

protection is that which this Act gives to them. They are the people with whom we are concerned when we bring this amending Bill before the House.

I hope members will view the Bill from that angle. If they do, they will be convinced that they have a duty to these particular people and accordingly will do their best to see the Bill passed through the House in a form reasonably acceptable to Parliament, and in a way that will improve the conditions of those who have had no legislative improvement granted to them of any worth-while character since 1925.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

*House adjourned at 10.53 p.m.*

## Legislative Council.

*Tuesday, 18th November, 1941.*

	PAGE
Questions: Yampi Sound iron ore, as to treatment ....	1917
Pastoral industry, wool appraised at Albany ....	1917
Leave of absence .....	1918
Motion: Taxation, volunteer militiamen's sustenance .....	1918
Bills: Main Roads Act (Funds Appropriation) (No. 2), 1R. ....	1920
Financial Emergency Act Amendment, 3R., passed .....	1920
Mortgages' Rights Restriction Act. Continuance, 2R., passed .....	1920
Industrial Arbitration Act Amendment, reports .....	1920
Potato Growers Licensing. Com. ....	1920
Workers' Compensation Act Amendment, Assembly's Message .....	1928
Increase of Rent (War Restrictions) Act Amendment, Assembly's request for conference .....	1928
Public Trustee, Assembly's Message .....	1929
Lotteries (Control) Act Amendment, 2R. ....	1929
Land Drainage Act Amendment, 2R. ....	1943

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

### QUESTION—YAMPI SOUND IRON ORE.

*As to Treatment.*

Hon. G. W. MILES asked the Chief Secretary: In connection with the grant of £1,000 towards the preliminary investigations concerning the establishment of the

iron and steel industry in Western Australia: 1, Have any investigations been made by the Government or other parties into the proposition that the Yampi iron ore deposits could be treated electrically? 2, In connection with the generation of electricity for the above purpose, has any proposition been considered to—(a) harness tidal waters, or (b) dam the Walcott Inlet in order to conserve the water flowing into that inlet from the Isdell, Calder and Charuley rivers? 3, (a) Is it a fact that estimates have shown that, after allowing 50 per cent. for seepage and evaporation, the conservation of water mentioned in 2 (b) would amount to three hundred thousand million gallons? (b) Will the Government check these figures by estimating the area of the watershed of the three rivers mentioned?

The HONORARY MINISTER (for the Chief Secretary) replied: 1, Yes. 2, Consideration has been given to the generation of electricity for smelting purposes by the harnessing of tidal waters and the damming of inlets. Such procedure would involve a very high capital expenditure which could only be justified by a very large production involving a serious marketing problem. 3, In the initial stages it is intended to concentrate on the establishment of the industry on a scale commensurate with the markets available. It is not intended at this stage to incur expenditure on the preparation of detailed estimates for the production of electric power from water storage.

### QUESTION—PASTORAL INDUSTRY.

*Wool Appraised at Albany.*

Hon. H. V. PIESSE asked the Chief Secretary: 1, Has the Government's attention been drawn to a letter in the "West Australian" of the 7th November, signed by C. H. Merry, secretary of the Wool Brokers' Association? 2, Is the statement made by Mr. Merry that wool appraised at Albany must be railed to Fremantle within 21 days correct, or does the 21 days' period refer to the time when the wool should be cleared from the Albany stores, and not necessarily railed to Fremantle? 3, Is the Government aware that sufficient storage space is available at Albany for an indefinite period for all wool that has to be appraised there this season? 4, If the wool

has to be railed to Fremantle will the Government use its influence to assist in the dumping being carried out at Albany before it is railed?

The HONORARY MINISTER (for the Chief Secretary) replied: 1, 2, 3, and 4, The whole matter is being administered by the Commonwealth Government, and the State Government has little information regarding the matter at present. However, inquiries are being made.

### LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

On motion by Hon. J. M. Macfarlane, leave of absence for twelve consecutive sittings granted to Hon. H. S. W. Parker (Metropolitan-Suburban) on the ground of military service.

### MOTION—TAXATION.

#### *Volunteer Militiamen's Sustenance.*

HON. J. CORNELL (South) [4.35]: 1 move—

That in the opinion of this House, the taxing under the Income Tax Act of 2s. 5d. per day sustenance received by volunteer militiamen, whilst compulsory trainees are exempted, is unfair and unreasonable, and considers that the National Security Regulations should be invoked to remove this anomaly.

This motion arises out of answers given by the Chief Secretary to questions asked by Mr. Roche. In essence one question was: Is the value of sustenance received by a person who voluntarily enlists in our armed forces exempt when assessing his income tax? The answer given was: "No, it is not." The other question was: "Is the sustenance rate exempt in the case of a person who is called up for universal service?" The answer to that query was: "Yes."

Since the answers were given I have made certain inquiries and all the twaddle possible to conceive has been set out in the reasons given for the differentiation. In the minutes of the proceedings for Wednesday the 12th November, members will find the Minister's reply, wherein he states that the Commonwealth Crown Solicitor has advised—

... that a distinction must be drawn, so far as employment is concerned, between those persons who were called up for service or who are undergoing compulsory training with the defence forces, and those who are voluntarily

enlisted members of the forces. The Crown Solicitor advised that an essential ingredient—

That is a good one.

—of employment is an agreement or willingness to be employed and a person who performs a duty because he is compelled by law so to do, whether his will assents to it or not, is not employed to perform it.

