

essential if he is to attain a white man's status.

Hon. J. G. HISLOP: If the words are to be retained, why retain only one form of venereal disease? Why not retain both?

The CHIEF SECRETARY: Too much importance is being attached to the right to vote. The words find a place in the clause for a specific purpose. There are many privileges which a certificate-holder will have that the ordinary native does not enjoy. The two last-named diseases are tropical diseases wholly confined to natives. If a native contracts either of them, it will be good evidence that he has been in contact with tribal natives. On the second reading I said that experience of the working of the measure might prove that some of its provisions could be modified. I hope the words will not be deleted.

Amendment put and negatived.

Clause, as previously amended, put and passed.

Clause 6—agreed to.

Progress reported.

*House adjourned at 6.18 p.m.*

## Legislative Assembly.

*Tuesday, 14th November, 1944.*

	PAGE
Petition: W.A. Turf Club, granted .....	1691
Questions: Wheat, as to transport to coast .....	1691
Seaforth Boys' Home, as to inmates and accommodation .....	1692
Medical practitioners, as to releases by the Army .....	1692
Railway tank, Beacon, as to cost and charges .....	1692
Licensed premises, as to trading hours .....	1693
Bills: Western Australian Turf Club (Property) Private, 1B, referred to Select Committee .....	1691
Busselton Cemetery, 3A, .....	1693
Stamp Act Amendment, 3B, .....	1693
Legislative Council (War Time) Electoral Act Amendment, 2A, .....	1693
Electoral (War Time) Act Amendment, 2B, .....	1693
Colle Recreation and Park Lands Act Amendment, 2A, Com., report .....	1694
Lotteries (Control) Act Amendment, 2A, Com., point of order, dissent from Chairman's ruling, dissent from Speaker's ruling, report .....	1694
Transfer of Land Act Amendment, 2A, .....	1710
Annual Estimates: Votes and Items discussed .....	1711

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

## PETITION—WESTERN AUSTRALIAN TURF CLUB.

Mr. NEEDHAM presented a petition from the Western Australian Turf Club

praying for the introduction of a Bill to resolve certain doubts concerning the power of the Western Australian Turf Club under the Western Australian Turf Club Act, 1892, to enter into agreements for the acquisition by purchase or otherwise of and to acquire by purchase or otherwise and hold and otherwise deal with real and personal property for the purposes of the Club.

Petition received and the prayer of the petitioner granted.

## BILL—WESTERN AUSTRALIAN TURF CLUB (PROPERTY) PRIVATE.

Introduced by Mr. Needham and read a first time.

*Referred to Select Committee.*

On motion by Mr. Needham, Bill referred to a Select Committee consisting of Messrs. Cross, Leahy, Shearn, Thorn and the mover, with power to call for persons and papers, to sit on days over which the House stands adjourned and to report on Thursday, the 16th November.

## QUESTIONS (5).

### WHEAT.

*As to Transport to Coast.*

Mr. DONEY asked the Minister for Railways:

(1) Has he read a statement appearing in "The West Australian" of the 8th November by the Superintendent of the W.A. section of the Australian Wheat Board—setting out that there are 13,000,000 bushels of wheat awaiting movement from railway sidings, but that rail transport is so hampered by (a) coal shortages, (b) disinclination of train crews to work on Sundays, and (c) the inability of the railway authorities to move more than 50 per cent. of weekly port requirements; that the board finds it impossible to meet the demand for wheat?

(2) Does he realise that this situation if not corrected—wholly or in part—will contribute substantially to food shortages in a period when food supplies threaten to become desperately short?

(3) Is the output of coal increasing?

(4) If not does he anticipate an increase (a) when, (b) on what grounds, (c) by how much?

(5) What are the rail factors that are having the unfortunate transport effects referred to in question No. (1) (c)?

(6) Are transport improvements anticipated? If so, when and of what nature?

The MINISTER replied:

(1) Yes.

(2) and (5) It is not a fact that the railways are unable to move more than 50 per cent. of weekly port requirements. So far as the department is concerned, it is not aware that any boat has been delayed by reason of lack of the necessary wheat deliveries at ports.

(3) Yes, since the beginning of the current year.

(4) Further increase in output is anticipated (a) early in the New Year; (b) (i) progress of Stockton open-cut mine, (ii) extended operation of the new Wyvern colliery, respecting which the Government has guaranteed expenditure on additional plant, (iii) installation of additional modern mechanical appliances at Collie mines; (c) it is not possible to estimate the amount at this stage.

(6) Yes, when the coal and industrial position improves.

### SEAFORTH BOYS' HOME.

*As to Inmates and Accommodation.*

Mr. LESLIE asked the Minister for Education:

(1) Is it a fact that the Salvation Army Seaforth Boys' Home was established for the education and technical training of sub-normal boys of school age?

(2) Is it a fact that because of the absence of facilities to provide for some of these sub-normal cases of a chronic and permanent nature, including epileptics, they have been obliged to remain at the home after school-leaving age?

(3) Is he aware that because of the limited accommodation available at the home, and the presence of these chronic cases, it has not been possible for the home to accept sub-normal boys of school age?

(4) Is it a fact that the Social Service Department of the Salvation Army has decided that the home is to be used for the original purpose for which it was established, and that because of this fact, instructions have been issued for the removal of these inmates over school age?

(5) Is there any State institution where such cases can be received, and if not, what provision is being made for them?

The MINISTER FOR THE NORTH-WEST replied:

(1) Yes.

(2) No.

(3) No. It has always been possible for the home to accept subnormal State wards of school age.

(4) (a) No. The home has never deviated from its original purpose of accepting sub-normal children of school age. (b) The removal of some of those over school age, now mostly men, is being undertaken by the Salvation Army of its own volition. These cases are housed apart from the children of school age.

(5) Most of the men concerned would be cases for either the Mental Hospital, Claremont, or the Old Men's Home, and could be received into either institution.

### MEDICAL PRACTITIONERS.

*As to Releases by the Army.*

Mr. LESLIE asked the Minister for Health:

Can he state whether any medical practitioners have been released by the Army for the purpose of re-entering private practice since the 1st August, 1944?

The MINISTER replied:

Six medical practitioners, as under, have been released by the Army to re-enter private practice since the 1st August, 1944:—

Dr. T. H. Ahern, .. ..	2/10/1944
Dr. J. M. Flynn .. ..	17/10/1944
Dr. W. H. Godby .. ..	12/10/1944
Dr. G. G. Henn .. ..	13/10/1944
Dr. E. C. Varley .. ..	6/11/1944
Dr. L. R. Jury .. ..	6/11/1944

### RAILWAY TANK, BEACON.

*As to Cost and Charges.*

Mr. LESLIE asked the Minister for Railways:

(1) Was the cost of the construction of the concrete tank in use by the railway at Beacon a charge against the Railway Department?

(2) What was the cost charged?

(3) Is it a fact that farmers carting water from this tank are charged for such water?

(4) What is the amount of such charge?

(5) What amount was collected from this source for the year 1943-44?

The MINISTER replied:

(1) Yes.

(2) £9,800.

(3) Yes.

(4) Two settlers pay a fixed annual charge of £10 each. The Mt. Marshall Road Board has a separate meter and pays 5s. per 1,000 gallons.

(5) £31 9s. 6d.

### LICENSED PREMISES.

#### *As to Trading Hours.*

Mr. NORTH (without notice) asked the Premier:

(1) What steps are necessary to vary the liquor trading hours?

(2) Can something be done to enable people who take their evening meal at hotels or eating-houses to obtain liquor legally?

(3) Will he, if necessary, approach the Acting Prime Minister re closing hotel bars in the middle afternoon and extending the time after 6 o'clock to enable those now inconvenienced to be accommodated?

The PREMIER replied:

(1) An order under the National Security Regulations.

(2) An alteration of the order will be necessary before this could be done legally.

(3) This matter can be dealt with by the State Government without reference to the Acting Prime Minister, but in view of the controversial nature of any alteration of the hours of licensed premises, no action has been taken in this matter.

### BILLS (2)—THIRD READING.

1, Busselton Cemetery.

2, Stamp Act Amendment.

Transmitted to the Council.

### BILL—LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL (WAR TIME) ELECTORAL ACT AMENDMENT.

#### *Second Reading.*

THE MINISTER FOR JUSTICE [4.50] in moving the second reading said: This is

a small Bill. Members will recall that in 1943 legislation was introduced and passed for the purpose of giving members of the Forces a vote at any by-election or general election during the existence of the Act. The Act is limited in duration, however, until the 31st December, 1944, and this measure is designed to continue the operation of the Act for the duration of the present war and 12 months thereafter. It is not probable that a general election will take place for three years, but a by-election may possibly occur at any time. At the last general election when this Act was in operation, very satisfactory liaison arrangements were made with the Army, Navy and Air Force, whose representatives co-operated with efficiency and goodwill. The assistance rendered by the Commonwealth electoral officers and divisional officers in the various States was most valuable and efficient, resulting in practically every Western Australian member of the Forces being given an opportunity to record his vote.

Mr. Doney: How is it known that that is a fact?

The MINISTER FOR JUSTICE: The Electoral Department was reasonably satisfied with the efforts that were made. We cannot expect 100 per cent. of efficiency during the war; most returned soldiers will realise that. The crux of the matter is that the Act will expire on the 31st December next and this Bill will extend its operation for the duration of the war and 12 months thereafter. The least we can do is to give these men during that period an opportunity to vote if an election should occur. Those who are fighting our battles are certainly entitled to a say in any election that may take place. I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

On motion by Mr. Seward, debate adjourned.

### BILL—ELECTORAL (WAR TIME) ACT AMENDMENT.

#### *Second Reading.*

THE MINISTER FOR JUSTICE [4.54] in moving the second reading said: This Bill, which is identical with the one I have just moved as applying to the Legislative Council, will affect the Legislative Assembly. Therefore all I have said in moving the second reading of the other Bill goes for

this Bill. It is to provide an opportunity for men to vote at any election for this House whether they be at the front with the Fighting Forces, or doing work directly or indirectly associated with the prosecution of the war. I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

On motion by Mr. Seward, debate adjourned.

### **BILL—COLLIE RECREATION AND PARK LANDS ACT AMENDMENT.**

#### *Second Reading.*

Debate resumed from the 9th November.

**MR. THORN** (Toodyay) [4.55]: In 1931 the Collie Recreation and Park Lands Act was passed, and I recollect its being amended ten years later to provide for the handing over to the board of some forestry land for the purposes of recreation and developing a park. Since then the board has sought to get a title to the property, but, before the title was issued, it was found that a mining lease encroached on the reserve. The Minister has therefore introduced this Bill to give the board control of the land to a depth of 40 ft. Thus it will not interfere with the coalmining lease, and the board will be able to secure its title to the land.

The Premier: That is the usual provision where a mining lease is involved.

**Mr. THORN**: That is so. I support the second reading.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

#### *In Committee.*

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

### **BILL—LOTTERIES (CONTROL) ACT AMENDMENT.**

#### *Second Reading.*

Debate resumed from the 9th November.

**MR. HILL** (Albany) [4.58]: I support the second reading of the Bill because I look upon the Lotteries Commission as a necessary evil. We in this Parliament must face facts. It is unfortunate that to gamble is a trait of human nature. Human nature is rather a peculiar mixture. I recall the story of a little boy

who said to his mother, "Mum, do not say 'must.' Whenever you do, I feel don't all over" I am afraid that we grown-ups have that same nature. We cannot, by legislation, make people moral. While we recognise the existence of this tendency to gamble, we must also realise it is our duty to control and discourage gambling. Before the Lotteries Commission was appointed, there was a considerable number of very undesirable lotteries in this State—cross-word puzzles and other things. In addition, considerable sums of money were being sent out of the State for lotteries in the East. The Lotteries Commission has put a stop to the undesirable lotteries within the State and has been the means of preventing considerable sums of money from leaving the State. On the debit side, however, it has encouraged people to invest in lotteries. This is a fact that must be deplored.

I am not going to be a hypocrite. I occasionally buy a ticket, and can claim to be one of the lucky ones, as I have probably won more than I have spent. The 2s 6d. for the ticket is not a big item for me, and in these days of plentiful money it is probable that all subscribers today can afford the price of a ticket; but I know that in normal times many tickets are bought by people who cannot afford them. While I have no fault to find with the Commission, I am of the opinion that we should not be proud of the increase in the Commission's business, but should be ashamed of it. It shows that while the Commission has controlled lotteries, it has also encouraged them. Instead of setting up advertisements like "Two thousand pounds for two shillings and sixpence," we should stress the fact that the odds of winning £2,000 are 75,000 against one, of a prize of £100 or more 18,500 against one, and of winning any prize 87 against one. Of every 2s. 6d. subscribed, 3d. goes to the agents. These threepences totalled £39,000 last year, and provided substantial incomes for many who could be doing more useful work. One point four pence goes to other administration, one shilling and fourpence is returned to the very few, proportionately, prize-winners, and about 10½d. is available for charities.

The Government is naturally pleased to have all the Commission provided last year—£129,000 for activities the provision of

which is definitely the responsibility of the Government; but it has been necessary for the Commission to collect nearly £400,000 to provide that amount. In spite of these unpalatable facts we must act on the principle, "Of two evils choose the lesser"; and the present evil is preferable to the conditions that existed in pre-Commission days. The Minister, in his efforts to justify the proposal to make the Commission permanent, stated that charities had lost £30,000 because the Commission could not enter into long-term contracts. I consider that this alleged disability could be overcome in other ways. In any case, no Act in sacrosanct; any Act can be repealed whenever Parliament so desires. The Minister also said that this annual Bill entails the expenditure of considerable sums. His statement that there is a growing interest in lotteries justifies the opposition which has existed to the Commission.

The financing of our charities by lotteries is expensive to the public. To provide the amount of nearly £1,000,000 for charities the public has had to subscribe nearly £3,000,000. About one and a quarter per cent. of the subscribers have received prizes, aggregating about £1,600,000, and the agents have received nearly £300,000. The weekly turnover is £9,375, and of this amount the agents receive £900 and the charities about £3,300. While I deplore the fact that lotteries have come—I am afraid—to stay, I do consider that it is not difficult to point out the failings of the Commission, and that we should do all in our power to discourage lotteries instead of encouraging them.

**MRS. CARDELL-OLIVER** (Subiaco): I have no intention of letting this measure pass without saying something against it, though I have not prepared a speech as the member for Albany appears to have done. But the point is this! Firstly, a great deal of money has been given to charitable institutions. I think something like £900,000, or perhaps a little more, has been given over the years to those institutions. But I do not think there is one member of this House or one person outside the House who puts half a crown into a lottery with the idea of giving anything to any charity. People pay their halfcrown definitely with the idea of winning. If they are doing that, we have to realise whether it is a moral thing that is being done, or an immoral thing, or some-

thing non-moral. If it is non-moral, then we do not know the difference between right and wrong; and if it is immoral we are definitely doing something wrong for gain. To legislate for something that is immoral is wrong. Therefore I wholeheartedly oppose the Bill.

The lotteries were initiated, I believe, during the time of depression—I was not in Parliament then. Members opposite will reply to me that it was members on this side of the House who initiated the system. Accordingly I hope that members on this side of the House will declare that they refuse to make the lotteries permanent. I care not what part of the world one is in, the people regard lotteries as immoral, although they accept them. Although charitable institutions are helped every day by the Lotteries Commission, a consequence is that people become less generous in other directions. I recognise that Mr. Kenneally and his fellow-Commissioners are men of understanding, and that they endeavour to do the best possible with the profits of the lotteries. I believe that they investigate every appeal brought before them and endeavour to be perfectly fair. I know they have helped every organisation which has been in need, if it has been in their power to do so. That, however, is not the point. The point is whether the system is right or is wrong.

**Mr. Rodoreda**: Do you take advantage of the lotteries for Subiaco institutions?

**Mrs. CARDELL-OLIVER**: I do not know of any particular institution in Subiaco that takes advantage of them, but I belong to one or two organisations like the Silver Chain, nutritional councils, and various orphanages, and they have definitely benefited by the lotteries. But that, I repeat, is not the point. The point is whether the thing itself is right or is wrong. If by legislation we do a thing that is wrong in order to gain half-a-crown from this person or that person, this country will not get anywhere, morally or otherwise. We must teach the children that it is wrong to put money into lotteries. The halfcrown is put into a lottery not to help charitable institutions, but to get something for little or nothing. I believe the cost of conducting the lotteries amounts to nearly 15 per cent. of the money subscribed. Even if we believe in lotteries, we must acknowledge that the cost is absolutely out of proportion to what is done.

In New South Wales, where there is a State lottery, administrative costs are a little over three per cent. odd; and in Queensland the costs amount to some five to eight per cent.

