirous of being relieved of this duty, would have to apply to be exempted. That would cast on the State a burden and an expense that is not justified. All that is necessary under this measure is for the women desiring to serve to make application, and thus the State will not be involved in any expense. I hope members will adhere to the vote they recorded on the second reading.

Hon. G. Fraser: This is different from the Bill we passed on the second reading.

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: It is in no way different.

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

Ayes	20
Noes	6

Majority for	14
----------------------	----

AYES.

Hon. E. H. Angelo
Hon. C. F. Baxter
Hon. L. B. Bolton
Hon. L. Craig
Hon. J. T. Franklin
Hon. E. H. Hall
Hon. V. Hamersley
Hon. E. M. Heenan
Hon. W. H. Kitson
Hon. J. M. Macfarlane

Hon. W. J. Mann
Hon. J. Nicholson
Hon. H. S. W. Parker
Hon. H. V. Piesse
Hon. H. Seddon
Hon. A. Thomson
Hon. H. Tuckey
Hon. C. H. Wittenoom
Hon. G. B. Wood
Hon. J. A. Dimmitt
(Teller)

NOES.

Hon. J. Cornell
Hon. J. M. Drew
Hon. G. Fraser

Hon. E. H. Gray
Hon. G. W. Miles
Hon. C. B. Williams
(Teller)

Question thus passed.

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

BILL—LOTTERIES (CONTROL) ACT AMENDMENT.

Second Reading.

Debate resumed from the 24th November.

HON. V. HAMERSLEY (East) [9.46]: This legislation was brought down in the first place to enable an important work to be carried out during a very serious time in the affairs of the State. The money was required for several purposes. When the Bill passed this House we thought we were going to do away with street collections.

Hon. C. F. Baxter: They are still with us.

Hon. V. HAMERSLEY: Unfortunately that is so. Nevertheless an enormous sum of money has been raised by means of these lotteries. This has been of great benefit to the Government which had gone cold concerning many duties that were thrust upon it when the State entered Federation. The revenue of the State was seriously interfered with, especially through the loss of Customs and excise duties. During the depression this legislation was one of the means adopted to relieve a serious situation. The hospitals were practically destitute of money with which to expand and provide the necessary equipment. The Government seeks by this Bill to make the Lotteries Commission permanent. I am not altogether satisfied about that. Taxation measures come up for review every year, and I think the same principle should apply in this instance.

The Lotteries Commissioners are doing good work, but if they were appointed permanently we would not have an opportunity to review their activities. Under present conditions the system is within the control of Parliament. Many people fear that if the Bill is passed the system may get out of hand. I am not greatly concerned about the number of lotteries held each year provided that the holding of them does not prevent other organisations from raising money by similar means. In the country small lotteries are conducted by churches and hospitals which at present receive very little help from the Commission. They have to apply for and obtain a permit to conduct their small lotteries.

Hon. J. M. Macfarlane: Do the churches hold lotteries?

Hon. V. HAMERSLEY: Some of them do.

Hon. J. M. Macfarlane: That is news to me.

Hon. V. HAMERSLEY: Raffles are lotteries, and money is easily raised by those means. Permission to conduct such raffles has to be obtained every year, and I fail to see why the same principle should not apply to the Lotteries Commission.

The Honorary Minister: I do not think people have to apply for the right to conduct a raffle.

Hon. V. HAMERSLEY: I think so, for a return has to be lodged showing how the money was expended and how much was raised. No doubt the Commissioners would feel more secure if their positions were made permanent. I understand the idea is to enable them to embark upon a long-term policy, and that the intention is ultimately to raise enough money with which to build a new hospital for Perth. When people in the country want a hospital they have to provide at least pound-for-pound of the amount given them by the Government. I cannot understand why the City of Perth is not put on the same basis. Why should it be placed in a better position than is a country centre?

Hon. A. Thomson: It should not be better off than is a country centre.

Hon. V. HAMERSLEY: The city is put upon a pedestal.

Hon. G. W. Miles: This has gone on since the year one.

Hon. A. Thomson: It is time a change was effected.

Hon. V. HAMERSLEY: Country people find difficulty in raising the necessary funds. No doubt many of them put a lot of money into the lotteries, but they nevertheless have to find their share of any expenditure on local hospital requirements. Proportionately they are doing far more under great difficulties than are the people of Perth in the way of providing hospital requirements. If all the moneys raised by the Commission are spent in Perth there will be nothing left for the country centres, and hospitals there will find themselves in a parlous position.

Under existing legislation each lottery must stand by itself. I have seen Press notices to the effect that money spent on tickets that have not gone into a particular lottery will be refunded. There must be many instances in which people do not apply for a refund. I presume that money goes into the coffers of the Government, and I

understand it is not passed on to the next lottery. Perhaps that is one reason why a good deal of money still goes to Tasmania. People are not satisfied that they are getting a fair deal here. If people send money to Tattersall's too late for a particular lottery, they know that tickets will be sent to them for the next lottery. I am satisfied that people scattered throughout the State and as far afield as Wiluna patronise the lotteries. They would not bother about claiming a refund of their money, but would prefer to have a ticket in the next sweep. They would not be particular whether their ticket was in one lottery or another. I think the proposal to carry excess subscriptions forward to the succeeding lottery is commendable. With the reservations I have indicated, I shall support the second reading of the Bill. I recognise that the lotteries have done much good and I do not know that they have done more harm than some of us expected. Still, we should keep a check on them to ensure that the business does not get out of hand.

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

House adjourned at 10.3 p.m.

Legislative Assembly.

Tuesday, 29th November, 1938.

	PAGE
Question: Betting, tickets and stamp tax	2521
Annual Estimates, 1938-39: Report of Committee of Supply, Committee of Ways and Means	2522
State Trading Concerns—Estimates 1938-39	2522
Loan Estimates, 1938-39: Votes and Items discussed	2537
Bill: Jury Act Amendment, Council's amendment, Bill rejected	2539

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

QUESTION—BETTING.

Tickets and Stamp Tax.

Mr. NEEDHAM asked the Premier: How many betting tickets are represented by the