The State Commissioner has adopted that ruling. The Chief Secretary went on and stated—

The Federal Commissioner considers, and the State Commissioner agrees with him, that it is most undesirable to grant specific legislative exemption of the value of sustenance allowed to members of the forces, as such exemption represents a departure from the general principle that sustenance is a proper item to be included in the assessable income of an employee. Legislative exemption of this nature would undoubtedly lead to contentions that civilian taxpayers should be similarly freed from tax on sustenance.

The gem of all is contained in the last paragraph which states—

In practice there is little ground for any grievance by volunteer members of the forces. Many of these persons do not include any amount in their returns for sustenance, and it is not the practice of the department to issue queries or to include sustenance where it is not returned. The tax at issue is of small volume judged individually and totally, and the office work of querying, etc., not worth the cost.

I have heard many evasive answers, but I have never heard one that was more ridiculous. The amount of sustenance allowed a private soldier is 2s. 5d. a day, but it is not merely the sum of money that is involved; it is the invidious distinction drawn in favour of the man who is compelled to undergo training as against the man who has voluntarily entered the forces. That decision by the Federal Commissioner, in which the State Commissioner concurs, is bolstered up by the Crown Solicitor. Some time ago the Commonwealth authorities practically decided to do away with the volunteer regiments, such as the 10th Light Horse, the 25th Machine Gun Company and the Cameron Highlanders.

These were essentially volunteer establishments, and any one acquainted with their ramifications is aware that no volunteer could join without material outlay on his part over and above what was allowed by the military authorities. Through the instrumentality of the R.S.L., led by Colonel Collett, those regiments were allowed to

continue, but subsequently universal trainees were drafted into each of them, as they were considered to be rather good schools for the young men who were required to do compulsory training. The commander of the 16th Battalion oversea, Colonel Potts, was a captain in the 25th Machine Gun Company. The position is that any one serving as a volunteer in those regiments has his sustenance allowance assessed as income by the Taxation Department.

Hon. G. Fraser: If he includes it in his return.

Hon. J. CORNELL: Well, assume that he does not include it, the stigma remains. On the other hand, a universal trainee drafted into one of those regiments under compulsion is allowed the value of his sustenance, which is not assessed as income. I have cited those three establishments but there are others. There are the fortress men at Fremantle and there is also the artillery for which men volunteered. I could enumerate a dozen such establishments. But when universal trainees were called up and placed in those establishments, they were given this consideration in regard to sustenance while the men who formed the establishment in time of peace, who kept it in existence and who cannot now get out of it, do not receive similar consideration.

The same remark applies to men of the Navy at Fremantle. Those who put in their names and were called up are regarded as volunteers and they do not receive this consideration, whereas men who are compulsorily serving do. The same remark also applies to the garrison battalion, which is composed practically of men who saw service in the 1914-18 war. All who volunteered for service in that establishment receive no consideration; their sustenance allowance is included in assessing their income. Take also the reserve of officers; throughout the Commonwealth there has been a reserve of officers and every one who had his name placed on the reserve list is considered a volunteer and is liable to be called up for service. But his sustenance allowance is included in his income for assessment.

Australia is committed to the voluntary system. The Prime Minister, according to this morning's newspaper, even extolled the voluntary loan. But volunteers who responded to the call by offering their services in the armed forces are treated differently from those who are compelled by law to

enter for training. A roundabout way to remove the anomaly would be to amend the income tax laws of the Commonwealth and the State, but there is an easier and swifter way of doing it and that is by invoking the regulations under the National Security Act.

It was my privilege to be in the House of Representatives when the ex-Prime Minister, Mr. Menzies, asked the Commonwealth Parliament to agree to the Government being granted full powers, even that of life and death, under the National Security Act, with the one exception of conscripting men for service oversea. A regulation could be drafted under the National Security Act and this taxation anomaly could be quickly removed. As I stated earlier, it is not the amount of money that is involved; it is the unfairness of the differentiation made between men and women who are prepared to give their services to the country voluntarily as compared with men who are compelled by law to do so. I hope the House will agree to the motion as speedily as possible. When it has done so, as I feel sure it will, I shall move that the resolution be transmitted to another place and its concurrence desired therein.

**HON. H. L. ROCHE** (South-East) [4.49]: In seconding the motion I shall not occupy much of the time of the House because I believe, or certainly hope, that there will be no opposition from the Government. The principle involved is thoroughly bad in that, at a time like the present when we, as a people, are going on our knees appealing to the youth of the State to enlist under a voluntary system and help to maintain the institutions and traditions handed down to us, such a differentiation should be made through a Government instrumentality like the Taxation Department. Certainly the amount of money involved is not very great; and, as the Chief Secretary said in reply to a question, if a militiaman does not include the amount of the sustenance in his return, he is not taxed on it. At the same time, if he does not include it in his return he is suppressing information to which the Commissioner of Taxation is entitled.

As the militia forces are constituted at the moment, both of volunteers and compulsory trainees—except those units mentioned by Mr. Cornell—when all is said and done, there is but little difference between

the trainee and the other casual Australian who has to be told what he must do and the men who have been in the militia for years. The volunteer is still the nucleus, even in those units comprising volunteers and compulsory trainees. In this country, where we are relying upon the volunteer for overseas service and where we are calling upon our people for voluntary effort on one occasion after another for the purpose of protecting and furthering Australia's cause, this principle is a bad one and I trust the House will carry the motion.

On motion by the Chief Secretary, debate adjourned.

### **BILL—MAIN ROADS ACT (FUNDS APPROPRIATION) (No. 2).**

Received from the Assembly and read a first time.

### **BILLS (2)—THIRD READING.**

- 1, Financial Emergency Act Amendment.
- 2, Mortgagees' Rights Restriction Act Continuance.