Here we give a commission of 10 per cent. to ticket sellers, and they have now erected kiosks or shops and other places which have a goodwill of one, two, or three thousand pounds. One seller of lottery tickets makes more by way of commission in a year than we pay our Premier. That is a disgraceful state of things. If the selling commission were reduced to the same amount as obtained in other States, we would not have so many shops selling lottery tickets. The vendors do not even write your name on the ticket, and yet they receive 10 per cent. commission. I believe the Bill will pass this Chamber, because the Government has the numbers; but I do not think it will pass another place, and I shall do all I can to see that it does not pass here. I am wholeheartedly against the Bill, and I hope members will not allow an absolutely immoral measure to be re-enacted.

**MR. DONEY** (Williams-Narrogin): To a considerable extent I agree with the views just voiced by the member for Subiaco. As a general rule we wish to take credit for far more in the way of charitable feeling and generosity than actually we possess. I know it is possible to claim that we buy a lottery ticket in order to assist hospitals, but I am with the member for Subiaco in believing that probably 99 per cent. of those who purchase tickets do not do it for that purpose, but solely for the purpose of making the half-crown as profitable an investment as possible. I am not prepared to concede what is asked for in the Bill, making the lotteries permanent; but I am prepared to go as far as two years of freedom from criticism by this House. I concede readily that having regard to the personnel of the executive, that is Chairman of the Commission, the Commissioners, and the secretary, we would be quite safe in allowing them freedom from criticism for, shall I say, all time, or until we reconsider the position at some future date.

It must be admitted—we can do no other than admit—that the present set-up, with Mr. Kenneally as Chairman, and Mr. Green as Secretary—has enabled this matter to be worked very successfully and very

fairly. Those two executive officers have received, and deserved, a great deal of praise from all quarters and I am one who joins in that praise. But I would like the House to consider that we have had executives in the past who have not been so free from criticism from this House and we may get them again. At any time we may have a new chairman or a new secretary or new commissioners, with the result that the general outlook and the methods followed by the Commission may change rapidly; in which case we would, I am sure, feel sorry had we done anything so drastic as is now suggested in the Bill.

**Mr. Rodoreda:** Does not that refer to every board we create?

**Mr. Watts:** How many are there on a permanent basis?

**Mr. Rodoreda:** Most of them.

**Mr. DONEY:** As a general principle, I think it is desirable that every board created by this House should have its activities reviewed periodically. So long as the present Commission remains in office, I would not mind the Act being extended for two years. I understand that the plea submitted in favour of the Act being made permanent is that the Commissioners wish to buy a certain block of buildings in the city, partly for their own use and partly for letting purposes, but that they hesitate to do so unless they have the knowledge that they will be free agents in matters of finance for many years to come. I believe that the building is required for letting purposes. I take it that the Premier does not know or does not care to say.

**The Premier:** I know as much as you have said.

**Mr. DONEY:** I thought the Premier would know a little more about it. Suppose that such a deal were made, but that in November in any year, when the matter came up for reconsideration, the building had not been fully paid for! The House, having earlier concurred in the acquisition of the building, could be depended upon, I think, to agree to the continuance of the Act. It would be most unusual if that were not so. But why should such a costly enterprise be undertaken? I do not think it is permitted under the Act. I thought I had the Act in front of me but I cannot find it. However, I believe the Lotteries (Control) Act sets out that its purpose is entirely charitable; but the purchase of a

big block of offices for letting purposes would hardly be an act of charity in any sense. Certainly the Act did not envisage and did not provide for that type of commercial transaction. Incidentally, may we be informed by the Minister, when he replies, exactly into whose possession this building would fall?

The Premier: Which one are you talking about?

Mr. DONEY: I do not think the Premier requires me to give him that information. The building to which I am referring is well known, and I think the intention of the Lotteries Commission in regard to it is equally well known.

The Premier: I do not know anything about it.

Mr. DONEY: I accept the Premier's assurance that that is so, but that does not change the fact that the Commission has eyes upon it; and, if this measure passes, the Commission, according to what is freely stated, will purchase it. I take it for granted that the Minister in charge of the Bill has a little more information at his disposal than has the Premier; and I would ask him whether, in the event of the discontinuance of this Act at any time, the building would fall to the Government or whether it would be sold and the proceeds made the subject of a trust fund for some specific charitable object. If this is envisaged, might I point out that the charities that would normally benefit from the Lotteries Commission would not be so well off by a long way until the cost of the building had been met. That is as far as I need to go.

Mr. Rodoreda: You have gone too far and not far enough.

Mr. DONEY: I shall be glad to enlighten the hon. member if he will indicate in what direction. I have my objections to the principle underlying lotteries. I share those expressed by the member for Subiaco. I might go further and say I object because lotteries imply an altogether too indiscriminate type of taxation wherein those who contribute most can generally least afford it, and prizes go to the lucky ones instead of to the most deserving. However, we must accept the position that, by a majority vote of this House and another place, we are saddled with the Lotteries Commission. Since we must have a Lotteries Commission let us have a good

one; and, so far as it can be secured, we have a good one. I do not suppose that anywhere can there be found two better executives than Mr. Kenneally and Mr. Green. If I could be assured that they were going to be there for the next hundred years, perhaps I might be more easily persuaded to give the wider license the Bill seeks.

MR. THORN (Toodyay): I have no objection to the re-enactment of this legislation, because it has brought lotteries under control and, as the member for Albany stated, has done away with a lot of undesirable small lotteries and cross-word puzzles.

Mr. North: Money used to go out of the State, too.

Mr. THORN: Yes. It should be our ambition to bring such things as lotteries totally under the control of the State. As the member for Claremont said, the Lotteries Commission keeps a tremendous amount of money in this State that used to go to other States, and that is our job; that is what we are here for—to keep control of that sort of thing. Nevertheless, I object to the 10 per cent commission that is paid to sellers of tickets. I have always thought it far too high, and that there is room for some reform in that regard. To a large extent, I agree with the arguments of the member for Subiaco; but I would like to point out that whether people invest 2s. 6d. in a lottery ticket or on a racecourse or in business, they expect some return for it. Those who are so desirous of assisting charities can, if they feel disposed, put their hands in their pocket and give a lump sum for that purpose, according to their conscience. Seeing that people have a tendency to gamble, here is an opportunity for them to do so in a small way, under control; and the chairman of the Commission, the secretary, and the Commissioners have already been commended by different speakers for the efficient control they have exercised.

With the present method of control we are all in accord. However, I do not consider it necessary to make this Act permanent. If we want to keep control, the best way to do so is to re-enact this measure when necessary. There are more important measures on the statute-book than this that the House has never seen fit to

make permanent. There are Acts dealing with primary production and rendering great service to primary industry—most important Acts that I would not like to see scrapped. I would like to see them permanently on the statute-book of this State. We have just re-enacted one for two years, and I consider that a very important Act of Parliament. In the past, I have spoken strongly on this measure, when different amendments have been submitted of which I did not approve. I approve of this measure. I think it is far more desirable than what we have had in the past, but I do not think it necessary to make the measure permanent. If we re-enact the legislation for two years, we will keep a firm control and will prevent all sorts of things being done in the next few years that might upset quite a lot of us. I wholeheartedly approve of the Act, and hope that an amendment to the Bill will be accepted providing for it to be continued for two years.

**THE MINISTER FOR THE NORTH-WEST** (in reply): There does not seem to be very much for me to reply to. The objections voiced against the Bill were: First, the high cost of commission alleged to be paid to sellers of tickets; secondly, the moral aspect; thirdly, that there are many other Acts of Parliament which are re-enacted annually and which, to Western Australia, are just as important as, if not more important than is the Lotteries (Control) Act. The overhead expenses in connection with lotteries have definitely been reduced. I gave figures, when introducing the Bill, as to the extent to which the cost has declined. It is useless to argue whether we are morally entitled to conduct lotteries. If it be a sin to conduct lotteries, it was a much greater sin to allow the gambling that went on in other avenues before the introduction of this measure. If it be a sin for Western Australia to give permission for lotteries to be conducted, then there are many of our sister States committing the same sin. There are lotteries in New South Wales, Queensland and Tasmania. I am not sure of the other States, but the majority have permitted this system of gambling. If the Western Australian Government, on moral grounds, decided to abolish the Lotteries Commission,

many hundreds of thousands of pounds would leave Western Australia for investment in lotteries in the other States; because, whether people invest 2s. 6d. with a view to assisting hospitals or other charities, or whether they do so for purely personal gain, gambling will continue and we will not prevent people from taking lottery tickets from somewhere.

It has been said that to give permanency to this Act may interfere with the integrity of the Commission that may, at some future date, take charge of the measure. The permanency of the Act has nothing whatever to do with the permanency of the Commission or of the staff, which will be re-appointed in the usual way by whatever Government may happen to be in power for the time being. The guarantee that Parliament and the public generally have is to be found in the reports of the auditors on each lottery as it is held, the audits being carried out by the officers of the Auditor General's Department. That is the security that the people have with respect to the conduct of lotteries. I cannot see anything in the argument that at some future date the personnel of the Commission might be changed and that possibly something not helpful to the interests of the State might be likely to happen. The member for Williams-Narrogin raised a point respecting which he appears to have information that is not possessed by the Government. When I moved the second reading of the Bill, I pointed out that in the opinion of the members of the Lotteries Commission, they had, because of the lack of permanency respecting the conduct of lotteries, lost something in the vicinity of £30,000 through not being able to make long-term contracts regarding buildings, printing and so on.

Mr. Doney: What buildings had you in mind?

**THE MINISTER FOR THE NORTH-WEST**: None, and I do not think the Commission had any in mind. From a purely business point of view, if I wanted to lease or rent a property and was able to enter into a long-term contract, I would be able to secure the premises much more cheaply than if I leased them for a period of 12 months only. That is merely a matter of commonsense. That is all, I think, the Commission had in mind. If the Act becomes a permanent measure, the Commission will



be able to enter into more satisfactory business transactions.

Mr. Watts: Can the Commission purchase a building under its present powers?

The MINISTER FOR THE NORTH-WEST: I do not think so. As I pointed out in my earlier speech, every time a Bill is introduced to extend the operations of the Act for a further period of 12 months or two years, a certain amount of expenditure is involved. I do not think the lotteries will ever be abolished, and with that expression of opinion I believe most members will agree.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

#### *In Committee.*

Mr. Marshall in the Chair; the Minister for the North-West in charge of the Bill.

Clause 1—agreed to.

Clause 2—Repeal of Section 21:

Mr. HILL: I move an amendment—

That in lines 1 and 2 the words “as amended from time to time is hereby repealed” be struck out.

The object of the clause is to make the Act permanent, which I regard as undesirable. If the amendment be agreed to, I propose to move to insert the words “is amended by deleting the word ‘forty-four’ and inserting the word ‘forty-six’” in lieu of those struck out. The effect of the amendment will be to extend the life of the Act for a further two years. The original purpose of the Act was to control lotteries. My principal objection to the work of the Commission is that the Commissioners encourage the holding of lotteries. The fact that charitable institutions are assisted is not sufficient justification for that, and we should certainly not encourage the holding of more lotteries. If the amendment I propose be agreed to, the Act will have to be reviewed at the end of two years. I hope that in time we shall be able to cease holding lotteries.

#### *Point of Order.*

The Chairman: I would like the Committee to bear with me for a moment. I consider the proposed amendment inadmissible. The Bill before the Committee seeks to repeal a section in the present statute. That is the principle embodied in the measure. The amendment seeks the continuance and extension of the section the Bill proposes to repeal. While I agree that

the Committee has full power to pass amendments even to the extent of nullifying the provisions of the Bill, I am particularly doubtful as to whether the amendment is admissible. It seeks to reverse the principle embodied in the Bill and agreed to at the second reading stage, which, in principle, sought to affirm the objective of the clause. In “May’s Parliamentary Practice,” 12th edition, page 371, reference is made to inadmissible amendments. I hope the Committee will follow me closely so that it may appreciate my point. “May” reads—

The Chairman also, in the case of an amendment offered to a Bill that was limited in scope to the repeal of a clause in a statute, ruled that the amendment was out of order, because its object was the continuance and the extension of the clause to be repealed. The Chairman stated that, though the Committee had full power to amend, even to the extent of nullifying, the provisions of a Bill, they could not insert a clause which reversed the principle which the Bill, as read a second time, sought to affirm.

As the amendment does that, I have no option but to rule it out.

Amendment ruled out.

#### *Dissent from Chairman’s Ruling.*

Hon. W. D. Johnson: I regret that I shall have to move to disagree with your ruling, Mr. Chairman. If it is allowed to stand, there will be placed upon the Committee a great restriction which has not been exercised since I have been associated with Parliament.

Mr. Thorn: We might as well be wiped out!

Hon. W. D. Johnson: I have only had the opportunity to listen to what you have read, Mr. Chairman, but, following upon your reading, it would seem that Parliament must not extend—

The Chairman: Is the hon. member disagreeing with my ruling?

Hon. W. D. Johnson: Yes.

The Chairman: Then I must request the hon. member to send up his objection in writing; the matter is not the subject of debate at the moment.

#### *[The Speaker resumed the Chair.]*

The Chairman having stated the dissent,

Hon. W. D. Johnson: I look upon this as a very simple matter. The position is that the Lotteries Commission has been created by an Act of Parliament. For years

it has been necessary to re-enact the legislation so that the Commission might continue in operation. The Act has been limited from time to time because Parliament in its wisdom established the Commission on a temporary basis. Until the present Bill was introduced, the Commission was maintained on a temporary basis in the sense that the Act had to be re-enacted from time to time. The Bill proposes that the Act shall now be of a permanent character, and the member for Albany has moved an amendment the effect of which would limit its life, as has been the practice over the years. The Chairman of Committees ruled the amendment out of order on the ground that because the second reading was passed of the Bill which proposes to continue the Act permanently, it is not permissible for the Committee to amend the measure to continue the Act temporarily, or, in other words, to repeat the practice followed in previous re-enacting Bills.

I draw attention to the fact that it is the universal practice always to give to Parliament a second thought, and an opportunity to reconsider a matter. From the Speaker's Chair, if there is a casting vote, it is always, irrespective of the proposition, in the direction of giving to Parliament a further thought. A Speaker does not vote "Yes," if "No" gives to Parliament an opportunity for further consideration. That is the basis of Parliamentary practice. The right of Parliament must not be restricted. This issue is a distinct one. I submit that if we are going to be restricted on this measure we shall know what to expect. If this kind of amendment is out of order we shall have to fight every second reading and throw out the Bill at that stage because of the limitation of our rights when in Committee. That has never operated in the past.

The second reading debate, in a case like the present, was for the purpose of endorsing the principle of the Lotteries Commission being allowed to continue in business. Surely Parliament can say, "Yes, continue in business, but only for so long!" Surely we have the right to say in Committee for how long a period the Commission shall continue! Unless we have that right the whole of the Parliamentary practice as we know it will be altered. I shall be sorry to see that restriction imposed

upon us. I submit that it is not in accordance with Parliamentary practice. I do not think "May" would allow us to make permanent that which is proposed to be temporary, but, when it is proposed to make temporary that which is sought to be made permanent, we are protecting the right of Parliament to review the matter from time to time. On these grounds I think the Chairman was wrong in his decision.

Mr. Marshall: Parliament has not been tested upon the point, nor has this House been tested upon it. There is a given set of rules and principles laid down, and decisions have been given by presiding officers in the House of Commons. I venture to say that each of those decisions is founded on commonsense and justice. In my judgment it is not the fault of the Speaker or the Chairman of Committees that these points are raised, but due rather to the lackadaisical attitude adopted by members towards the rules of debate, and to their desire, having missed one opportunity, that the presiding officer should relax and give them a further opportunity. It is no pleasure to me to rule any member out of order, but unless we confine our debates to our Standing Orders and to the practices usually adhered to by the House of Commons and the rules of debate in similar institutions, we shall reach such a stage where our debates become ridiculous. I believe that is not foreign in some Parliaments within the Commonwealth.

I did not rule out of order the amendment of the member for Albany because I took pleasure in so doing; nor do I think this point would have been raised on any other than a continuance measure. It is the first incident of its kind I have any recollection of when a continuance Bill was about to be made permanent by the Government of the day and a member sought to oppose that step being taken. I remind the member for Guildford-Midland that this is not a principle that has been constantly brought forward or is likely to arise again. This Chamber could have voted the Bill out on the second reading, the Committee can vote the clause out, or the Bill can be voted out on the third reading. We have to adhere to the decisions of those who have preceded us and who are probably better versed in the rules of de-

bate and Parliamentary practice than we are. I venture to say that there is no averment in "May" that is more specific upon a particular point than is the case on this point. I will read what "May" has to say—

The Chairman also, in the case of an amendment offered to a Bill that was limited in scope to the repeal of a clause in a statute, ruled that the amendment was out of order, because its object was the continuance and the extension of the clause to be repealed.

The Chairman ruled that the amendment was out of order because its object was the continuance of the extension of the clause in the parent Act so to be repealed. That is the object of the amendment I ruled out of order, and the Bill itself says that that part of the parent Act shall be repealed. Could anything be more specific? The only member who has not apparently digested that, is the member for Guildford-Midland. "May" goes on to say—

The Chairman stated that, though the Committee had full power to amend, even to the extent of nullifying the provisions of the Bill, they could not insert a clause which reversed the principle which the Bill, as read a second time, sought to affirm

Nothing could be more explicit. Are we not going to pay any regard to the rules that are set down for us to conform to? It is an obligation upon us to see that some respect is paid to the rules of debate. That is the whole point. It is laid down in these rules that an amendment is not permitted to reverse the principle to which the House has agreed on the second reading. If we did so we would be stultifying the vote given on the second reading. The constitution of this Committee is of the House as a whole, so that were we not to obey the rules of debate we would have one decision in the House and immediately reverse it in Committee of the whole House.

I respectfully suggest that the principle adopted in the House of Commons on an occasion similar to this was the correct one. Were that not so we would be in danger of becoming a rabble. In my decision I was guided by one better versed than I am in these questions and by an institution I hold in high esteem and respect. There are no restrictions upon the activities and scope of a member. He has many opportunities given to him in connection with any Bill. If members were more alert as to the Standing Orders and were to give more considera-

tion to the rules of debate this point would never have been raised; nor would amendments such as the one we have been dealing with have to be ruled out. We should not depart from the Standing Orders. If they are silent on a point we must then adopt the rules set down for us by the House of Commons.

Mr. Watts: This is a most peculiar set of circumstances. I think that justice would best be done and the Standing Orders satisfactorily complied with if the amendment were allowed to proceed. The Chairman of Committees fastens himself to some rather abstruse decision that is to be found in that interesting book which we call "May." I should like to ask whether "May" had the Standing Orders of the Legislative Assembly of Western Australia to deal with when he made this interesting assertion. I venture to say that he had nothing of the kind before him. I have not the faintest idea, nor do I think 90 per cent. of the members of this Chamber have the least idea, whether the Standing Orders of the Mother Parliament bear any resemblance to those which we have or are couched in the same words, or just what they are.

Mr. J. Hegney: You are an iconoclast. You want to break down everything.

Mr. Watts: I want to preserve to members some semblance of right, as the member for Guildford-Midland suggested to deal with legislation that is brought before them. I do not know whether the rulings given in that interesting book, which is read all too often in this place, are founded on the Standing Orders of the Parliament of Great Britain, but I do know that Standing Order No. 1 of the Legislative Assembly of Western Australia—of which we are all aware—contains the following:—

In all cases not provided for hereinafter, or by Sessional or other Orders, resort shall be had to the rules, forms and practice of the Commons House of the Imperial Parliament of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, which shall be followed as far as they can be applied to the proceedings of this House.

The Standing Order does not say we have to follow those rules and forms inch by inch and minute by minute, and never vary them in the slightest degree, which is the tragedy that is growing up in this Assembly so far as private members are concerned. Private members include all those who do not sit on the front bench on the Government side of the House. The Standing Order

does not say we must follow those documents slavishly, and in all cases "not provided for hereinafter" and "as far as they can be applied to the proceedings of this House," which lays it open to some inquiry. What is the position so far as members of this House are concerned? No-one has yet suggested by what other means the amendment of the member for Albany can be moved.

The Premier: That will be found in the Standing Orders.

Mr. Watts: Neither the Chairman of Committees, nor any member who has yet spoken, has made any suggestion as to how this proposal can be brought forward by a private member for the purpose of allowing the Committee to discuss the question, or the question whether the Bill is to be permanent or not. We are offered a Bill, a rather extraordinary one in many aspects in that it repeals that section which for 11 years has given a temporary term of office to the Lotteries Commission! If the ruling be correct, we are therefore in the position that we cannot say anything except, "We will have it permanent or will not have it at all." That is our position.

Hon. W. D. Johnson: That is not our position.

Mr. Watts: It is, if the ruling be correct. We are going to say, "We will not have a Lotteries Commission at all by our vote which raised that point of view, or we will have it for all time." The Government, by introducing a Bill of this kind, is simply depriving us of the opportunity to offer any alternative which might be considered just and proper. It seems to me that that never was intended and that the Chairman's ruling is stretching the point much further than it ought to be stretched, even if one assumes for a moment that there is some legal background for the ruling. Turning to our own Standing Orders, No. 281 seems to have some reference to the subject. It says—

Any amendment may be made to a clause, provided the same be relevant to the subject-matter of the Bill . . .

No-one will deny that a proposal to extend the life of the Lotteries Commission for two years is relevant to the subject-matter of the Bill. If I understand the word "relevant" aright, it has relationship to the subject-matter of the Bill, which is to continue it permanently. Consequently, the amendment

does not come under that objection. The Standing Order continues—

or pursuant to any instruction . . .

There is not any—

and be otherwise in conformity with the rules and orders of the House; . . .

I have taken some time, such as is available to me, to look at the other rules and orders of the House, but I can find nothing to say that there is anything wrong with the amendment on that ground. The Standing Order continues—

but if any amendment shall not be within the Title of the Bill, the Committee shall extend the Title accordingly, and report the same specially to the House.

The Title of the Bill is plain enough; it is "to amend the Lotteries (Control) Act, 1932-1943." Therefore, it is not a question of not being within the order of leave, as was the amendment the other night in respect of which I thought there was some justification for its disallowance, although the ruling on it might have been subject to argument. Standing Order No. 282 says—

No clause, schedule, or amendment in substance shall be offered to, be added to, or made in, any Bill in possession of the House except in Committee of the whole House.

So it seems to me that if this amendment is ruled out of order, away goes another one of the few fast disappearing remaining privileges of private members of this House to deal with legislation that seems to them to require alteration; although in principle we are agreeable to the continuance of the Lotteries Commission, the only divergence of opinion being as to whether it shall be for an indefinite term or for a specific term. The amendment offers a specific term; the Minister's Bill desires an indefinite term. The principle of the Bill is not, as I understand it, to give the Commission a definite term, but to extend its term, to continue its life; our suggestion is that the Commission shall have a life of two years as against a life for any number of years. To my way of thinking, there should not be any difference about it. The amendment ought to be accepted. We ought to pay more attention to the rules and principles of our own Standing Orders rather than slavishly follow something which we do not understand most of the time and which is in operation 10,000 or 12,000 miles away.

The Premier: The ruling of the Chairman of Committees is quite right. Our Standing Orders are modelled on the Standing Orders of the House of Commons, and consequently when we are in a difficulty or in doubt, we have the precedent of many years of rulings which have been upheld by three or four different authorities. We have also the well-recognised work "May's Parliamentary Practice."

Hon. W. D. Johnson: And our own Standing Orders.

Mr. Speaker: Order!

The Premier: That work is regarded as authoritative. I do not pose as an authority on Standing Orders; but I think the object of the member for Albany could have been achieved when the second reading of the Bill was being moved. The member for Albany could have moved as an amendment to the motion that "The Bill be now read a second time," "subject to amendment with respect to the length of time for which the Bill shall be in operation."

Mr. Berry: The member for Albany said that.

The Premier: No. He did not move it. The Speaker put the motion, "That the Bill be now read a second time." That was the stage at which our Standing Orders provide that an instruction should be given to the Committee to deal with an amendment lengthening or shortening the term of the Commission's appointment.

Mr. Watts: We tried that two years ago and it was ruled out of order.

The Premier: I do not think so.

Mr. Doney: You cannot prevail against the Government.

The Premier: That is not the point.

Mr. Doney: But you did not hear the point I intended to make.

The Premier: I heard what the hon. member said. He did not believe me this afternoon, but I believe him. In my opinion, we are not getting away from the procedure of the House, nor are we depriving members of their rights and privileges. Had what I suggested been done, the whole matter could have been discussed in Committee and then referred back. We are not denying the right of the House to carry out its business in its own way, nor are we taking away from members the right to move that certain things may be done under the Standing Orders. If a motion

for the second reading has attached to it an instruction to the Committee that it shall consider this, that or the other, then it is within the order of leave.

Mr. Rodoreda: But the instruction to the Committee must be put on the notice paper.

The Premier: I accept what the member for Roebourne says. Members have methods by which they can carry out the procedure of the House and protect their rights as to the amendment of any legislation. The way I have pointed out is the method by which this amendment could have been moved. Had the member for Albany taken advantage of that procedure we would not have reached this impasse. As I said, I consider the ruling was right. I agree with the member for Murchison that I have never seen a ruling of "May" so appropriate, so applicable, to the circumstances under discussion. In my opinion, the Chairman had no option but to rule as he did.

Mr. Doney: There is plainly a great deal that is not known about the intentions of "May" or the intentions of our Standing Orders, which latter are supposed to be our official guide. We are constantly finding on all points that arise, differences of opinion between the other side of the House and this, difficulties that "May" seldom solves with general satisfaction. I cannot see why we need to follow "May" so slavishly. I admit we must have an authority but I can find no reason why it should be "May."

Hon. W. D. Johnson: "May" does not endorse this.

Mr. Doney: So far as "May" comes into the matter, he comes into it here; but it is laid down for general guidance, at the commencement of our Standing Orders and rules—

In all cases not provided for hereinafter, or by Sessional or other Orders, resort shall be had to the rules, forms and practice of the Commons House of the Imperial Parliament of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, which shall be followed as far as they can be applied to the proceedings of this House.

The Premier: Exactly!

Mr. Doney: That would certainly seem to indicate that we should be in possession here of that "Manual of Proceedings" which should be found in the Parliament of Great Britain. There should be a book properly set up, containing the rules, form

and practice of the Commons House of the Imperial Parliament. We should have such a publication here to guide us. We are required by our Standing Orders and rules to observe it, but it seems to me it is not in existence.

The Premier: The very title of the book, "May's Parliamentary Practice" proves that it is an authority.

Mr. Doney: But our Standing Orders make no specific reference to "May" or any other authority. We need not necessarily accept "May"; there may be some other interpretation of the Standing Orders of the House of Commons besides his. In my opinion, if we are required to follow the harsh dictates of "May" so slavishly as in the present instance, there should be a specific direction to that effect in our Standing Orders. That is all I intended to say. If light can be thrown on the question as to when we first started following "May" and whether it is legally and officially incumbent upon us to do so I hope it will be done. I quite admit that usage may give us some direction; but I maintain there should be an authority quite apart from that which arises from usage. The case is not sufficiently strong to suit me. If you, Mr. Speaker, will be good enough to elucidate these points, I and the House will, I am sure, be glad.

Mr. Berry: I am not a constitutional authority, nor do I know very much about the Standing Orders; but I am beginning to think that there is nothing left to private members. The reasons put forward by the Chairman of Committees were very clear, but the feeling I am left with is this: During the life of this Parliament we have become adept at dropping the axe on everything we on this side of the House bring forward. That is a distressing state of affairs to me, "May," "Mary" or "Milly" notwithstanding. My feeling is that the member for Albany very definitely gave the House an assurance that something in the nature of an amendment would be moved. So much was I under that impression that, before he stopped speaking, I actually read the amendment into the Bill under discussion. I looked at my notice paper and saw the amendment was there. Another matter that worries me, apart from the manner in which we are being "axed"—I am getting mentally restive on that score—is that if it continues it will be a waste of time for

us to attend here. We could have voted this Bill out on the second reading had we been, perhaps,—

The Premier: Strong enough!

Mr. Berry: —as learned as the Premier. But I would like to know upon what authority the Premier asserts that we could have said, "If you do not give us a two years' basis in the Bill, we will rule it out." How are we to amend a Bill of this nature, which contains but one clause which we do not like?

*Sitting suspended from 6.15 to 7.30 p.m.*

Mr. Berry: Before tea I was endeavouring to find out how it would be possible to amend anything in this Bill. It seems that the member for Albany could have voted against the Bill. His only other alternative, I understand, would be to move an amendment during the Committee stage. If that principle is negatived, how is it possible to bring forward any amendment to a Bill that we might wish to submit? The member for Albany made it very apparent throughout his discourse during the second reading debate that it was his intention to endeavour to have the Bill extended for a period of two years. Those are my two objections. My first objection, as I mentioned earlier, is that I think there has been far too much political head-chopping during this session.

Mr. Speaker: Order! The hon. member must not make such allusions.

Mr. Berry: I am sorry. I do not know how to express the disappointment I feel, and I trust that the ruling given will not be allowed to stand.

Mr. McDonald: The reference in the 12th edition of "May" at page 371 is that the chairman—

in the case of an amendment offered to a Bill that was limited in scope to the repeal of a clause in a statute . . .

made a certain ruling. So the basis of his ruling was that the Bill was limited in scope to the repeal of a clause in a statute. I thought the scope of a Bill depended always on the order for leave to bring the Bill in, and what was contained in the order for leave was repeated in the long title of the Bill. Those two factors—the order for leave and the repetition in the long title of the Bill—I always thought, rightly or wrongly, determined the scope of the Bill. If that is correct and we look at the scope

of the Bill now before the House, we find it is a Bill for an Act to amend the Lotteries (Control) Act, 1932-1943. With great deference to the Chairman of Committees, I should have thought—and always have thought—that under a Bill with an order for leave and a long title in those terms, any section in the parent Act might be the subject of amendment in Committee.

I always thought that if a member or Minister introducing a Bill desired to limit the scope of an amendment he limited the order for leave and the long title by providing that the object of the Bill was to amend or repeal a section or, in the case of a temporary Bill, to continue the operation of that Bill. If that reasoning is correct, this amendment would be within the scope of the Bill. I feel that the authorities referred to by the Chairman of Committees may not govern this case at all, because we do not know sufficient about them. If the term "scope of the Bill" means what I have thought it meant, then, when the Chairman of Committees in the case reported in "May" dealt with a Bill that was limited in scope to the repeal of a clause in a statute, he was dealing with the order for leave only and the long title, which simply referred to a Bill for an Act to repeal a certain section in the parent Act.

If the case cited in "May" were of that description, I could understand the ruling mentioned in "May." But we do not know what the order for leave or the title was in the case cited in "May." From a reading of the example cited in "May," I would think that the order for leave and the long title of the Bill were, as I have mentioned, a Bill for an Act to repeal a specified section in the principal Act. I find it difficult to believe that the ruling referred to in "May" could have been applied to a Bill that was so general in its terms that it proclaimed itself to be a Bill for an Act to amend the parent Act without any restrictions or indications of the sections in the parent Act which were to be or could be affected by the amending Bill.

Mr. Speaker: Order! I want to hear the member for West Perth.

Mr. McDonald: In view of the fact that the order for leave and the long title and—as it appears to me—the scope of this particular Bill before the Committee are as wide as the parent Act itself, we may turn

just for a moment to the amendment. The section proposed to be repealed by the Bill is Section 21, which provides that the parent Act shall continue in force till a certain date and no longer. In other words, it is the section which makes the measure temporary. The Bill now before the Committee proposes to repeal this section and take the parent Act out of the category of temporary Acts and place it into that of permanent Acts. The amendment simply seeks to retain the present temporary character of the Act and to give it currency for a further period of two years. In the absence of any clear authority the amendment appears to be essentially relevant to the Bill because it seeks to prevent the Act being made permanent, and to retain the temporary character which it now possesses. I would be reluctant to see an amendment that appears to be so relevant and so much within the compass of the interests of members of the Committee ruled out on a reference in "May" which very possibly and quite probably refers to a different kind of Bill altogether, namely, a Bill in which the order for leave is restricted to the repeal of a single section.

Hon. W. D. Johnson: Have I the right of reply?

Mr. Speaker: No. I draw the attention of the member for West Perth to Standing Order No. 2, which provides.

"Subject-matter of a Bill" means the provisions of the Bill as printed, read a second time, and referred to the Committee.

I suggest that the member for West Perth has not seen that Standing Order. With regard to the ruling, the subject-matter of this Bill, as introduced, was the repeal of Section 21. The House, on the second reading, agreed to the Bill with that subject-matter. Standing Order No. 281, quoted by the Leader of the Opposition, provides as follows:—

Any amendment may be made to a clause provided the same be relevant to the subject-matter of the Bill.

To permit an amendment that went beyond the subject-matter would be beyond the power of the Chairman. The Chairman, when in doubt, in giving his ruling, is guided by "May's Parliamentary Practice" which is the most reliable of guides in interpreting the practice of Parliament. In my opinion, his ruling was absolutely in ac-

cordance with the passage quoted by him and I must, therefore, uphold his ruling.

### *Dissent from Speaker's Ruling.*

Mr. Watts: I rise to move—

That the House dissent from the Speaker's ruling.

I have yet to learn from anybody in this House by what manner of procedure an amendment to this Bill can be moved.

Mr. Speaker: That has nothing to do with my ruling. The Leader of the Opposition must confine himself to disagreeing with that.