*Passed.*

### **BILL—INDUSTRIAL ARBITRATION ACT AMENDMENT.**

Reports of Committee adopted.

### **BILL—POTATO GROWERS LICENSING.**

*In Committee.*

Resumed from the 13th November. Hon. G. Fraser in the Chair; the Honorary Minister in charge of the Bill.

Clause 3—Potato growers to obtain license:

The CHAIRMAN: Progress was reported on Clause 3, to which Hon. W. J. Mann had moved the following amendment:—

That the following proviso be added to Sub-clause 1:—"Provided that a license shall not be issued to a person engaged in growing or employed in growing potatoes unless he is a British subject."

Hon. C. F. BAXTER: A great deal of controversy has taken place on the amendment, and there is little to say for either side. Unfortunately, the scales are weighted so heavily against the passing of the

amendment that I consider the mover would be well advised to withdraw it. If the Bill is to be of any use at all—I cannot see that it will—this amendment ought not to be included in it, because, if it is, the assent of the Lieut.-Governor is sure to be withheld. To say that no one but a British subject shall be permitted to engage in this industry is taking a high stand and the repercussions will not be to the benefit of the State. Without going further into the pros and cons of the amendment, I hope wiser counsels will prevail and that the mover will withdraw it.

Hon. H. L. ROCHE: I support the amendment. I suggest in all seriousness that some members have rather misunderstood its purport. It is not designed to prevent aliens from working in the industry, but to prevent them from becoming the holders of licenses to grow potatoes. The Committee should face the issue fairly and squarely and realise that it is part of our duty to ensure that action is taken to protect Britishers and naturalised subjects who are engaged in the industry. I cannot see why so much should be urged in favour of giving an unnaturalised foreigner a license to compete in the industry. Thousands of foreigners are in the country and, while many of them perhaps are able to make themselves understood, not many are concerned with fitting into Australian ways of life.

Their living and social standards are not the same as ours and until they have been here long enough to acquire some knowledge and recognise that this country has certain standards it intends to maintain, they should be debarred from having a license to engage in this industry. There have been stout opponents of the amendment but some of them would not like to see unrestricted competition by unnaturalised aliens in certain other industries. Someone suggested that the industry might provide an avenue for the employment of men returning from the war. I know some men who were engaged in potato growing in the lower Great Southern when they returned from the last war, and they have done reasonably well. I would like to ask those who think that this industry is not sufficiently good for returned men: To what occupation do they think returned men should turn their attention, if not to primary industries, including the one under discussion? If an

industry such as potato growing is to be eliminated, members must suggest something better for the men to do.

The CHAIRMAN: I hope the hon. member will not invite suggestions concerning the future of returned men.

Hon. H. L. ROCHE: I will not pursue that line of argument any further. I am not a staunch supporter of the encouragement of the migration of Southern or even Central Europeans to this country. One member said that we have encouraged them to come here. That may be the policy of some individuals.

The Honorary Minister: It was your party's policy.

Hon. H. L. ROCHE: Not mine.

The Honorary Minister: Your party's.

Hon. G. W. Miles: This is a non-party House.

Hon. H. L. ROCHE: It may have been the policy of certain individuals. I can remember when a certain organised section of the community strongly opposed immigration. I think they went so far as to oppose immigration of any kind.

Hon. J. J. Holmes: A Labour Prime Minister went to Rome and invited them to come.

Hon. H. L. ROCHE: He may have done so, yet possibly Mr. Scullin was speaking for himself, just as the hon. member today may be speaking for Mr. Scullin.

Hon. J. J. Holmes: He was speaking for the Labour Party.

Hon. H. L. ROCHE: There are Southern Europeans who are pleased to be here; I have heard them say it is a very good country. If they were in their own country they would be fighting today, but we send our own men away to fight for them. The issue will have to be faced not only with regard to Southern Europeans but with regard to other refugees also. The majority of the fruit and vegetable shops in Perth are run by refugees, and most of those engaged in hawking are foreigners who can speak only broken English. They seem to take advantage of opportunities of which our people either cannot or will not avail themselves, possibly because the standard of living is not such as they are prepared to endure.

Hon. G. B. WOOD: I oppose the amendment. Who are we to deny the right to earn a decent living to persons who have been allowed by the Commonwealth Govern-

ment to come into Australia, who—according to some hon. members—have been invited here? Mr. Roche said we should not give them licenses.

Hon. H. L. Roche: Until they are naturalised.

Hon. G. B. WOOD: They cannot be naturalised until they have been in Australia for five years. I will not be a party to debarring any foreigners such as Jugoslavs, people whose country was sacrificed for our benefit—

Hon. J. Cornell: Our benefit?

Hon. G. B. WOOD: Yes, or attempted benefit anyhow, though it did not do much good. I do not propose to be a party to debarring them from engaging in this industry.

Hon. L. B. Bolton: Would you debar Italians?

Hon. G. B. WOOD: Not if they were naturalised. If they were unnaturalised, they would be interned. Mr. Roche spoke about the standard of living of these people. I would like him to visit the Upper Swan vineyards and see some of the Jugoslavs' homes; he would not talk so much about their standard of living then.

Hon. H. L. Roche: A lot of the children cannot speak English.

Hon. G. B. WOOD: That is not correct. There is a special school conducted by the Roman Catholic Church at Herne Hill. I have not come across a single Jugoslav child in the province I represent who could not speak English. At any rate, it does not say much for Australians and Britishers if they cannot stand up to the competition of any foreigner. Let us cast our minds back to 10 or 15 years ago, when there was an argument about foreign land clearers. Our people would not do the work.