Mr. Watts: I am about to do so, but I suggest, with great deference, that in order to disagree with your ruling, Sir, it is relevant to know whether there is any other procedure that can be adopted. If there is no other procedure then there is no other method of amending the Bill. That is foreign to the intention of Standing Orders and to the intention of every principle of this House. You, Sir, have disagreed with the member for West Perth by quoting Standing Order No. 281, to which I referred, and which provides that an amendment may be made provided the same is relevant to the subject-matter of the Bill. You have also referred to Standing Order No. 2 which defines subject-matter as meaning—

The provisions of the Bill as printed, read a second time, and referred to the Committee.

A divergence of opinion must exist as to whether the exact meaning you attribute to the phrase "subject-matter" is correct. You, Sir, confine it within a very narrow space. You say, if I understand you correctly, that because the Bill simply seeks to repeal Section 21 it is impossible to take any other action with regard to Section 21 than to repeal it or to throw the Bill out, which would tend to obliterate the Commission for all time. The alternative to altering it in the manner proposed by the member for Albany is either to deprive the House of any right to amend it, or to reject the Bill altogether and thus dispose of the Lotteries Commission. I submit that the doing away of the Lotteries Commission is definitely not the subject-matter of the Bill. The continuance of the Commission for an indefinite period is the subject-matter of the Bill. Its continuance, in short, is the subject-matter, and I submit that the questions of whether it be continued indefinitely

or for a specified number of years are both well within the subject-matter of the Bill, because the subject-matter is not the question of doing away with the Lotteries Commission, but its continuance.

To place a restricted interpretation upon the term, "subject-matter" in Standing Order No. 2 means that we can do nothing except repeal the section as proposed by the Bill, or reject the Bill altogether and thus end the existence of the Lotteries Commission. That seems to me to be unduly limiting the authority which Parliament possesses. I can find no other way by which this matter can be handled because there have been rulings from you, Sir, as to instructions to the Committee which, in the course of his remarks on the Chairman's ruling, the Premier introduced into the debate that then took place. The Premier alleged that it was competent for the Committee to take steps to have itself instructed in order that it might deal with some such proposition as this. But I submit that if your interpretation of the term "subject-matter" is the correct one then it is impossible for the House to instruct the Committee. I need only go back to the debates in this House on the 4th December, 1941, and to a ruling which you, Sir, gave then to lend at least some colour to that statement.

It will be remembered that on an earlier occasion the member for Roebourne, who was anxious to insert into a continuance measure dealing with the same lotteries Act a proposal that the affairs of the Lotteries Commission should be subject to the Government auditor, proposed to give an instruction to the Committee. Having duly given notice that proposal of his was accepted and, the instruction to the Committee being agreed to by the House, a clause having reference to the Government auditor and to the Commission's book-keeping was agreed to in Committee and subsequently became the law of this State. In 1941, however, the same procedure was proposed to be adopted by way of instruction to the Committee in connection with an amendment to the Industries Assistance Act Continuance Bill. The necessary notice was given and the necessary motion made by the then member for Avon and you, Sir, ruled his proposal out of order on the following grounds:—

I would like to draw the hon. member's attention to the fact that his proposed Instruc-



tion to Committee on this Bill must be ruled out of order. Standing Order No. 393 provides that an instruction can be passed authorising a Committee on a Bill to make amendments, not otherwise possible, provided they be relevant to the subject-matter of the Bill. The subject-matter of this Bill is the continuance of the operation of the parent Act for a further period of one year, and that alone. Unless an instruction comes within the terms of the Standing Order above quoted, it cannot be moved.

I draw the attention of the House to the fact that an instruction to the Committee cannot be given unless it is relevant to the subject-matter of the Bill. Taking your restricted ruling as to the meaning of the term "subject-matter of the Bill" in regard to this Bill, Mr. Speaker, the subject-matter is the repeal of Section 21 of the principal Act and, in consequence, no instruction to the Committee other than the repeal of Section 21 of the principal Act could be accepted, because it would not be relevant, according to your interpretation, to the subject-matter of the Bill.

I quoted from the Speaker's ruling on the 4th December, 1941, when a motion was moved by the then member for Avon as the House was about to go into Committee. Immediately after the second reading had been passed, the hon. member moved that the Committee be instructed to give consideration to the question of adding certain provisions to the Industries Assistance Act Continuance Bill. The Speaker ruled out the proposal on the ground that the provisions had to be relevant to the subject-matter of the Bill and that these were not. I am indicating that your restricted interpretation of the words "subject-matter" in the case of the Bill now before us is such that no instruction to the Committee could be moved that was relevant to the subject-matter of the Bill, unless it was designed to do the same thing as the Bill itself proposes, in other words, repeal Section 21 of the Act, because nothing else could be relevant. That is your ruling. I submit that anything is relevant that has reference to the continuance of the lotteries in existence, whether it be for all time, which would be achieved by repealing Section 21 of the Act, or for two years, which would be achieved by the amendment of the member for Albany, or for any other period any member cared to move. All those would represent a rea-

sonable interpretation of the words "subject-matter of the Bill."

I am not the slightest bit concerned as to whether the proposed amendment of the member for Albany will be defeated. That is a privilege of members of the House when the amendment goes to the vote. What I am concerned about is that there should be no way available to a private member of this House to move any amendment to the clause or to express by his vote an opinion on this clause except to vote against it, which a great majority of the members do not wish to do. The only divergence of opinion is whether the Act shall be continued for two years or for a longer period. In order to have that point of view discussed, the member for Albany has moved the amendment, and it has been ruled out of order. I revert to the 4th December, 1941. On that occasion you, Mr. Speaker, quoted "May's Parliamentary Practice" 13th edition, page 406, as follows:—

In like manner, it is not within the scope of a Committee on an expiring laws continuance Bill to amend the provisions of the Acts proposed to be continued, or to abridge the duration of such provisions; or to make permanent the Acts proposed to be continued; but an amendment to exclude from the continuance by the Bill distinct provisions of such Acts is in order.

You went on to say, Mr. Speaker, that you laid special stress on the words "by the Bill" in the last portion of the above quotation, and added—

It would be quite in order for a Bill to continue the operations of an Act to contain provisions excluding certain portions of the Act from continuance upon its introduction; but the Committee has no power to do this by an instruction or otherwise. I rule the motion out of order.

For those reasons, on your interpretation of what constitutes the subject-matter of a Bill and the limited way in which you interpret it, it would be impossible for the House at any stage of the proceedings to give the Committee an instruction to do anything other than to repeal Section 21 of the Act, and this could not be done because that is part of the Bill. The position, therefore, is that no member can offer by any amendment to alter the proposal before us, which I think everyone will agree is an intolerable state of affairs, and some way ought to be and, in my opinion, must be found out of it.

You have quoted this very interesting volume, "May's Parliamentary Practice" which, as I have said, has been accepted far too widely by this House over a long period of years. I turn now to the paragraphs quoted by the Chairman of Committees, as follows:—

The Chairman also, in the case of an amendment offered to a Bill that was limited in scope to the repeal of a clause in a statute, ruled that the amendment was out of order, because its object was the continuance and the extension of the clause be repealed . . . .

The Chairman stated that, though the Committee had full power to amend, even to the extent of nullifying the provisions of the Bill, they could not insert a clause which reversed the principle which the Bill, as read a second time, sought to affirm.

"They could not insert a clause which reversed the principle which the Bill, as read a second time, sought to affirm." Who seeks to reverse the principle of a clause? Not the member for Albany! He seeks to amend the existing clause. As the member for West Perth observed, it is doubtful whether the ruling of the Chairman as quoted on page 371 of the 12th Edition of "May" has any reference to the proposal at present before the House. The Chairman in the passage quoted from "May" was dealing with a proposal to insert a clause to reverse the principle of the Bill. There is no such proposal by the member for Albany. He simply seeks to amend a clause within the title of the Bill, which is to amend the Lotteries (Control) Act. There are very grave and sincere doubts as to the state into which we are drifting when we allow these decisions to be taken out of "May's Parliamentary Practice" and regard them as applying here.

Mr. North: It should be called "shan't," not "May."

Mr. Watts: That might be so. As I quoted when discussing the Chairman's ruling. No. 1 of the Standing Rules and Orders of the Legislative Assembly says—

In all cases not provided for hereinafter, or by Sessional or other Orders, resort shall be had to the rules, forms and practice of the Commons House of the Imperial Parliament of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, which shall be followed as far as they can be applied to the proceedings of this House.

We are asked to believe that the Chairman's ruling, given on one occasion and reported in the House of Commons debates at page 2398, with no more historical

or legal background than that, without giving the subject-matter of the measure or the exact circumstances of the case, has to be accepted as a means of obliterating for all time in this House—once the ruling is passed, it means for all time—the right of a private member to move an amendment to a Bill of this nature.

The Minister for Mines interjected.

Mr. Watts: The Government has power to bring down whatever it likes. I do not want the Minister to misunderstand me. The Government has charge of the measure, and may include such terms as it pleases so that the rights of all other members may or may not be restricted because of the peculiar wording.

Mr Cross: A private member can bring down a Bill.

Mr. Watts: Then let the hon. member bring down a Bill. I do not mind if he does, but I should be sorry for the Government, because I do not think it is a proper thing for any member of the House—if members want my full opinion—to be restricted in moving an amendment of this nature. No question of money appropriation or any difficulty of that sort arises here. Surely this is the right of any member! As the member for Canning would like it that way, I am prepared to help him if I can. I want to see the right of every member preserved in the matter of moving amendments of this character in Bills of this sort, and I do not want to see it placed on the records of the House, through this ruling, that in future any member is prevented from moving an amendment of this character.

But to come back to this famous Chairman's ruling of the House of Commons, as I say, it has no more legal background or authority than is to be found in the House of Commons debates of some time ago—it may be 50 years ago, or more or less. It is a ruling of the Chairman of the House of Commons of which I have no particulars, nor, so far as I know, has any member of this Chamber, and which is found to be an isolated instance to rule out a proposal which, in my view, has since been covered by quite new proposals which ought to be accepted by this House in this particular case; because there has been quite a lot of water gone under the bridge, so far as the House of Commons is concerned, since many of these things

that are mentioned were placed on record. I find on page 398 of the Thirteenth Edition of Sir Erskine May—I quote this just to show members how many alterations have had to be made in the procedure of even the House of Commons in order to overcome difficulties which arose from time to time—the following:—

To explain the principles that govern the proposal of instructions to Committees of the whole House, it must be borne in mind that, under the Parliamentary usage in force in former times, an amendment might be wholly irrelevant to the motion or Bill to which it was proposed (see page 285), and that consequently clauses might be added to a Bill during its progress through the House relating to any matters however various and unconnected, whether with one another or with the Bill as originally drawn. A reaction from such laxity of procedure led to the establishment of rules and practice which imposed on the House of Commons an inconvenient rigidity in dealing with a Bill.

First of all, they could do as they liked, and then they got a practice and a procedure which imposed on the House of Commons an inconvenient rigidity in dealing with a Bill.

No amendment could be moved which was not strictly within the scope of the prefatory paragraph, known as the Title, which is prefixed to every Bill and describes its objects and scope. To obviate the difficulty thus created, the House, in 1854, by Standing Order No. 34, gave a general instruction to all Committees of the whole House to which Bills were committed, which empowered them to make such amendments therein as they should think fit, provided that the amendments were relevant to the subject-matter of the Bill; and if such amendments were not within the Title of the Bill, the Title was to be amended, and reported specially to the House. This general and standing instruction to Committees on Bills meets all ordinary occasions. Amendments to Bills may, however, be offered which might be beyond the scope of the amendments contemplated by Standing Order No. 34, and which, without a special instruction from the House, could not be considered by the Committee.

The subject-matter of a Bill, as disclosed by the contents thereof, when read a second time, has, since 1854, formed the order of reference which governs the proceedings of the Committee thereon . . .

I have indicated to the House that your interpretation, Sir, of the subject-matter is that the subject-matter of this Bill is the repeal of Section 21, whereas the subject-matter, in my view, is the continuance in existence of the Lotteries Commission, which is being achieved by the repeal of Section 21. In order to continue the

Lotteries Commission in existence, Section 21 is being repealed; and that is the subject-matter of the Bill, the continuance of the life of the Lotteries Commission. Then, of course, that being accepted, there is no difficulty about the matter at all. The only question that exists is whether the Lotteries Commission shall be continued, as proposed in the Bill, for ever, subject of course to the right of Parliament to repeal the measure at a future time, or until the matter of repeal comes up for consideration. What is the subject-matter of the Bill? Is it a mere question of repealing Section 21 of the Act? If it is, if that is to be the correct and limited and strangled interpretation of the words "subject-matter of the Bill," it means that all that has to be done in future in regard to measures of this kind is to bring down a Bill to repeal the section of the Act which regulates its term of life and no member, no matter what the Bill may be—be it a dairy products marketing Bill or a dried fruits Bill or any other continuance measure—will be able successfully to move an amendment either in the House or in Committee to make the Bill otherwise than of indefinite life, unless repealed by some subsequent legislation. I am clear that neither the House nor you, Sir, want that to be the case; and I appeal to the House to reject your ruling because it is founded on some genuine and bona fide mistake, I feel sure genuine and bona fide, which you have made and which, if carried forward in the records of this House, is likely to result in future mistakes.

Mr. Speaker: The Leader of the Opposition has drawn attention to my rulings on several occasions. If there is one thing to be proud of, it is that my rulings have been consistent right through the period. The Leader of the Opposition laid great stress on the phrase "subject-matter of the Bill." I have already drawn the attention of the House to the fact that "subject-matter of the Bill" means the provisions of the Bill as printed, read a second time, and referred to the Committee. So far as this Bill is concerned, there is only one principle contained in it, and that is the repeal of Section 21 of the Act. Chairmen of Committees and Speakers are not here to rule as they might want a measure to be passed. They have to abide by precedents and rules laid down for their guidance. I have ruled

that this Bill can only be either accepted or rejected. If that were not the case, it would be necessary to introduce another measure to rectify the position in regard to continuance Bills.

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

Ayes	..	..	..	..	15
Noes	..	..	..	..	20

Majority against	..	..	5
------------------	----	----	---

AYES.				
Mr. Berry		Mr. Owen		
Mrs. Cardell-Oliver		Mr. Perkins		
Mr. Hill		Mr. Seward		
Mr. Keenan		Mr. Thorn		
Mr. Leslie		Mr. Watts		
Mr. McDonald		Mr. Willmott		
Mr. McLarty		Mr. Doney		
Mr. North				(Teller.)

NOES.				
Mr. Coverley		Mr. Needham		
Mr. Cross		Mr. Nulsen		
Mr. Graham		Mr. Panton		
Mr. Hawke		Mr. Rodoreda		
Mr. J. Hegney		Mr. Smith		
Mr. W. Hegney		Mr. Telfer		
Mr. Holman		Mr. Triat		
Mr. Leahy		Mr. Willcock		
Mr. Marshall		Mr. Withers		
Mr. Millington		Mr. Wilson		(Teller.)

AYES.		NOES.	
Mr. Abbott		Mr. Newton	
Mr. Kelly		Mr. Raphael	
Mr. Mann		Mr. Styants	
Mr. Stubbs		Mr. Wise	

Question thus negatived.

#### Committee Resumed.

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

Ayes	..	..	..	..	19
Noes	..	..	..	..	15

Majority for	..	..	4
--------------	----	----	---

AYES.				
Mr. Coverley		Mr. Nulsen		
Mr. Cross		Mr. Panton		
Mr. Graham		Mr. Rodoreda		
Mr. Hawke		Mr. Smith		
Mr. J. Hegney		Mr. Telfer		
Mr. W. Hegney		Mr. Triat		
Mr. Holman		Mr. Willcock		
Mr. Leahy		Mr. Withers		
Mr. Millington		Mr. Wilson		(Teller.)
Mr. Needham				

NOES.				
Mr. Berry		Mr. North		
Mrs. Cardell-Oliver		Mr. Owen		
Mr. Doney		Mr. Perkins		
Mr. Hill		Mr. Thorn		
Mr. Keenan		Mr. Watts		
Mr. Leslie		Mr. Willmott		
Mr. McDonald		Mr. Seward		
Mr. McLarty				(Teller.)

Clause thus passed.

Clause 3, Title—agreed to.

Bill reported without amendment and the report adopted.

### BILL—TRANSFER OF LAND ACT AMENDMENT.

#### Second Reading.

**THE MINISTER FOR JUSTICE** [8.15] in moving the second reading said: This is a simple Bill and it affects only one clause of the parent Act. A similar clause has already been amended in similar Acts in the other States. The proposed amendment will be of considerable benefit both to the Titles Office and to the public generally. Section 75 of the Act deals with the procedure which is to be followed when it becomes necessary to issue a duplicate certificate of title to replace one that has been lost or destroyed. As the section stands at present, the applicant, upon proof of loss or destruction, is supplied with what is termed a "special certificate." This special certificate is required to contain an exact copy of the certificate in the register book and of every memorandum and endorsement thereon. Many different forms of Crown grants have been issued throughout the years, and these grants, when registered under the Act, become duplicate certificates. The variations made from time to time in the form of these grants deal mainly with the conditions on which the grants were issued and the reservations of metals and minerals, etc., until at the present time there are probably 30 or 40 different forms in existence.

As the various forms of grant have fallen into disuse, stocks have been exhausted and of course no further copies are now printed or can be printed, as it is impossible to estimate how many may be required merely for the purpose of replacing grants that have been lost or destroyed. The result is that if no suitable printed form of grant is available the special certificate to be issued must be typed. This entails a considerable amount of unnecessary work. Moreover, to comply with the requirement that an exact copy of the original certificate must be furnished, details must be shown on the special certificate of every prior dealing appearing on the original certificate, although these dealings no longer affect the position. For example, every prior endorsement of a transfer must appear thereon as well as every encumbrance, even though the latter

be discharged. These endorsements may be numerous.

The amendment proposed would enable the Titles Office, in lieu of issuing a special certificate with the consequent necessity of furnishing an exact copy of the original, to issue a new certificate in the form of the fifth schedule to the Act. The original certificate would be cancelled and the new certificate given another volume and folio number. The only endorsements appearing thereon would be those required to show the existing condition of the certificate. This system has been in operation in Victoria since 1916 and has worked satisfactorily. It is a great improvement on our present system. The change is not revolutionary. On the contrary, it would bring the practice to be followed, when issuing a certificate in consequence of the loss or destruction of any existing duplicate, into line with the present practice when replacing an existing certificate under any circumstances, such as when a certificate becomes too full for further endorsement thereon, or becomes dilapidated or when portion only of the land in a certificate is transferred.

The proposed amendment specifically refers to Crown leases, reference to which does not appear in the present section as, at the date this became operative, namely 1893, no provision existed for registering a Crown lease under the Transfer of Land Act. A further argument in favour of the proposed change is that, if a new certificate is issued with a new number and the original certificate is cancelled, there is no possibility of two duplicate certificates for the one piece of land with the same volume and folio number existing, as is the position at the present time if a certificate, assumed to be lost or destroyed, is subsequently discovered. The fact that two duplicate certificates exist might not be realised by a person who searches the original certificate, and who does not realise the significance of an endorsement thereon that a special certificate has been issued. Such a person might deal with what has become a worthless security; whereas, if the original certificate is cancelled, no confusion can arise. This is a small amendment. If it is accepted it will prove very helpful and safer than the present provisions. If a duplicate certificate is lost or destroyed today, a special certificate is issued on which there must be an

exact copy of the details on the one lost or destroyed, although all of the particulars are in the register. That seems to be superfluous. If a certificate is dilapidated or too full and a new one is issued, there is no need to place all the endorsements upon it but only those existing at the time.

As has been explained, there will be no possibility, under the measure, of two certificates being in existence at the one time. I commend the Bill to the House. A similar measure has had a fair trial in Victoria. It was introduced in 1916 and has proved quite satisfactory. I want to emphasise the fact that this measure will remove the danger of two certificates being in circulation and that a tremendous amount of work will be obviated. Between 40 and 50 different forms have to be filled in, and, at present, if a certificate is lost or destroyed, the whole of the endorsements must be typed on the back of those forms by the limited staff available in our various offices. The Bill has been carefully checked by the Commissioner and the Registrar, who are 100 per cent. behind it. They feel that they will have more security if it is passed and that there will not be so much chance of fraudulent practices. I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

On motion by Mr. McDonald, debate adjourned.

## ANNUAL ESTIMATES, 1944-1945.

### *In Committee of Supply.*

Resumed from the 9th November; Mr. Marshall in the Chair.

*Vote—Taxation, £21,000:*

**THE PREMIER** [8.25]: When progress was reported, we had reached the Vote "Taxation." The member for Mt. Marshall raised a point in connection with the amount of taxation collected owing to the incidence of uniform taxation. He said that for two years prior to the imposition of the uniform tax, the taxation collected by the State had been a little greater—£100,000 greater, in fact—than the amount we now receive from the Commonwealth. The fact is that it was not on the year before the uniform tax was imposed that the basis of compensation was decided but on the years 1939-1940 and 1940-1941. Looking up the taxation received from that particular source,

we find that the method adopted has been correct but that other factors have to be taken into consideration. The Commonwealth, when making out the amount of taxation to be paid to the State, deducted from that the amount which it cost to collect the tax. The Commonwealth Government decided it was not going to collect the taxation for nothing when it had cost us £30,000 to do so and consequently took £30,000 from our compensation.

Hon. N. Keenan: In what way did it cost any more?

The PREMIER: It used to cost us—

Hon. N. Keenan: I know. What I am asking is: What extra did it cost the Commonwealth?

The PREMIER: What happened was that the Commonwealth had a taxation department here and we had not. The Commonwealth collected the tax for the State and, for performing that service, charged us £30,000 which, over the years, proved to be reasonable.

Mr. Doney: That is what it cost us?

The PREMIER: Yes.

Mr. Doney: Have you determined what it cost the Commonwealth? It would not cost it as much.

The PREMIER: It used to cost the State £30,000, which was paid to the Commonwealth for collecting the tax. The Commonwealth said: "We are not going to collect it now for nothing. You used to pay the Taxation Department £30,000. Therefore, that will be the cost charged against the taxation received by the State from the Commonwealth." So that amount is deducted from the compensation payable.

Hon. N. Keenan: That does not answer the question: What did it cost the Commonwealth Government to collect the tax?

The PREMIER: The Commonwealth said: "We will undertake the collection of your taxes and the bill will be £30,000." I do not know what it cost the Commonwealth. It is just the same as if the member for Nedlands gave an opinion to somebody and sent in a bill for 10 guineas. I do not know what the opinion would actually have cost. That would be the bill and that is what the man would have to pay. That is the position between the Commonwealth and the State. That is the agreement that was made and it appeared to be satisfactory. The Commonwealth knew

how many people were engaged and what it cost us when the Commonwealth collected our tax.

Hon. H. Millington: That was their contract price?

The PREMIER: Yes. In the year the member for Mt. Marshall mentioned, there was a fairly heavy collection of arrears, which increased our taxation revenue. In addition to the deduction for the cost of collecting the tax, the Commonwealth deducted the refunds of tax which averaged about £15,000 a year. The cost of collection, £30,000, and the refunds came to £45,000 in each of the years so that there was not a great deal of difference in connection with it. But the hon. member must recollect that the figures are based on the years 1939-40 and 1940-41. Those two years added together provide the basis for the calculation by which the Commonwealth arrives at the sum of £2,546,000, which is paid to this State. The hon. member implied that I said that we were making something out of the uniform tax. I did not say that. I said that the combination of the dividend tax, the gold profits tax, the income tax, and the financial emergency tax which we achieved some years ago, resulted in a slightly greater amount of tax than if those taxes had been continued separately. To that extent we were a bit better off. I trust I have made clear how the calculations were made.

It does appear, on looking back over the two years preceding the imposition of the uniform tax, that we did receive more but the basis on which the Commonwealth tax composition was paid to us was not on the year preceding, but the two years preceding the year immediately prior to the introduction of the uniform tax. It is a rather complicated explanation, but if the hon. member sees what is collected each year and bears in mind that the Commonwealth debits us with the amount that it used to cost the State to collect its tax, namely, £30,000 and also takes off the refunds of taxes, he will get pretty close to the mark. The whole thing is actuarially sound, but it is difficult to check unless one has all the factors which go to make up the amount of compensation that we are paid.

MR. LESLIE (Mt. Marshall): With all due deference to the Treasurer I am not

quite satisfied, although I accept his explanation about the compensation being based on the years 1939-40 and 1940-41. I would like the Premier to tell me why those two years were selected instead of 1940-41 and 1941-42.

The Premier: We only considered the matter in 1942 and we did not know what the amount would be that year.

Mr. LESLIE: I have in front of me the figures taken from the Treasurer's accounts for the years 1939 to 1943, and I propose to read them so that members can see what tax we collected ourselves and what we have received from the Commonwealth Government. The amount of tax that the Commonwealth reimburses us is made up of income tax, dividend duty and financial emergency tax. The total revenue from these sources for the year 1939-40 was £2,273,766. In addition we got the hospital fund tax of £271,689, or a total in that year of £2,545,455. In the year 1940-41 the revenue from the income tax, financial emergency tax, dividend duty and the hospital fund tax amounted in all to £2,641,168. In the year 1941-42 the hospital fund tax reached £292,700, or a little less than the amount for 1940-41. The total State revenue was £2,626,567. In the year 1942-43 we got the first Commonwealth reimbursement, which totalled £2,546,000. We received the same amount last year. Included in that amount was a sum of £275,750 which was set aside in the hospital fund trust account. The average for the two years 1939-40 and 1940-41 was £2,593,311. If we take the Premier's figure of £45,000 which he has quoted as being the Commonwealth charge for collecting our taxation and the amount of £15,000 which it allows for arrears, it brings the average to what we get today, namely £2,546,000. That is all right, but if the average for 1940-41 and 1941-42—

The Premier: The Commonwealth could not take them.

Mr. LESLIE: At the same time I do not see why we should stick to those figures. Let me quote some figures to show what has happened in those years of which the Treasurer and the Commonwealth appear to have taken no recognition. The Treasurer might, but not the Commonwealth, and I believe he has a good case for review. In 1939-40 the wages and salaries paid in Western Australia, accord-

ing to the Western Australian Year Book, amounted to £4,941,000. In 1942-43 the wages and salaries totalled £6,817,000. That is an increase of nearly £2,000,000 in wages and salaries paid in this State, on which the Commonwealth Government is collecting a tax and on which we would be receiving an additional tax if we were collecting income tax, dividend duty, financial emergency tax and hospital fund tax.

The Premier: But the Commonwealth would not let us do that.

Mr. LESLIE: We must put up a fight to do it.

The Premier: We put up a fight; we contested it at law!

Mr. LESLIE: It is as well for the public to know the facts. The value of recorded production in Western Australia amounted in 1939-40 to £31,922,712. In 1940-41 it dropped by about £1,500,000 to £29,522,447. I endeavoured to ascertain the reason for this drop and I believe I found it, inasmuch as the smaller production was due to the lesser number of persons engaged in industry, and that can be attributed to the military call-up which took place at that time. The number engaged in industry was actually 300 or so less than in the previous year. In 1942-43 when our releases started and we commenced to intensify production again, our State production increased to £33,545,933 and, moreover, in the year 1942-43 we had nearly 3,000 more persons engaged in industry than in the year 1939-40, which is one of the years on which this tax reimbursement is measured. I want to give an illustration as to what this increase in earning capacity has actually meant.

One item I can take is the hospital fund tax. In the year 1939-40 the hospital fund tax yielded £271,689 and in the year 1941-42 it yielded £292,700, which is equal to an increase of 7.7 per cent. on the 1939-40 figures. Incidentally, I would like to point out that although we reached the fine figure of £292,000 in 1941-42 I am sure the Minister for Health is very sorry that he is limited to only £275,000 under the existing agreement. I am certain that, if he had the collection of the tax on the old basis, the figure would be nearer to the £300,000 mark. This increase of 7.7 per cent. for 1941-42 can be taken as a continuing increase, as I have shown it will be, on the earnings of the people. If this

were applied to the total of the taxation, which is now included under the Commonwealth reimbursement scheme our taxation receipts in 1942-43 would have been increased by £195,995, which is a considerable sum.

To prove conclusively that this State is losing a large amount of money—I said we were losing £100,000, and in spite of the fact that the cost of collection has been allowed for, this is a conservative figure in view of the change of circumstances—I point out that our taxation per head of the population under the Commonwealth reimbursement scheme is £5 6s. whereas in 1941-42, when we collected our own taxes, it was £5 10s. 3d. Since 1941-42, the net value of our production has increased greatly, and that would yield a large increase of dividend duties and a considerable increase in the total earnings of the persons engaged in industry. A 50 per cent. increase on those figures means that we would have been very much better off than we are under the Commonwealth scheme. I mention this because the people ought to know the facts. I have heard it stated here—I am not implying that the statement came from the Premier—that we are doing better under the uniform tax scheme. I say definitely that we are not doing as well; in fact, we are doing very badly, and every effort should be made to induce the Commonwealth to come to light with some of the lucre which it has grabbed and which rightly belongs to this State.

**THE PREMIER:** The uniform tax scheme was introduced for a simple reason. The Commonwealth pointed out that the States were going to get the benefit of larger earnings by their people, and that the Commonwealth should be able to tax the increased incomes that would be earned by the people throughout Australia consequent upon the expenditure of £400,000,000 on the war effort. The States strongly opposed the proposal. I believe the hon. member was not here at the time. We took the case to the utmost limits of the law in order to preserve the position of the States. We knew that the national income would increase to a considerable degree and we knew we would get our share of the taxation on that income. The Commonwealth, however, adopted the attitude that, because it was spending £400,000,000 on the

war effort, there was no reason why the States should get the benefit, which, it claimed, rightly belonged to the Commonwealth, to be used in the war effort over and over again. The hon. member is quite right in what he has said; the Commonwealth did that deliberately and, I think, from its standpoint, quite justly.

Mr. Leslie: The Commonwealth robbed us as well.

**The PREMIER:** The Commonwealth did not rob us. If that money had not been spent by the Commonwealth, the figures the hon. member quoted to show the rise in the national income of this State would not have been possible, because the Commonwealth spent millions of pounds in Western Australia, though not to the extent that it spent money in the other States.

Mr. Leslie: Hear, hear!

**The PREMIER:** Consequently, the earning capacity of our people was increased and, instead of that money going to the State, the Commonwealth said it was a fair thing that the extra taxable capacity of the community by reason of the rise in national income should go to the Commonwealth to be used for war purposes. The Commonwealth succeeded in imposing a uniform tax scheme on the States. We went to the utmost limits to prevent it. We went to law, and the High Court gave judgment against us. All the circumstances were made known to the public of Australia at the time. If the hon. member had not been away he would have known the circumstances, which received wide publicity. I do not dispute the hon. member's figures in the slightest because they are right, but we are not entitled to quarrel with the Commonwealth's idea that, because the taxable capacity of the people was raised by war expenditure to an enormous degree—I think the national income increased from £750,000,000 to £1,100,000,000 in four years—it was entitled to receive the taxation on the extra amount of the national income to use for war purposes.

Mr. Watts: Have you approached the Grants Commission for an additional amount under the uniform tax scheme?

**The PREMIER:** Not yet. We have just been able to balance the budget, and no State has made a claim for extra compensation. The reason for not doing so is



that we are all in the war, and that we are anxious to make a good financial showing and to leave as much money as possible with the Commonwealth for furtherance of the war effort.

Mr. Leslie: What about our social services?

The PREMIER: We have not lessened any of our social services.

Mr. Leslie: A while ago I could not get £150 from the Minister for Health.

The Minister for Mines: Because you were not entitled to it.

The PREMIER: We are not £100 short in regard to social services. So far from lessening social services, we have to an extent improved them. On the Education Vote, for instance, many male teachers on fairly high salaries enlisted and have been replaced by women on supply at a much lower salary, and the Vote has not been expanded as it otherwise would have been. We have spent no money on unemployment relief. Those in receipt of unemployment relief at present number only 20 or 30 people and the reason is that they are destitute and cannot get work, though they are not permanently incapacitated. We were spending £150,000 on unemployment some years ago, and the saving of this expenditure has helped us to balance the budget.

We have had no need to go to the Grants Commission for an additional amount as compensation under the provisions of the uniform tax laws, but it will be noted that the Commonwealth grant has been increasing and, if necessary, the grant this year may be £1,129,000. But the Commonwealth Grants Commissions said, "If you can balance the Budget by receiving the grant"—which was one of the greatest we ever got, £904,000—"with all the rest in reserve, there might be drought or some affliction come on the State and render it necessary to get that extra money." There is being held in reserve an amount of £225,000, and that will be carried forward to next year if we do not use it this year, in the same way as was the case in the previous year. So we would not have to make an application under the uniform income tax Act to get compensation. What we shall do, if more money is needed to help us to carry on our social services and the general financial affairs of the State, is to ask the Grants Commission to revise its decision and give

us the £1,129,000. But the Grants Commission said, "No; you ought to be able to get on with the £904,000, and the necessities of the circumstances can be considered later on in the year."

I think the Committee will agree that it is incumbent on all State Governments to endeavour to be as economical as possible in regard to expenditure during wartime. Everyone knows the Commonwealth is raising £280,000,000 by loan! And the Commonwealth has raised taxation to a tremendous level, and is getting about £280,000,000 by tax each year, as well as having used bank credit of well over £340,000,000 up to the end of June last. In times of such difficulty we do not want ever to press for larger amounts of money. If we cannot spend the money by reason of not being able to get labour or material, there is not much point in getting funds just to lay by. We have nothing very much to complain about. While we have been able to balance the budget, that is only due to the increased Commonwealth grants as the years went by. Even so we have not been able to put enough money into suspense accounts for renovations and repairs to public buildings and other things, though we have been able to make some contributions in that direction. So while it is all right to say that we should get a greater amount of tax out of the uniform tax collection by the Commonwealth, this uniform tax scheme was devised for the express purpose of—

Mr. Watts: How do we compare with the Eastern States in regard to the uniform tax?