The CHAIRMAN: I must ask the hon. member to confine his remarks to the present.

Hon. G. B. WOOD: I was using that illustration to back up my argument. I oppose the amendment.

Hon. Sir HAL COLEBATCH: I would like to remind the Committee that in regard to migration over a number of years prior to the outbreak of war there was an excess of departures over arrivals. That was a condition that could not but excite the gravest anxiety in the mind of every man with the interest of this country at heart. Ultimately the excess was a little more than balanced

by the arrival of a number of foreigners who came practically at the invitation of Australia. Every foreigner making application for admission had to fill in a long questionnaire. The three outstanding items in that questionnaire were: First, that he must be of good character and of good health; second, that he must be prepared to engage in the cultivation of the soil; and third, that he must be possessed of sufficient money to enable him to embark on such enterprise. Is it not obvious that this amendment flies in the face of that undertaking?

Hon. W. J. MANN: Since the Committee last met I have received many messages of congratulation for having introduced this matter. One man, representing a fairly large association, went out of his way to tell me on Saturday night that the problem had been discussed and that he had been asked to see me and express the hope that Parliament would give a lead in this direction. I made it clear previously that I was under no misapprehension as to the gravity of this subject. I know that certain treaty rights that existed before the war may be called into question. But what are treaty rights today? How many of those treaties are really in existence? Very few; none so far as the enemy is concerned, for it has torn up every treaty to which it was party.

Something has been said about the balance of departures over arrivals having been adjusted by the advent of foreigners. I have not the figures before me and cannot therefore support or deny that statement; but I presume it is correct. One thing I do know is that there was a good deal of smart practice indulged in regarding the way some of them got here. Money has been sent abroad to bring them here and we have been told that has been resorted to on a number of occasions. I think that is fairly correct. I would be the last to want to place the Committee in a position in which it would not like to find itself, but I suggest that if the phraseology of the amendment is not acceptable, there is a very clear principle—one that Mr. Wood forgot—which should guide us. He referred to people in the Upper Swan. Surely he is aware that under the Dried Fruits Act no person can vote in the election of the board to control that industry unless he is qualified as an elector for the Legislative Assembly.

Hon. G. B. Wood: But that Act does not debar such a person from growing currants.

Hon. W. J. MANN: No, but he cannot cast a vote in the election for the board.

Hon. J. J. Holmes: You want to debar these people from growing potatoes.

Hon. W. J. MANN: There is a way of overcoming that difficulty. I had a suggestion to make regarding the amendment.

Hon. J. CORNELL: I move—

That the amendment be amended by striking out in line 3 the words "a British subject" and inserting the words "enrolled as an elector for the Legislative Assembly" in lieu.

That will get over the difficulty that some members contemplate when they suggest that, with Mr. Mann's amendment included, the Bill would be reserved for the Royal Assent which, they predict, would be refused. I join issue with those who adopt that view and remind them that the nation is at war.

Hon. W. J. Mann: The difference between your amendment and mine is simply a matter of phraseology.

Hon. J. CORNELL: Under the Dried Fruits Act no alien can cast a vote in connection with the election of the board controlling that industry. For many years no such provision was included. The reason for its insertion was to prevent aliens, naturalised or unnaturalised, from electing a board that would comprise foreigners only. On the best of authority I know that had that amendment not been inserted in the Act, the board controlling the dried fruits industry would have been a Yugoslav-cum-Italian board.

The Chief Secretary: How would your amendment affect Australians under 21 years of age?

Hon. J. CORNELL: They would have the right to grow potatoes.

The Chief Secretary: Your amendment would prevent Australians under 21 years of age from securing licenses to grow potatoes.

Hon. J. CORNELL: That is not so.

Hon. J. J. Holmes: Who is the "person engaged in growing?" Is he naturalised or unnaturalised? Will he be an individual working for a boss or someone else?

Hon. J. CORNELL: The suggestion is that the grower must have a license before he will be entitled to grow potatoes, and I agree with that principle. For a considerable period the Returned Soldiers' League has been endeavouring to prevent the transfer or lease of land to any alien, naturalised

or unnaturalised. As the result of the attitude adopted by the league here Colonel Olden secured the passage of a resolution at the Brisbane conference of the R.S.L. last week to the effect that aliens should not be able to secure land under lease or by transfer until adequate provision had been made for the rehabilitation of our own people and that the National Security Regulations should be amended to that effect. I remind the Committee that Australia has been at war for two years. I know aliens who have been here for 30 years and have not taken the trouble to be naturalised. I do not agree with Mr. Wood when he said that the Jugoslavs came to our assistance, for unfortunately we went to their assistance.

Hon. T. Moore: But not strongly enough.

Hon. J. CORNELL: Throughout Australia nationals of foreign countries, many of them unnaturalised, are digging in, taking advantage of all that we can offer them as the result of the war—and we are looking on complacently.

Hon. W. J. Mann: We will be cursed for it later on.

Hon. J. CORNELL: Of course we will be.

Hon. H. L. Roche: And have New York over again.

Hon. J. CORNELL: The R.S.L. conference in Queensland went further and suggested appropriate measures for dealing with the alien menace, drawing attention at the same time to the widespread public unrest and the feeling of insecurity engendered through the presence in Australia of so many nationals of enemy countries and refugees from places occupied by enemy forces. In the published report of the proceedings the following appeared:—

"Now," asked Mr. Huish, "can Australian men in areas where there are aliens, be asked to enlist and leave their wives, children and homes while aliens remain to carry on and make profits?" Returned soldiers and others felt grave disquiet about the position. He stated that within a 20-mile radius of one North Queensland town 26 per cent. of the people engaged in industry were British, 68 per cent. Italian, and 6 per cent. others.

That is the position into which we are slowly but surely drifting in Western Australia, and that applies particularly in the South-West.

Hon. W. J. Mann: In Queensland there are 3,000 unnaturalised foreigners engaged in the industry referred to.

Hon. J. CORNELL: And I hope we shall avoid such a position in Western Australia.

I look at this matter through different spectacles from those I was accustomed to before the last war. I said early in the piece that we will not get out of the present crisis except through the blood and sweat of the English-speaking people themselves. That is why I wish to secure to them the heritage that should rightly be theirs.

The HONORARY MINISTER: I visited the South-West during the week-end and I confess to having been shocked at seeing so many aliens there. As a matter of fact, I never before saw such an aggregation of aliens in any one town, with hardly an Australian to be seen.

Hon. J. Cornell: There is no trade union there or you would have heard about it promptly.

The HONORARY MINISTER: As a result of what I saw, I am much more in sympathy with the objective Mr. Mann has in view. But I think the way proposed is the wrong method to adopt. I do not think a potato Bill is suitable for dealing with such a matter. We must be careful regarding what we do. I can understand the intention because of my experience on Saturday. In that town I saw two soldiers in uniform and very few eligible Australians.

Hon. J. J. Holmes: Where was this?

The HONORARY MINISTER: At Bridgetown.

Hon. J. Cornell: They are there all right.

The HONORARY MINISTER: I can quite understand the feelings of fathers and mothers whose sons are on active service when they see these people at work all over the district, taking advantage of present circumstances. At the same time we must do justice to the foreign element. Quite a large number of them are Slavs. We must not allow our feelings to run away with us. If a large proportion of the aliens are evading their duty and doing things detrimental to the State, that problem must be dealt with in the proper way. But we cannot do it merely by inserting an amendment in the Bill under consideration. Members must remember that in past years farmers have made use of the services of these aliens who work long hours for cheap rates of pay. The foreigners have seen the opportunity to do something for themselves and are doing it.

Hon. W. J. Mann: My word they are!

The HONORARY MINISTER: If Mr. Cornell persists with his amendment, he

will debar many young men from growing potatoes, although their fathers may be fighting for us at the front. Such a position would be absurd. We have had a frank talk about the difficulty and I suggest that the amendment on the amendment, together with the amendment, be withdrawn and the matter be not put to the vote.

Hon. H. TUCKEY: I support the views expressed by Mr. Cornell. I was with the Minister at Bridgetown, and discussed the question with him there. To say it is not necessary to take this opportunity to do something in the matter is entirely wrong. Throughout the South-West are to be found numbers of returned soldiers who have been settled there for years, and some of them have sons away fighting. The Honorary Minister says that the aliens work for low wages, but that is not the case today. The chairman of the Bridgetown Road Board told me that those men have now got together and are demanding more than the basic wage—not less than 15s. a day. Probably they will demand £1 per day for picking apples, no labour other than theirs being available. The aliens are taking advantage of this time of war, and something should be done to stop them. Half of them cannot speak English. Surely we can find a way out, and that is what Mr. Cornell seeks to do. Most of the young Australians who have been mentioned work for their parents. My main concern is about the enemy aliens. I would intern them. Some of them were interned, and then set free again—why I do not know, whether because Australia cannot afford to feed them or whether there is not accommodation for them.

The Chief Secretary: Is the 15s. per day earned at regular work, or at seasonal work?

Hon. H. TUCKEY: Labour is very scarce indeed, and there is no one to engage but these aliens. The question is extremely serious in the South-West, and this opportunity to deal with it should not be missed.

Hon. T. MOORE: After all, this is an Australian question, and not one for this Chamber. It is rather outside our province. I agree with much that has been said about foreigners who came to this country, and I know who brought most of them here. The goldmining companies brought them

here in boat-loads. They are here, and have been allowed to settle in this country. In fact, I regret that there were not some more brought here. As regards enemy aliens, I have not been able to make up my mind who will be an enemy alien and who a friendly alien before the war is over. As the game goes on, the screw will be applied, and there will be happenings. Mr. Cornell was on sound ground when he said that the returned soldiers' conference sitting in Brisbane was dealing with the matter on right lines. Let the thing not be done piecemeal—licensing in one industry and then in another. However, the amendment should not be persisted in.

Hon. J. CORNELL: There is another way out which might be more palatable—to provide that no alien should hold a license. I ask leave to withdraw my amendment.

The CHAIRMAN: The amendment has not yet been stated, and therefore there is no need to withdraw it.

Hon. J. CORNELL: I shall not proceed further with my amendment to Mr. Mann's amendment.

Hon. H. TUCKEY: If these aliens own blocks and want to grow potatoes on them, they should be allowed to do so; but they lease their land. They clear land and hand it back to the owner.

Hon. L. B. BOLTON: Is not that an advantage to the State?

Members: Yes.

Hon. H. TUCKEY: Under the Bill they will be able to grow potatoes without any restriction.

Hon. E. H. H. HALL: In the Geraldton district large numbers of foreigners are growing tomatoes. Whether it is a question of observing treaties or not observing them, we are at war, and, as Mr. Cornell has said, many things are going by the board. This question is highly important, and bristles with difficulties. Aliens in the Geraldton district are good citizens; they are not living on the smell of an oil rag but are living well. Some of them have become naturalised, and some have not. If an alien is unnaturalised after five years' residence here, he has only himself to blame. I must stand by my own kith and kin, despite what has taken place between President Roosevelt and Mr. Churchill. I know what Western Australia owes to the foreigners who have cleared thousands of acres of land that would never have been

cleared but for them—but we are at war. I hold that it is not for me to shirk my job by claiming that this Chamber should not decide the question.