The PREMIER: As a matter of fact, the Treasurer of Victoria makes a long wail about it at every conference. With a population five times as large as that of Western Australia, Victoria's payments under the uniform tax are only three times as much as we get. Victoria receives a little over £6,500,000, and we get approximately £2,500,000. Fortunately, we had put our taxation up to somewhere near our needs. That is why we get a better return per head of population from the uniform tax than some other States get.

Mr. Watts: New South Wales looks pretty good!

The PREMIER: That State also had very high taxation. It used to have high taxation in order to finance child endowment, taxation employed to pay something

other States did not pay. When the Commonwealth took over child endowment, New South Wales was in Easy Street, being a wealthy State with a high national income. There is something to be said for the Commonwealth point of view, although we contested it strongly, even carrying the matter to the High Court of Australia. There was something to be said for the Commonwealth's contention, because nobody ever dreamt of Commonwealth loans of over £200,000,000 a year. Further, we did not know how that would affect the taxable capacity of the people. The Commonwealth wants to get the money back, because it is absolute war expenditure. That is the whole reason for the imposition of the uniform tax. Some States have very high income taxation, and the imposition of the Commonwealth tax on top of the State tax would have made some individuals pay about 25s. in the pound, which of course they could not raise, so that they would be compelled to draw on capital. On the other hand, Victoria would not have had rates higher than 12s. or 14s. in the pound, whereas now all Victorians with very high incomes have rates up to 18s. in the pound. In Queensland the higher income group would have had to pay 25s. in the pound, drawing on capital for the purpose.

**MR. WATTS (Katanning):** I well remember the proceedings before the Commonwealth High Court in which the Western Australian Government participated, but I am attracted by the Premier's view that it is better, or more desirable, to obtain money out of the Grants Commission by way of loan than it is to press claims for re-adjustment of compensation under the uniform tax laws.

The Premier: I said it is just the same.

**Mr. WATTS:** With all due respect to the Premier, I do not think it is just the same. The objection I have falls into two parts. The first is that to ask for larger grants not based on the taxation principle simply results in our being mendicants to a greater degree than we were originally, under the Grants Commission's procedure from its early days to the present time; whereas, on the other hand, if we forwarded a claim for compensation in respect of tax it placed us in the position of being able to say that this was warranted by the in-

creased production of national income by the people of Western Australia.

The Premier: Caused by Commonwealth expenditure!

**Mr. WATTS:** Not at all. The national income of Western Australia has been to a large extent dependent upon primary production. I am aware, of course, that the prices paid for our primary produce have something to do with the income derived from it—quite a substantial amount, as a matter of fact.

The Premier: Production has been reduced in quantity, unfortunately.

**Mr. WATTS:** Only with respect to wheat. The quantity of wheat produced has definitely been reduced, but that is due to Commonwealth restriction and not to Commonwealth expenditure.

The Premier: And gold!

**Mr. WATTS:** The quantity of gold produced has also gone down, again occasioned by Commonwealth restriction and not by the expenditure of Commonwealth money. Wool production has increased, and probably meat and other primary products are being produced in greater quantities because of the greater demand; but the increase in the national income of Western Australia is not by any means altogether dependent upon Commonwealth expenditure; it is in some cases in spite of Commonwealth restriction.

The Premier: We have 50,000 or 60,000 troops here all drawing money and spending it.

**Mr. WATTS:** Other States have 500,000 or 600,000 troops and so obtain much more money than we do. Western Australia is simply in the position that it is unable to build up any reserve fund. If we want any money, it comes not as a right because of the increase in our production or in our national income by whatever means obtained, but is given to us as beggars seeking for it because we are hard up. I believe it would have been a better principle to go to the Commonwealth through the Grants Commission under the uniform tax laws, rather than to approach the Grants Commission purely on the basis of obtaining a grant without any justification other than needs. However, the Premier thinks differently. In the meantime, I will not say that our social services are going to pieces, but there are other aspects of State enterprise in the gravest financial diffi-

culty if the reports being made from time to time are correct. I have not sought that these reports should be examined, but we know what difficulties there are in regard to health matters and railway matters. At the same time we notice that Queensland has a very substantial surplus, while Western Australia is just keeping on an even keel, and doing so—I am convinced—by refraining—perhaps not parsimoniously—from expending money on things that would be desirable and that in other States have been carried out.

The Minister for Mines: What are you going to spend the money on?

Mr. WATTS: The other States of the Commonwealth by some means have done so. They have been able to obtain manpower and materials; we have not.

The Premier: I quite agree with you. We have a grievance there.

Mr. WATTS: Then here I will stop. For once I am in agreement with the Premier. I will subside.

Vote put and passed.

*Vote—Workers' Homes Board, £5:*

**MR. McLARTY** (Murray-Wellington) [9.5]: I know that the Commonwealth Housing Commission has been travelling throughout Australia collecting information about housing, but I would be glad to hear the Premier tell the Committee something of the activities of the Workers' Homes Board. I travelled through part of my district with the Commonwealth Housing Commission, and I feel that it is collecting valuable information and that the report which it will issue will be of great value in the post-war period. But I also feel that the Commission is missing a great deal of information. The Commission only visited the more prominent towns of the State, but it got a good survey of the conditions in those towns. Smaller towns, however, also require housing; in the aggregate, a great number of houses are needed. I rather fear that when we reach the post-war period there will be considerable confusion in regard to the housing problem. We have always looked upon the department administered by the Minister for Works as being the great spending department, and the department which creates most employment. In the post-war period, however, the Workers' Homes Board will rival the Department of Works both in expenditure and employment. I feel that

certain things which we should be doing in this State at present are not being done fast enough. We should be purchasing land in a number of towns.

The Premier: I hope to be able to do that this year. We have £250,000 on the Loan Estimates for that purpose.

Mr. McLARTY: That is information which I am glad to obtain from the Premier. Probably the Premier will tell us where the money is being spent. As to purchasing land, I agree with the recommendation made by the Housing Commission. Land should be acquired or purchased in country towns where light, water and other amenities are available. Now is the time to purchase the land. However, the Premier has told us that that is going to be done at once.

The Premier: The money is provided.

Mr. McLARTY: Our next difficulty is in connection with a reserve of materials. Here I do not offer any criticism which I know is not justified. Owing to shortage of labour and war causes, materials are not available. Recently I asked a question with regard to the output of bricks. The State Brick Works is the only establishment producing bricks in Western Australia, and it is not turning out a sufficient quantity to meet present requirements. Not a brick is available as a reserve for the post-war period.

The Premier: There is not a man available to employ there, either.

Mr. McLARTY: We have also a shortage of skilled tradesmen. I know that is because of the war, but what I am afraid of is that when we do reach the post-war period we are likely to lose a number of our skilled tradesmen to the Eastern States. The demand for skilled tradesmen all over Australia will be very great and the tendency will be for building costs to rise. Of that there is not the slightest doubt. Some people will be so anxious to get houses built that they will be prepared to pay almost any price to tradesmen to erect houses for them.

The Minister for Works: You should have voted "Yes" at the Referendum!

Mr. McLARTY: No. I do not think the Referendum has anything to do with this matter. It is necessary that, in the post-war period, we should encourage private enterprise to the utmost.

The Minister for Mines: To make bricks?

**Mr. McLARTY:** If they are encouraged and given an opportunity they will make bricks and will do much to assist us to overcome the housing shortage.

**The Minister for Works:** We need manpower.

**Mr. McLARTY:** That is the trouble all round; and, as I have said, any criticism or remarks I have to offer are not delivered in a hostile manner, because I appreciate the difficulties. Again, I suggest to the Premier that when people are prepared to build their own homes their names should be obtained and, if they require some assistance, the money should be made available to them. I know people who are prepared to put up a few hundred pounds but, unless help is forthcoming, they will not be able to build; and I think special consideration should be given to them and money provided for them. We know what the position is in regard to what are termed belated repairs. Just how we can get over that difficulty, I do not know; but there are thousands of homes in Western Australia in need of urgent repair and, where money is required, it should be made available. I rose to ask the Premier to tell us something about the activities of this department which, in the post-war period, will be one of the most important departments we have, both as an employer and as a spender.

**MR. HOLMAN (Forrest):** A matter which has been raised in my electorate in connection with the building of houses is the provision of an adequate water supply; and I suggest to the Workers' Homes Board that, when it is planning the building of homes in country districts, it should take this question into consideration. It has been brought to my notice that, in connection with dwellings that have only recently been built at Donnybrook, complaints have already been made about the lack of water. In Brunswick Junction a site has been selected for the erection of workers' homes that we hope will meet with the approval of the board. In that area—and in other country districts where such projects are to be undertaken—some foresight should be displayed in the provision of an adequate water supply. That is one of the first things the military authorities always make sure about, and in any new settlements we envisage we should profit from the mistakes made in the past and

provide sufficient water. I have a letter from Donnybrook in which the following appears:—

Recently within the last few months three workers' homes have been erected in Emerald street, Donnybrook, and they are now all tenanted. The water supply of all the three houses consists of one 2,000 gallon tank and one 1,000, and in my case at the time of going in these tanks were only three parts full and one (2,000) had to be emptied on account of leakage and only refilled about two-thirds.

These people have applied to the Workers' Homes Board for a well to be sunk. They were under the impression that a well was to be provided but nothing has been done about it. My latest report from the board is that the building of the houses has been fairly costly and that it would be economically unsound to spend any more on them. That is a poor view. When he returned from the Premiers' Conference the Premier told us that—

As the money for the present year at least is to be provided by the States the Commonwealth will have no over-riding power in connection with housing. As the houses are to be provided for some people who cannot afford to pay the economic rent the Commonwealth has agreed to accept three-fifths of the losses incurred, the States bearing the remaining two-fifths.

I think the statement that it would be economically unsound to provide water for those houses at Donnybrook does not—if I might put it this way—hold water. The Commonwealth is prepared to shoulder three-fifths of the losses on the housing scheme and the State is to bear the other two-fifths. Surely, therefore, the State can provide an adequate water supply for these homes.

**The Premier:** We do not want to be extravagant.

**Mr. HOLMAN:** No? It has been suggested that we should beautify these homes, but my correspondent at Donnybrook writes that the people in those houses cannot even indulge in a daily shower. I do not think having a daily shower can be regarded as extravagance. Gardens, of course, are out of the question, and water is even seriously restricted for domestic purposes.

**The Premier:** In Donnybrook?

**Mr. HOLMAN:** Yes. These people have not the water. I hope the department will not quibble in connection with such a necessary project. If this is to be the fore-

runner or a sample of other country housing schemes, the matter should be looked into and taken seriously because water is one of the main essentials of any household. I believe the department is sending the district inspector to look over the place; but I think that is only for the purpose of re-filling the tanks, if possible, not with a view to providing a permanent water supply. I hope that in the near future some action will be taken in that connection.

**MR. NEEDHAM** (Perth): I understand that money is available for housing and I know the board wants to go ahead with the building programme allotted to this State. Members who have preceded me in discussing this Vote have referred to various items mostly connected with the post-war period. I would like to find out from the Premier what the position is in regard to the release of men from the Services for the building of homes.

The Premier: There is no chance. When one mentions that matter one does not get very much encouragement.

**Mr. NEEDHAM**: We have all read the statement of the Prime Minister in that connection. He said that the whole thing depended not on money, but on men and materials. I know the Government is surrounded with difficulties, but I would like the Premier to tell us what has been done towards getting a number of skilled artisans from the men who have been or are about to be released from the Services. A little while ago, the Minister for the Army, Mr. Forde, mentioned that a number was to be released to work on the food front and to be employed in other directions. So far we have not heard anything definite in regard to the number to be released to help in the building programme in the different States. Perhaps the Premier can elaborate on that point when replying.

**HON. N. KEENAN** (Nedlands): I want to ask the Premier whether the Workers' Homes Board is doing work for the Department of War Organisation of Industry, and if so whether it receives any grant for it. If one applies to the Department of War Organisation of Industry for leave to purchase materials, or for labour, one is sent to the Workers' Homes Board. Are we receiving compensation for the work carried

out by the Workers' Homes Board on behalf of that department? We heard tonight that the Commonwealth receives £30,000 for collecting our taxation when the Commonwealth is not put to an extra penny's expenditure, because the assessments and the returns are put on one form. But in the case of the Workers' Homes Board, the time of some of the clerks, and certainly some of the secretary's time, must be employed in connection with work done for the Department of War Organisation of Industry. Do we get any compensation for that?

The Premier: Yes, we do.

**Hon. N. KEENAN**: Where does it show?

**MR. DONEY** (Williams-Narrogin): I am glad the member for Murray-Wellington submitted to the Premier his questions in regard to housing. I suppose every member has been receiving a number of inquiries from different people. The information supplied by the Workers' Homes Board is that there is no likelihood at present, outside the Commonwealth scheme, of houses being built, and those that are built by the Commonwealth are erected for rental purposes only. People applying to that department are told that the Commonwealth has no other scheme in hand yet, implying that in possibly a month or perhaps 18 months some other scheme will be introduced, and no doubt there will be. We are told also that the present is an undesirable time for private individuals to build, because material is up 30 per cent. and in some cases even more. I think the time is opportune for the Premier to make a general statement in regard to housing prospects in this State. I am sure members would be glad if he would do so. I want the Premier, particularly in regard to Division 18, to connect if he can the absence of building activity in the Workers' Homes Board and the War Service Homes Department with the substantial increases in salaries and in the number of clerks employed. There is no building activity within those two departments, although, as has been explained by the member for Nedlands, it might quite easily be that these rather steep increases in costs and in clerical assistance are explained by the extra work being done for the Department of War Organisation of Industry. I hope that in due course the Premier will reply to the questions sub-

mitted by the member for Nedlands. I am a little disturbed, if I understand the Premier aright, to learn that no grant whatever is forthcoming from the Department of War Organisation of Industry.

The Premier: I did not say that.

Mr. DONEY: Did the Premier say that some grant was going to be made?

The Minister for Mines: The Premier was going to reply when you got on your feet.

Mr. DONEY: I did not know. In any case, the Premier will have an opportunity to give a fuller reply when I sit down. In order that he may not misunderstand the matter to which I am particularly referring, I would like him to notice that in Item 1 of Division 18 the number of inspectors is shown to have increased from two to four and, secondly, the salary total has been increased from £855 to an amount almost double, namely, £1,784. The next item might bear a little explanation. The number of clerks has risen from 35 to 36, but the salaries totals seem to be out of all proportion. Last year the salaries for 35 clerks amounted to £4,688, whereas this year the total is £5,677, and there is only one extra clerk. There is another steep rise in the case of temporary assistance, from £4,701 to £6,663. I ask the Premier to explain the reasons for these differences.

MR. CROSS (Canning): I, too, think the Premier should make a general statement on the question of workers' homes. I know people who, because they cannot get workers' homes, have made their own arrangements and applied for permits to build, but they have been refused. In spite of the fact that they have a builder, the necessary men and quite a lot of the material—I do not know about the roofing material—their permits have been refused. I know of one case where five or six people—adults and children—are living in a four-roomed house, and they submitted plans for a house which, on the increased costs, would mean an expenditure of about £1,250. That would provide a house equal to one costing about £800 before the war. That application has been turned down, and no hope has been held out of building at any time. Those people are entitled to know just how long they have to wait. People who are prepared to find their own finance should get some consideration and maybe

some preference later. I think they could expect to be given some idea as to whether they will be able to build their own homes next year or within three or four years.

The Premier: Well, give us some idea when the war will finish.

Mr. CROSS: We were told that steps were being taken to erect a certain number of houses. Surely people who are going to finance their own homes should get some consideration. As I travel around I see that some houses are being built, and they are not confined to a figure of £800 or even £1,000, which seems to be the limit for which a permit will be given. I was near the depot at Karrakatta, where I saw a number of homes being built. I understand that the State is building some and the Commonwealth is building others. I guarantee that those houses would cost not less than £1,200 to build today. Those homes are being built on the ocean side of Karrakatta, which is not an accessible area, and if there were not the batteries and a military camp there, there would not be a bus service.

Mr. North: It is a permanent bus service.

Mr. CROSS: There is a bus route because of the batteries and the military camp there. We still have any number of blocks on existing bus routes, but people cannot get permits to build on them. In my electorate there are fully 2,000 people living in other people's houses. I know the position because prior to the last election I made a very careful canvass of the district. I know they include many country folk. It is not a fair proposition for those people to go on living a Kathleen Mavourneen existence, never knowing when they will be able to get homes of their own. The housing position is more acute now than ever before, particularly in the metropolitan area.

Mr. Needham: And will get worse.

The Minister for Works: Kathleen Mavourneen can get a home any time she says "Yes."