Hon. H. SEDDON: The question turns upon the fact that we are at war and the further fact that there is a great deal of truth in what has been said about men hanging back and foreigners filling the places of men who have gone to the front. There is strong feeling on the question. For my part I will stand by the men who have stood by this country. We have to decide our position relatively to this question, because the present war is different from the previous one inasmuch as it threatens our freedom, our standards of living, and our very existence as they have never been threatened before. With regard to the men who have gone to the front, we must stand behind them when they come back.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: I was surprised to learn that this Bill had been brought down by the Government. The question arises whether the potato-growers want the Bill, or desire it to be wrecked. If they want it to be wrecked, they are going the right way about it. I understand the Minister in another place agreed to bring down a Bill containing the conditions included in the measure as it was introduced. I also understand that the growers were informed that the Government would not agree to any amendment such as that now before the Chamber.

Hon. G. B. Wood: Are you speaking for the Government?

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: No. I can understand English, and can also see the way the straw is drifting. It is now proposed to load the Bill with this amendment, which will surely wreck it. Possibly that will accomplish what some of its so-called supporters desire. The most powerful organisation in Australia, next perhaps to the Labour Party, is that comprising the returned soldiers. That organisation has declared that it has been trying to accomplish what members hope to achieve by this amendment, but has been unable to do so. The proper way to deal with this question is through the Federal Government under the National Security Act. International questions arise here. Did Mr. E. H. H. Hall say that foreigners were growing tomatoes at Geraldton?

Hon. E. H. H. Hall: Yes.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: Then why should they not be prohibited from doing that if others are to be prevented from growing potatoes in the South-West?

Hon. A. THOMSON: According to Mr. Holmes, those who vote for the amendment will wreck the Bill. If the majority of the members of this Parliament wish to amend a Government measure, the Government must give consideration to their wishes.

Hon. J. J. Holmes: The Bill was agreed to by the growers.

Hon. A. THOMSON: They are strongly in favour of aliens being prevented from securing a license, but do not object to their working for those who are licensed. Mr. Seddon and Mr. E. H. H. Hall were on the right track when they said we must look after our own kith and kin. It is our duty to preserve the rights and privileges of our men who have gone oversea. Foreigners have been given the opportunity to live here under much better conditions than they would have enjoyed in their own countries. We do not wish to deny them the right to obtain a living in our midst, but our first duty is to our own people who have gone to fight for us. We have the spectacle of men who have not seen fit to become naturalised in all the years they have been living here. All they have sought to do is to take advantage of the privileges we have offered them, without accepting any responsibility for the welfare of the country. I hope the Committee will indicate its opinion in no uncertain manner.

Hon. G. W. Miles: Give us a chance to do so. We have been debating this matter for hours.

Hon. A. THOMSON: This is a serious question. I am entitled to express my opinion, and I resent Mr. Miles's interjection. He should not dictate to members.

Hon. G. W. Miles: Everyone has spoken for hours on this subject.

Hon. A. THOMSON: I am going to voice my opinion. The hon. member's objections will not hasten the debate.

The CHAIRMAN: I suggest the hon. member does not pursue that subject.

Hon. A. THOMSON: With Mr. Seddon and Mr. E. H. H. Hall, I feel it would be wrong for me to give a silent vote. Whilst I have no desire to injure foreigners in any way, I think our duty is to protect our own people.

Hon. G. W. MILES: I move—

That the Committee do now divide.

The CHAIRMAN: I think the amendment will now go to a vote without further discussion and there is no need, therefore, for such a motion.

Hon. J. M. MACFARLANE: Mr. Chairman—

Hon. J. Cornell: Mr. Macfarlane has the floor. The motion cannot be put now.

The CHAIRMAN: Mr. Miles really has the floor. I sat him down when he moved his motion.

Hon. G. W. MILES: I ask leave to withdraw the motion.

Motion, by leave, withdrawn.

Hon. J. M. MACFARLANE: Many side-issues have been imported into the discussion. I am just as anxious as is anyone to assist our men when they return from the front. If our tomato and potato industries had not been developed as they have been there would have been no argument over the matter. The development provides a future for some of our men now oversea in the trade they will be able to do with the Eastern States. I want to see that avenue kept open for returned soldiers. The Commonwealth Government brought foreigners into this country, and those people should be given a chance to earn a living. We cannot deny them the right to grow potatoes. If we maintain the tomato and potato industries, we shall provide a wider opportunity for work on the land for our own people when they come back to us. My intention is to vote against the amendment.

Hon. C. F. BAXTER: Every member of this Chamber is loyal to our soldiers, and will do whatever is possible to keep positions open for them. The amendment will be of no value as a means of restricting the operations of foreigners in the potato or tomato industries; rather will it drive the business into the hands of a few people. One or more of the countrymen of these foreigners will probably get a license, and will then make use of those who are not licensed in order to enrich themselves. That will not lessen the production of either potatoes or tomatoes. Foreigners are here and will remain here. The amendment would lead to the creation of a monopoly.

Hon. J. CORNELL: This is the first opportunity the Chamber has had since the declaration of war to exercise a vote that

will curtail the activities of aliens during the war.

Hon. J. J. Holmes: There is too much flag-waving.

Hon. J. CORNELL: Let us take advantage of this opportunity, if members think they should do so. If then the Government does not desire to proceed with the Bill, the measure can be dropped.