Mr. CROSS: This is no laughing matter! When there are two families living in a four-roomed house with eight or nine children between them, all having to use the same kitchen, bathroom, laundry and so on, members cannot surely regard it as a laughing matter. I can understand some of these people getting fed-up. A compre-

hensive statement should be made by the Premier to give the people some idea of how long they must continue to tolerate present-day conditions. We have had statements about the Commonwealth housing scheme, and the people I refer to are anxious to know what chance they have of getting a home. They do not appreciate that only about a hundred houses will be erected in Western Australia during the next couple of years or so. I hope the Premier will make a statement regarding the matter because the people are mightily interested in it. Many people have approached me with a request that I should tell them if ever I saw an empty house. I am sure 50 people would be trying to get possession even if one were available. All sorts of tricks are resorted to in order to secure homes. Some are willing to pay a few pounds to secure the key to a house or even for knowledge as to when a house is likely to be empty. That is not right. Sufficient houses should be available even in these times.

**MR. LESLIE** (Mt. Marshall): Before the Premier makes the statement that members are appealing for, I wish to put a question to him in the hope that he will answer it. There are many workers' homes in my electorate and I pay a tribute to the Workers' Homes Board for the consideration shown to its clients during the difficult period that has extended over the past few years. I believe in giving credit where it is due, and from the reports I have received from people occupying workers' homes regarding their treatment, I can say that nothing but praise has been forthcoming for the consideration shown them by the board during the period of their financial and other difficulties. As to the question I desire to submit, I would like to know from the Premier whether the Workers' Homes Board has made any inquiries about the construction of cement brick houses in the country areas. I have perused the plans in connection with the housing scheme and have noticed that they provide only for timber or asbestos sheet houses. In the country districts cement bricks are much favoured as a medium for construction, being very slightly more costly than timber.

Houses built of cement bricks are easy to construct. I could show the Premier and the members of the Workers' Homes Board

houses constructed of cement bricks by people who previously had never laid one brick upon another. They made the bricks themselves in accordance with the directions and then built jolly good houses—houses really worth living in in country districts. I do not wish to say anything that will affect the prospects of potential business for those associated with the timber industry, but we must be concerned with the comfort of people in the rural areas. I commend to the Premier and the Workers' Homes Board the advisability of having a complete investigation of cement brick construction for country homes. Dwellings so constructed are most desirable, comfortable, cool in summer and warm in winter. I do not know the life of such houses, but I should say it would be three or four times that of a dwelling constructed of timber. If cement brick houses were constructed it would do away with the difficulties arising from dry rot and costly maintenance associated with wooden houses and, in addition, would get away from the white ant scourge.

**MR. J. HEGNEY** (Middle Swan): The housing problem is urgent and important not only in the metropolitan area but throughout the State. An indication was given to the people by the Prime Minister recently when he was in Western Australia that, because of the need of the Fighting Services, manpower could not be made available for building purposes.

The Premier: He was pretty positive about it, too.

**Mr. J. HEGNEY:** Yes. I introduced a deputation to him, and Mr. Curtin made it quite clear that more men would be required for work associated with the Fighting Services as they went further afield. Timber and other materials would be required much closer to the firing line and for the construction of warehouses, huts, and generally for requirements of the Services. Members speak as though they had no knowledge of the position!

The Minister for Mines: As if the war were all over.

**Mr. J. HEGNEY:** That is so. We are all anxious to have homes built for the people as soon as possible, but the facts are there—stark and real. The member for Irwin-Moore urged the construction of wooden ships and the Commonwealth Government helped materially in that regard.

Shipwrights were required for the construction of wooden ships at Fremantle, and as there were only 30 available, carpenters had to be called in to assist. Today there are over 300 carpenters engaged in shipbuilding. The question arises as to which is the more important, provision of transport or the building of homes. Even if tradesmen were available, the problem of supplies would arise. Recently when commenting on a leading article that appeared in the Press dealing with the Commonwealth Government's housing policy, the Prime Minister made it quite clear that the requisite manpower could not be made available at this juncture.

**Mr. Seward:** The Commonwealth Bank seems to have found a few for work at the corner of William-street.

**Mr. J. HEGNEY:** We have been told by the Commonwealth Housing Commission that quite a number of plans have been prepared from which soldiers can choose the type of home they require. I went to the department this afternoon to discuss the matter and the officer dealing with the granting of permits explained the position. I knew the facts, as every member knows them, in respect to the supply of manpower and material. It is all very well for us to urge the need for building more homes. I believe the Commonwealth Housing Department is anxious to go ahead as soon as it gets authority to do so but, having regard for the need for servicing our men in the front line, we are not likely to get houses built very soon. People are constantly pressing members to get homes for them. Homes undoubtedly are urgently needed; in my district many people are living under great disadvantages. When I submitted a case to the department today, the officer said it was not comparable with a case he had been asked to investigate—that of a woman with nine children who was living in two rooms that were virtually an underground cellar. I had to admit that that was a more urgent case.

Each member has a similar experience in his own electorate, and it would probably be difficult for any one of us to adjudicate as to the relevant urgency of cases. The sooner steps can be taken to alleviate the existing difficulty the better it will be for all, but we know the facts and should not adopt the unreasonable attitude of continually pressing the department to provide

more homes. As I said before, 300 carpenters are now engaged on building wooden ships. Eighteen months ago the House passed a motion urging that ships should be built in this State, and wooden ships are being built. I am informed that they are serviceable vessels, but carpenters have been withdrawn from the building trade to assist in their construction. Until they are again available for building homes there will not be much flip given to the building trade in this State. I understand that some houses are being built at Karrakatta and at North Perth, and that there is a proposal to start in other parts of the metropolitan area. In my electorate there is ample scope for building homes and, while I am not clamouring for that district to receive attention, I think the department will see that houses are built in the metropolitan area in due course. For my part I do not believe in worrying the Premier to proceed with the building of homes when I know he is unable to do so.

**THE PREMIER:** The member for Middle Swan has to some extent covered the ground I would have traversed regarding the difficulty of providing more homes for the people. The member for Perth wants to know what steps we have taken. I have made urgent representations to the Prime Minister for home building and have been informed, as the member for Middle Swan indicated, that more men are required in the north of Australia. The climate in New Guinea and the Halmahera Islands has to be considered. On account of the exceptional rainfall everything has to be put under cover—stores, guns, ammunition, food supplies, clothing, etc. Additional hospitals have to be built, and instead of releasing men from the army, more and more men are required. Men are not being released from the Army for the building trade. More men and more materials are required to bring the war to a close. I do not give the silly reply that some people give, "Don't you know there is a war on?" The Prime Minister has made a public statement on the subject. I attended a reception at the Town Hall at which Mr. Curtin spoke for 35 or 40 minutes, and devoted at least 10 minutes to an explanation of the difficulties of providing men and materials for home building and for building generally.



When I go to the Eastern States to attend a Premiers' Conference, the Minister for Health asks me to do something about the Perth Hospital. I think the Minister has about fifty men working there, and we cannot get the requisite labour to bring the building to a state where it can be effectively occupied. That is the position in regard to many other requirements. The Minister for the Army did not say he would release artisans. He said more men were required by the Army, and the only men being released were those who could work in the dairying industry or in the production and manufacture of foodstuffs. I suppose every member has had numbers of people—as I have—requesting the release of men from the Army on various grounds. To all such requests we get the reply, "Unless they are to go into dairying or primary production to increase necessary food supplies, the answer is 'no'."

Hon. N. Keenan: The Army has released a lot of jockeys.

The PREMIER: There may have been one or two jockeys released who were not fit for anything else, little fellows weighing about six stone and unable to do any hard work, though very strong in the arms for pulling back. The request is for men to be relieved from the Army, and the answer, just simply and plainly, is a deliberate "No." We are in a worse position in regard to building than most of the States—particularly South Australia—because we took notice of the Prime Minister's statement that as regards the building trade work was to be stopped and all the men were to be called up. They were practically all called up in Western Australia. The South Australian people disregarded entirely what was a direction of the Commonwealth Government regarding building operations. Why the South Australians did it, and how they did it and squared up the manpower authorities I do not know.

We, perhaps too patriotically, agreed with the Prime Minister's injunction that the building trade was to be at a standstill for a time, and that all men and materials were to be available for Army requirements. In other States the matter was not taken as literally as it was in Western Australia. We suffered a great penalty because of our larger percentage of enlistments than those in eastern Australia. Here applications have been made for little shacks to be

erected in backyards. Our people did not care for those shacks. We are worse off for manpower than two Eastern States are. We suffered because our citizens were more patriotically inclined than people in other States. Our percentage of enlistments was 10 or 15 per cent. higher as regards men, and 50 per cent. as regards women, than the corresponding percentages in eastern Australia. It was easier, moreover, to expand existing industries than to start new industries. We were also unfortunate in losing our skilled workers. I think there was a tendency then to exaggerate conditions in the Eastern States; "distant fields are greenest." In South Australia many houses were built for workers.

Member: Asbestos buildings!

The PREMIER: Yes, costing about £100 each. Members have asked what is going on in Western Australia with regard to building houses. In April we had authority to build 75 houses, and in July we have obtained authority to erect another 90 houses as well as 100 additional in October; in all about 265 houses.

Mr. Doney: All for renting?

The PREMIER: Yes.

Mr. Doney: Under the Commonwealth scheme?

The PREMIER: Yes. The localities where they are to be built are—Claremont 25, Collie 15, Boyup Brook 10, Donnybrook—for the dehydration factory—four or five, North Perth 37, Fremantle 33, Bassendean 15, and Northam, Merredin and Bunbury 10 each. We have not yet allocated the 100 houses of the third quota. It is very difficult to ascertain the housing requirements of various places in the country as well as in the metropolitan area. The Workers' Homes Board has got in touch with local authorities, and has circulated a number of application forms among people in the metropolitan area and in the country towns asking those who want houses for letting to fill them in. Thus we have got a cross section of opinion as to where the houses are to be built. As the Government has a fairly large area of land at North Perth, many of the houses are being built there; but those houses might not suit people working in localities six or eight miles away. Consequently we want people who are at work to inform us where they want houses built.

I do not like anticipating Loan Estimates, but for the information of the Committee I may say there is £490,000 on those Estimates for houses, of which amount £250,000 is for actual building operations and £240,000 for the acquisition of land on which to build houses for this programme, which will last three or four years, all over the country as well as in the metropolitan area. The shortage of houses is extreme. Members have represented particular cases which have been brought under their notice, though under the letting scheme it is possible for people whose disabilities are greater to receive preference in regard to vacant houses available for letting. Under the Commonwealth scheme a considerable proportion of the houses for letting will be reserved for returned soldiers. People whose necessities are very great will receive preference in regard to houses that become available.

Mr. Holman: Is there not some new scheme under which the tenants will be able to buy the houses at some future date?

The PREMIER: Yes. The scheme is first to provide houses for those greatest in need. These will be let in most cases, but the tenants will be able to buy them afterwards. The greater the demand for houses to be purchased, the greater will be the number built.

Mr. Holman: That covers the point raised by the member for Mt. Marshall.

The PREMIER: Yes. The work in connection with the war housing scheme is being pushed ahead as far as manpower and material restrictions will permit. There is a definite shortage of carpenters, and until the number of tilemakers and fixers and plaster-board workers can be increased, there will be a bottle-neck in this section of the constructional work. Every effort is being made to secure the release of a few key men. There is no great hope of securing the release of a large number of such men. We might secure the release of a few key men, but we shall have great difficulty in doing so. Brick-making is a heavy trade and there is much wastage incurred. The manager of the State Brick Works reports that some of the men sent to him are incapable of doing more than 50 per cent. of the work they should do; nevertheless, when the manpower authorities make available 20 or 30 men for the works, these are engaged notwithstanding that they can only do half a day's work in a day. In normal times such workers would

not have a hope of securing a job at the works.

Mr. McLarty: It is heavy work.

The PREMIER: Yes. There are two kilns operating at the brickworks at present, but unfortunately we have only enough men to man one-and-a-third of them. That means extra expense. The manager reports that from present appearances one kiln will have to be shut down at Christmas. Yet this is the time when the works should be working to full capacity! If possible, men should be working overtime in order to cope with the present brick requirements. Houses are urgently needed in country towns as well as in the metropolitan area. The Workers' Homes Board is at present conducting a survey of the need for homes in the metropolitan area and throughout the country districts. Applications for tenancies have been invited, and already over 600 are to hand. The scheme has only been in operation for two or three weeks. These applications are being classified and tabulated, and allotments will be made as and when cottages are available. The local authorities in the various districts are co-operating in this survey.

With other members, I am concerned about the cost of houses. Costs have gone up 30 per cent. or more; I think 35 per cent. What applies in this respect to Western Australia applies also to Melbourne, Sydney and Brisbane. In fact, in most of those cities the costs have gone up to a greater extent than they have here. There is no doubt, however, that they must be met. The experience is Australia-wide; the increase is not due to any special circumstances here. Wages and materials have gone up in price. I understand that window-frames and fittings for windows are impossible to procure, and builders are forced to use other more expensive material. Tile-tyers are scarce. It is found that when a house reaches a certain stage in its erection, it is necessary to wait for a week or a fortnight in order to get the roof tiled, and during all that time the men are being kept on and paid. This, of course, increases the cost of the house.

Mr. Willmott: We experience great difficulty in securing tilers at Busselton.

The PREMIER: Tilers cannot be secured in the metropolitan area. Many houses are being held up for want of tiles.

Mr. Leslie: Tiles are plentiful.

The PREMIER: I do not think there is a plentiful supply of any material at the moment. There are very few tilers available. The cost of bricks at the State Brick Works has gone up about 40 per cent.

Mr. McLarty: Do you see any early prospect of costs coming down?

The PREMIER: Costs could come down considerably. I mentioned the arduous nature of the work entailed in making bricks. If we could get young strong men who could do a day's work every day of the week, costs would come down.

Mr. McLarty: I mean building costs generally.

The PREMIER: It depends to a great extent on the cost of materials and the variations in the basic wage.

Mr. Leslie: While the price of land is up, other prices will be up.

The PREMIER: It is difficult to get builders to tender for jobs. Tenders are called for a house and a builder will say, "I will have a shot at this job at a couple of hundred pounds above the ordinary price. If I get it, so far, so good; if I do not, it does not matter." Builders quote on that basis because they know the difficulties with regard to shortage of materials.

Mr. Doney: Builders are like storekeepers. They can get what they ask.

The PREMIER: Yes.

Mr. Willmott: The storekeeper cannot; his prices are fixed.

The PREMIER: I was going to say that there is such a thing as a black market.

Hon. N. Keenan: You were going to tell the Committee what you are getting from the Commonwealth.

The PREMIER: We get a small amount from the Commonwealth, such as the additional salary which we pay the Auditor General, Mr. Taylor. I think he gets £200 or £250 for superintending certain work. He does a tremendous amount of work and is at his office three or four nights a week. Only about £1,000 is made available by the Commonwealth. We are co-operating to a great extent with the Commonwealth. If the Commonwealth want us to do a small job for it, we do not mind doing the work. We do not adopt the attitude of the member for Nedlands, who said that because the Commonwealth received £30,000 for collecting our income tax we should not give anything in return without payment. However, we are a little on the generous side.

The Commonwealth has made allowances for much of the work we have done for it.

Mr. Leslie: The Commonwealth does not show much consideration for our goodness and co-operation.

The PREMIER: I do not adopt a grouching attitude. Taking the merry-go-round and the swings together we do not fare badly, although we could single out some specific cases of complaint and perhaps injustice, but when we survey the position all round we find that others are not very much better off than we are in that respect. I have some figures showing the cost of building. I was talking about the brick works. Coal has gone up about 7s. per ton in the last two or three years. Small coal is not available to meet all the requirements of the brickworks; large lumps of coal are delivered there and these have to be broken up for the furnaces. That naturally increases the cost of production of bricks. Houses which cost £750 to £800 some time ago now cost £1,000 to £1,030. Prices of houses in the country seem to have gone up higher still because of the shortage of labour there. Men have to be sent from the city to the country, and they are paid, in addition to their ordinary wages, an away-from-home allowance. This further increases the cost of houses in country areas.

There is a reason for all these things. If the costs are analysed, one can see how they are made up. That, however, does not make it easier to pay them; and, in view of the money that will have to be expended on the building of these houses, the economic rent will be considerably greater than if we had been able to carry out the housing programme three or four years ago. Some of the increased costs are as follows:—Timber construction, 15 per cent.; joinery, 20 per cent.; cement, 34 per cent.; bricks, 42 per cent.; plasterboard, fixed, 39 per cent.; roof tiles, fixed, 35 per cent. The cost is high even though economies have been effected by having somewhat smaller rooms—not very much smaller but slightly smaller—and lower ceilings. That is supposed to have saved from £25 to £30 per house.

Mr. Doney: Are they still insisting on the lower ceilings?

The PREMIER: Not insisting; they are building them.

Mr. Doney: Then they are insisting!

The PREMIER: Even with economies in the cost of construction, the cost of providing these houses has not been lowered to any great extent; on the average it is about 30 per cent. greater. The member for Canning asked when houses were going to be built. I have listened to the Prime Minister on three or four occasions and he has not given us any hope. He has not given the Minister for Health any prospect of securing additional men to carry out work on the new hospital. For three years there have been only a few men working on that building. It would have been completed long ago if we had been able to get the men. I intend to say more about housing when discussing the Loan Estimates. I have already indicated to the Committee that about £500,000 is being provided for housing, and I intend to deal more fully with the matter when presenting those Estimates. However, if there is any further information in regard to housing matters that members desire, I will be happy to supply it now.

Mr. Doney: Are there likely to be further increases in the clerical staff?

The PREMIER: More people will be required to undertake the building construction programme. There are four extra draftsmen, for instance. Eight or nine plans have been laid on the Table. People go to the office and inspect the plans. They say, "This is nearly what I want; but I would like this room turned round a bit, and a bathroom put here, and a front door there, and a little verandah somewhere else." When each plan is altered to some extent and there are 250 different buildings, each one needing alteration, a fair amount of drafting is necessary. Now we are actively in operation under the contract system. We intend as time passes to get gangs together to test out the difference between day labour and contract labour with a view to seeing which is the better. Because of the 300 houses about to be erected we must have more supervisors, clerks and typistes. Then we have to provide for automatic increases in salaries; because, whether the war continues or not, those increases persist. We have taken on a lot of juniors to replace men who have enlisted, and their salaries are subject to automatic increases each year.

Mr. Leslie: Will you go into the concrete brick business?

The PREMIER: We have made inquiries into the matter. There is not much economy in sending a man to make bricks on the job. If people are prepared to buy cement and get sand and make bricks themselves it is different. The hon. member said they could do the bricklaying, but it is not much easier to do the bricklaying with concrete bricks than with clay bricks. I do not know whether the ordinary worker would be competent to build houses just because he was able to get concrete bricks.

Mr. Leslie: It needs expert supervision, but the labourer could do it.

The PREMIER: If expert supervision can be provided, that is different altogether. In order to determine what is the lowest cost for which houses can be built economically, the Commonwealth has set up a bureau and is trying out all methods of saving money. It is putting up half-a-dozen different houses in different places by different methods, and is hoping to be able to determine the greatest degree of economy possible.

Mr. Leslie: The utilitarian point of view needs to be considered as well.

The PREMIER: That is being considered. The Commonwealth is endeavouring to find out by which method the cheapest houses can be provided, and it is seeking to provide adequate houses and not the type built under the South Australian scheme. I propose to devote a little more time to the matter of housing when dealing with the Loan Estimates in a week or two, when more information will be available.

Vote put and passed.

*Votes—Superannuation Board, £3,350; Printing—£70,400—agreed to.*

*Vote—Tourist Bureau, £730:*

Mr. HILL: I fully realise that the tourist trade is one that must remain in abeyance for the duration, but I regret the Vote is so small, because I am of opinion that our Tourist Bureau should be in operation so as to be able to carry on as soon as the war is over. I have here the report of the Commissioner of Railways in Queensland, and the remarks concerning the Tourist Bureau in that State are worth reading. The Tourist Bureau in Queensland, like that in South Africa, is apparently

under the control of the Commissioner of Railways. The report states—

The collections at offices of the Tourist Bureau amounted to £131,120, compared with £118,210 in the previous year, an increase of £12,910, or 11 per cent.

Branches or agencies of the bureau are now established in all the States. The Rockhampton branch was transferred on 26th May, 1939, to more central premises in East-street and a full-time tourist officer appointed.

An extensive publicity campaign was conducted, particularly in other States where the Press, radio, cinema screen, hoardings, and windows were utilised. Films in natural colour were also displayed to selected audiences. The winter traffic to North Queensland and the Great Barrier Reef reached a new record and many tourists who wished to travel by ship could not secure berths. Representations concerning the need for augmented services during the winter months have been made to the Associated Steamship Owners.

The Commonwealth Cinema Branch has control of the distribution of films relating to all kinds of subjects affecting Australia, including tourist attractions—Queensland receiving its share of publicity in this direction. There is a system whereby such films are placed on overseas steamers on their way to Australia. They are of the standard sound cinema type—35 mm.—and are taken by the branch itself.

Greater efforts were made during the year to attract tourists to other portions of the State with pleasing results, particularly at Brisbane and near coastal resorts.

The winter traffic to Queensland is now probably the largest concerted movement of tourists in Australia and, undoubtedly, the benefit to the State is considerable. Ten years ago the number of tourists from other States was small, but today, with comparatively little additional expenditure, a valuable business has been established. The expenditure on the Tourist Bureau in 1928-29 was £8,142. During the year 1938-39 the expenditure was £19,332, of which £6,633 was recouped by commissions, the net expenditure being £12,699. In 1928-29 the turnover amounted to £1,360, none of which was revenue to the Railway Department. In 1938-39 the turnover amounted to £131,120, of which £25,663 was paid to the railway revenue for services rendered.

Satisfactory as these figures are, they do not represent the actual results achieved by the Tourist Bureau. Many visitors, who are attracted by its publicity, travel independently or through other agencies: a notable feature has been the increased number of motorists travelling privately from other States. These visitors after arrival in Queensland circulate a large amount of money through various channels.

In the past there has been a tendency to under-estimate the value of the tourist traffic to this State. We have not a Great Barrier Reef, but we have other attractions that compare favourably with those in any other part of Australia. In the North we

have Geraldton with some of the finest fishing in Australia. A few weeks ago the suggestion was made that Perth should be the Paris of the Southern Seas. We might refer to Bunbury as the Brighton of Western Australia and to Albany as the Riviera, and Esperance is not without its attractions. I hope the Government will make provision for the tourist traffic as soon as the war is over. The tourist trade represents the one asset that we can sell and at the same time keep.

Mr. NORTH: I do not wish to deal with the general position with regard to the tourist trade at the present time. The Royal Automobile Club and Bernie's are very active in trying to move in the matter of tourist attractions. In the first place, Mr. Hardwick has spent some time with the Premier and his department.

The Premier: Through you.

Mr. NORTH: He is very grateful for the consideration he has received from the department. He has obtained some official information as to where to carry out the schemes he has in mind. He proposes to hire out the wooden ships made in this State to bring to the metropolitan area the fish caught at Shark Bay, and on the return run to take passengers who care to travel to those parts. He also proposes to get a number of fishing luggers in order to cater for sportsmen who desire to fish on the high seas. He also has ideas of beautifying the Swan River and providing alfresco fish suppers on the river of a summer's evening. The fulfilment of his ideas will cost the State very little. He has received advice from the Government as to what departments to approach in order to carry out his programme. Another matter concerns the Royal Automobile Club. It has been very active in regard to the East-West road. At present the club is in touch with the Premier with a view to having one or two hostels built on the main road between Norseman and Eucla. The idea is that people travelling to Western Australia will be invited, when their ship arrives at Fremantle, to unload their cars and drive overland in order to see our State.

The weak spot in the whole plan is that on the run between Norseman and Eucla no accommodation is provided for motorists. The suggestion has been made that the Premier may arrange with the Tourist Bureau,

at some later date, to erect a hostel or a rest house so that the run from Perth to the Eastern States would be a practicability. That would provide one economical means of attracting many extra tourists to this State. If they go to the Eastern States by sea or overland by train they cannot spend their time and money in Western Australia. Although this is a small Vote at present I hope that the two bodies I mentioned will receive all the assistance the Government can possibly give in the helpful and encouraging if not in the financial sense until after the war when the big plans which have been announced by the Premier and supported by the member for Albany will eventuate.

Mr. HOLMAN: I realise that the Vote must necessarily be small at this particular time, but it would be advisable to keep the future publicity of the State in mind. I take it that this would be taken over by the Tourist Bureau. I was interested to read in "The West Australian" an experience of one of our W.A. airmen in the United States. He compared their beaches with the Western Australian beaches. In the course of his letter he said—

There was little surf, and the beach is nothing to compare with ours. Few people realise that we have the best beaches in the world. Our long stretches of white sand are unsurpassable anywhere. Whether it be surf or calm water the swimming is not equal to ours. There is no doubt that we do not advertise our beaches enough.

That is the opinion of most of us in respect to Western Australia, and it is not only in connection with our beaches but the possibilities of all matters that would attract tourists to this State. I hope the Government has some plans that will attract tourists here in the post-war period. The tourist traffic means a lot to the South-West in particular, and that is the part in which I am mainly interested. Certain private firms are not waiting until after the war. They have their ideas in hand at present and are working pretty hard on them.

One particular firm I have in mind is the Metro Bus Company which, I believe, is taking over the Ravenswood Hotel and the surrounding country so as to make it into a very fine tourist centre. That is a very shrewd move because, if we think of the round trip, we realise that it is necessary to go from Perth through Armadale to Pin-

jarra and then on to Mandurah. In the course of the return journey from Pinjarra we come to Ravenswood. From there we go through Mandurah to Perth and there are only about two places on the track where the traveller can get a cup of tea, and the people who run those establishments are not fussy about serving customers. In fact at Mandurah they consider they are conferring a privilege on the traveller when they serve him. That applies also in Pinjarra where those concerned do not seem very fussy about attending to the wants of travellers.

The Metro Bus Company has seen the weakness in the present position and has decided to establish, as it were, a half-way house to cater for the requirements of tourists. From all accounts it will be a great institution. However, that phase of the tourist business is being taken out of the Government's hands. I think the work should be undertaken by the Tourist Bureau. I hope to see in the future special provision made for tourists along the track from Perth to Augusta, Albany and other resorts. If the Government were to establish hostels they would add to the tourist attractions of Western Australia. Then again there is the question of providing swimming pools. If one were made available in the city it should prove popular. This is no new idea; it was advocated many years ago, but unfortunately nothing has been done.

Mr. Triat: What about one at Laverton, where there is no water available for such a purpose within 200 miles?

Mr. HOLMAN: A start could be made at centres where there is plenty of water. If swimming pools were provided at, or in close proximity to, schools in the country areas, it would enable the children to engage in aquatic sports and thereby receive very necessary education in swimming. It might result in the averting of tragedies when country children visit our beaches or riverside resorts.

Mr. Watts: Why not take them to Katanning where there is a very fine swimming pool?

Mr. HOLMAN: And there is another remarkably fine pool at Kalgoorlie. There is another at Pemberton where the local people have made provision for themselves. At other centres where the residents have not the initiative or the necessary finance,

the Government would do well if it helped in that direction and thus added to the attractions of the State from a tourist point of view.

Vote put and passed.

*Vote—Literary and Scientific Grants, etc., £13,050:*

Item, Public Library, Museum and Art Gallery of Western Australia and Travelling Library, £9,550.

Mr. PERKINS: The position regarding this item could be made more clear. While the actual figures are quite correct, a footnote to the Vote states that the total amount includes provision of £1,050 for the schools travelling library and £500 for the provision of an archives officer. There is an increase of £1,500 on the item. The position is that £1,000 is provided for the country library scheme, and £500 for the archives division. The £50 for the schools travelling library is the same as last year.

The Premier: When will you bring in your report?

Mr. PERKINS: I hope very shortly, as soon as matters can be arranged. The Chief Librarian has been out of the State recently. Some people have raised the question as to whether the trip of the Chief Librarian was to be financed out of the £1,000 provided for the schools country library scheme. We know that is not so, but it is well for the point to be made clear in Parliament. I think it would have been better to have included a separate item dealing with that aspect, for then no misapprehension could have arisen.

Vote put and passed.

*Vote—Miscellaneous Services, £1,484,729:*

Item, Expenditure as may be necessary owing to war conditions, £165,000.

Mr. SEWARD: The item shows a decrease of £27,523 on the actual expenditure for 1943-44, but I would like to know whether there is any hope of the Vote being reduced.

The PREMIER: When the Estimates were framed we did not know just how the war would progress. It is expected now that greater economies will be effected and much less money expended than is provided for in the Vote.

The MINISTER FOR MINES: With regard to the civil defence aspect, as the Premier has pointed out, it is only lately that we have received any definite decision from

the Commonwealth Defence Committee and the military authorities here. A fortnight ago it was decided that the Civil Defence Council would suspend operations as from the 1st January. Much of the equipment has already been brought in from the country. In all, tens of thousands of pounds worth of equipment in the metropolitan area and the country districts will have to be collected, and that will take some time. There has to be a general cleaning up of the A.R.P. organisation. That will involve a good deal of expense because all the shelters, underground and surface, that were erected by the Government and local governing authorities have to be removed. They will be taken up as they were put down, on a fifty-fifty basis, and that work will be attended to as manpower becomes available. The Civil Defence Council will go into recess. The Act governing the appointment of that body operates for the period of the war and six months afterwards. There will be a considerable volume of detailed work to be attended to, and the council will be called together when necessary to clean up the whole business.

Mr. Seward: I suppose all the wood will be for sale.

The MINISTER FOR MINES: Yes. Mr. Cavanagh has been in charge of the work since Mr. Dumas retired from the position of chairman of the Shelters Committee. The shelters that are considered a menace to the health of the community or are used for purposes not intended will be dismantled first. As members are aware, the bunds attached to shop fronts are being taken down and the windows are being restored. By the end of March we hope that all traces of A.R.P. constructions will be removed.

Item, Allowances to officers for additional work for Commonwealth Government War Organisation of Industry, £350.

Mr. RODOREDA: This is apparently an amount paid by the State to officers for additional work done for the Commonwealth.

The Premier: It is recouped by the Commonwealth.

Item, Reforestation Fund, special grant, £15,000.

Mr. HOLMAN: The expenditure last year was £45,000, and thus there is a de-

crease this year of £30,000. Can the Premier explain the decrease?

The PREMIER: The fund did not get a grant for ten years until last year, when we made available £45,000 for work paid for out of the fund. This year we propose to make £15,000 available.

Mr. McDONALD: The State Shipping Service showed a loss in 1943-44 of £56,000 odd. No provision is made for the service this year. Is it customary to wait and deal with the situation as it arises?

The PREMIER: There is no Vote for this year and we are not quite in order in discussing the item. However, the financial position was such last year that we were able to make a grant to the State Shipping Service. This year we have only one ship working, and we do not expect to make a loss. Previously we had three ships in the trade and, owing to the war, they had often to remain at Fremantle for three or four weeks, and thus considerable loss was incurred. This year the position is entirely different.

Vote put and passed.

Progress reported.

*House adjourned at 10.16 p.m.*

## Legislative Council.

*Wednesday, 15th November, 1944.*

	PAGE
Bills: Mortgagees' Rights Restriction Act Amendment, 3A. ....	1730
Health Act Amendment, reports ....	1730
Perth Diocesan Trustees (Special Fund), report	1730
Rural and Industries Bank, 2A. ....	1730
Colliery Recreation and Park Lands Act Amendment, 1A. ....	1738
Lotteries (Control) Act Amendment, 1B. ....	1738
Shearers' Accommodation Act Amendment, Assembly's message ....	1738
Redemption of Annuities Act Amendment, 2A	1738
Natives (Citizenship Rights), Com. ....	1739
Bussellton Cemetery, 2A. ....	1739
Stamp Act Amendment, 2A. ....	1740

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

### BILL—MORTGAGEES' RIGHTS RESTRICTION ACT AMENDMENT.

Read a third time, and returned to the Assembly with amendments.

### BILL—HEALTH ACT AMENDMENT.

Reports of Committee adopted.

### BILL—PERTH DIOCESAN TRUSTEES (SPECIAL FUND).

Report of Committee adopted.

### BILL—RURAL AND INDUSTRIES BANK.

*Second Reading.*

THE CHIEF SECRETARY [4.39] in moving the second reading said: The introduction of this measure is the consummation of considerable thought and consideration by the Government of that most important and vexed question, namely, rural finance. It is a measure which has a highly important bearing on rural industry and on the business life of the community, and if passed will be recognised as a milestone in the history of rural finance in this State. The proposal is to constitute a trading bank under the name of the "Rural and Industries Bank of Western Australia," to take the place of the existing Agricultural Bank.

Before dealing with the provisions of the Bill I propose, as briefly as possible, to cover past legislation relating to the establishment of the Agricultural Bank, and also to deal with its operations to indicate how these have played an important part in the development of the State. During the early nineties the population of this State was very small. We had huge areas of Crown land available for selection, a considerable proportion of which was suitable for wheat and sheep and other agricultural purposes. It was in these circumstances that legislation was first introduced to establish the Agricultural Bank. The Act was passed in 1894 and was a well-conceived piece of legislation. Provision was made for the appointment of a manager, who had power, under the approval of the Governor, to make advances for the purpose of promoting the occupation, cultivation and improvement of agricultural lands in this State. These purposes are described as the objectives of the legislation.

The capital of the bank was limited to £100,000, with statutory power given from time to time to increase this capital, and the maximum amount of advance which could be made was £400. The usual powers were