Hon. T. MOORE: The opportunity to which Mr. Cornell referred is hobbled at the outset. If it is desired to discuss the question as a whole it is open to Mr. Cornell to move accordingly so that we may then have a full debate. Do not let us have a position that is hamstrung. Let us deal with all industries. There are many reasons why some members will vote for this amendment, but on the question as a whole they may vote in a different direction. If this is the opportunity for a discussion on this matter, it is not the correct way for it to be brought before the Chamber. The opinion of members should be taken in another and more direct manner. It is wrong to stress the point as to what we ought to do for the men who are away. Every member will do his best for them. That is a red herring.

The HONORARY MINISTER: We have been three-and-a-quarter hours on this one question.

Hon. C. F. Baxter: And the potatoes are not cooked yet!

The HONORARY MINISTER: The object of the measure is to lay a foundation for the obtaining of statistical information. The Bill is brought forward by agreement with the Agricultural Departments and Ministers of each State. If we pass the Bill without this amendment, we can get the information. Every grower will have to register and the Government will be in a position to know exactly what is happening. We may do serious damage to friendly aliens.

Hon. J. Cornell: There are no friendly aliens!

The HONORARY MINISTER: There may be some Americans. Are they not friendly aliens?

Hon. J. Cornell: There are none there.

The HONORARY MINISTER: Yes, there are.

Hon. J. Cornell: You will be saying an Irish Free-Stater is a friendly alien.

The HONORARY MINISTER: The amendment is an admission that our men

have failed in competition with other men in the growing of potatoes. No Australian will admit he is inferior to any other worker in the potato, or any other industry. I ask the Committee to reject this amendment. It is the wrong time to debate it and to agree to the proposal would be unjust to many people.

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

Ayes	..	..	..	10
Noes	..	..	..	15

Majority against .. .. 5

## AYES.

Hon. J. Cornell	Hon. H. L. Roche
Hon. L. Craig	Hon. H. Seddon
Hon. W. R. Hall	Hon. A. Thomson
Hon. W. J. Mann	Hon. H. Tuckey
Hon. H. V. Piesse	Hon. E. H. H. Hall

(Teller.)

## NOES.

Hon. C. F. Baxter	Hon. W. H. Kitchin
Hon. Sir Hal Colebatch	Hon. J. M. Macfarlane
Hon. J. A. Dimmitt	Hon. G. W. Miles
Hon. J. M. Drew	Hon. T. Moore
Hon. E. H. Gray	Hon. F. R. Welsh
Hon. V. Hamersley	Hon. G. B. Wood
Hon. J. G. Hislop	Hon. L. B. Bolton
Hon. J. J. Holmes	

(Teller.)

Amendment thus negatived.

Clause put and passed.

Clause 4—Application of license fees:

Hon. H. V. PIESSE: I move an amendment—

That the following proviso be added to paragraph (i) of Subclause 2:—“Provided that the portion of the fund so expended shall not in any year exceed one-fifth of the total.”

No provision is made in similar legislation in the other States for the cost of implementing the scheme, as contained in this measure. I do not say it is the intention of the Government to take advantage of this clause because the Minister is a practical agriculturist and has indicated by his speeches that his object is to assist the industry. If, however, we permit the clause to remain in its present form the Government will have the right to use the whole of these collections for governmental purposes or departmental expenditure. I do not think the Government will object to the amendment. I have estimated that the income will be about £900. The amendment will permit nearly £200 of that amount to be expended. Resolutions have been passed by various associations in this State asking for this matter to be clarified.

Hon. J. J. Holmes: Will that provide expenses for delegates to conferences at Adelaide, Melbourne and Sydney?

Hon. H. V. PIESSE: The one-fifth is for the Government. The excess money could be spent as directed by the advisory committee.

Hon. W. J. MANN: I support the amendment. There is a feeling in the country that there should be some restriction. I have a letter from the Donnybrook Potato Growers' Association and the paragraph referring to this particular portion of the Bill says that that body feels that the measure, in its present form, is merely a means of providing revenue to administer the potato branch of the Department of Agriculture. The association is, of course, misinformed. That is not the Government's idea.

The HONORARY MINISTER: I must oppose the amendment. We do not know what the cost will be. Mr. Piesse should let people in the country know that no Government would dare to use that money except for its proper purpose. A new organisation is to be established, and the amount quoted by the hon. member may not be sufficient.

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

Ayes	..	..	..	17
Noes	..	..	..	8

Majority for .. .. 9

## AYES.

Hon. C. F. Baxter	Hon. W. J. Mann
Hon. L. B. Bolton	Hon. H. V. Piesse
Hon. Sir Hal Colebatch	Hon. H. L. Roche
Hon. J. A. Dimmitt	Hon. A. Thomson
Hon. E. H. H. Hall	Hon. H. Tuckey
Hon. V. Hamersley	Hon. F. R. Welsh
Hon. J. G. Hislop	Hon. G. B. Wood
Hon. J. J. Holmes	Hon. H. Seddon

(Teller.)

## NOES.

Hon. J. Cornell	Hon. W. H. Kitchin
Hon. J. M. Drew	Hon. G. W. Miles
Hon. E. H. Gray	Hon. T. Moore
Hon. W. R. Hall	Hon. L. Craig

(Teller.)

Amendment thus passed.

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

Clause, as amended, agreed to.

Clauses 5 to 8—agreed to.

New clause:

Hon. H. V. PIESSE: I move—

That the following be inserted to stand as Clause 5:—“At the expiration of twelve months from their appointment the two persons licensed under this Act so appointed by the Governor shall retire and their places shall be taken by two persons licensed under this Act (who may include either or both of the persons so retired), who shall be elected for such period as may be prescribed and be eligible for re-election thereafter.”

Interested associations desire the right to elect two growers whom they consider fit to represent them on the advisory committee. This is similar to the provision in the Dried Fruits Act.

The HONORARY MINISTER: The proposed new clause is not acceptable. This is not the time to make arrangements for an elective board. No provision is made in the Bill for marketing regulation, and when the measure has operated for 12 months, it will be time enough to consider the position.

Hon. L. CRAIG: Proposals of the kind indicated in the new clause do not work out in practice. Experience has shown that producers are keen to get boards appointed, but after a lapse of time the apathy is appalling; growers simply will not bother to vote. I fear that a large proportion of the first year's income will be absorbed in the expenses of the ballot. South-West Co-operative Dairy Farmers, Ltd., has a turnover of nearly £500,000 a year and yet it is difficult to get producers to vote for directors. When opportunity was given for the dairy industry to be represented on the Australian Dairy Council, circulars were sent out and everything required was done to secure a representative vote, but the result was a vote of less than 20 per cent. A large proportion of the potato growers are of alien birth and are not interested in the election of a board.

Hon. G. B. WOOD: I support the amendment. There are four producer representatives on the Dried Fruits Board and no apathy has been displayed there. The sooner the committee gets to work to educate the potato growers, the better it will be.

Hon. J. CORNELL: If the new clause is not passed, I shall endeavour to get the duration of the measure limited. Under the Bill anything could be done by the Government; the measure could continue indefinitely. The Dried Fruits Act has to come up for review periodically.

Hon. J. J. Holmes: Limit the Bill to two years.

Hon. J. CORNELL: I am prepared to move in that direction if the new clause is not accepted.

Hon. H. V. PIESSE: I am surprised at Mr. Craig's attitude. One association has written that though the committee would remain in office for 12 months while the in-

dustry was being organised, future committees should be elected by the growers. If the members of the first committee proved satisfactory they would be re-elected. This would give growers an opportunity to control their own industry. I take it the object of the Bill is to permit the growers to organise their industry and create a committee which will have nothing to do with the two men who are to advise the Minister on the spending of the money collected. The departmental officer will gain information and will be able to advise the committee to be appointed. This is the main point of the Bill. The growers should have the right to elect the two men to advise the Minister on the expenditure of the money.

New clause put and passed.

New clause:

Hon. H. V. PIESSE: I move—

That the following be inserted to stand as Clause 6:—“(1) The elections shall take place at the time and in a manner prescribed. (2) Every licensed grower of potatoes who is for the time being licensed and who is enrolled as an elector for the Legislative Assembly shall, at every election, be entitled to one vote for each candidate required to be elected.”

This clause is consequential upon the new clause that has just been agreed to, and will recommend itself to the Committee. It does not permit any person who is not naturalised to vote in any election for the committee.

New clause put and passed.

Title—agreed to.

Bill reported with amendments.

## **BILL—WORKERS' COMPENSATION ACT AMENDMENT.**

### *Assembly's Message.*

Message from the Assembly received and read notifying that it had agreed to amendments Nos. 2 to 13 and had agreed to amendment No. 1 subject to a further amendment.

## **BILL—INCREASE OF RENT (WAR RESTRICTIONS) ACT AMENDMENT.**

### *Assembly's Request for Conference.*

Message from the Assembly received and read requesting a conference on the Council's amendment and alternative amendment and notifying that at such conference the Assembly would be represented by three managers.

**BILL—PUBLIC TRUSTEE.***Assembly's Message.*

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

**BILL—LOTTERIES (CONTROL)  
ACT AMENDMENT.***Second Reading.*

Debate resumed from the 11th November.

**HON. SIR HAL COLEBATCH** (Metropolitan) [7.51]: I cannot welcome this Bill with any great enthusiasm. In fact, if the course of the debate should suggest any possibility of defeating it on the second reading I should be glad to vote against it. I do not propose to say a single word as to the moral aspect. Certain high ecclesiastical dignitaries have thrown the mantle of respectability over the State Lotteries, and I ask myself, who am I that I should join issue on a matter respecting which there are so much higher authorities than I can pretend to be? At the same time, I contend that this is a wasteful, extravagant method of raising money for public charities and that it is anti-social in all its implications.

For that reason I take a good deal of satisfaction—malicious satisfaction, perhaps, I may say—in noting the decreasing popularity of these lotteries. I hope that that is a reflection of public opinion and that the time will come when, as the returns grow smaller and the profits less, the Government will see the wisdom of dropping these continuance Bills. I take it that is the general attitude of members of this House; otherwise they would scarcely insist that this legislation should come up for review every 12 months. That in itself suggests to my mind that the majority of the members of this House are by no means satisfied that this is something which is so good that it should be embodied in our permanent legislation.

During the course of his speech in moving the second reading, the Chief Secretary has told us that the profit for the year amounted to £46,623, and that the expenses were £27,171, equal to more than 18 per cent. of the total moneys subscribed. Looking back a year or two, I find that in 1935 the profit amounted to £63,658, while

the expenses were only 15 per cent. of the total subscriptions. So it will be seen there has been a decrease of £17,000, a very large percentage decline in the profits, and an increase of more than 3 per cent. in the expenses. To my mind, 18 per cent. is an exceedingly high percentage of cost. The expenses totalled more than half the amount paid annually to the hospitals. I have looked over the accounts placed on the Table some little time ago and find that they tell a tale of steadily decreasing profits and, of course, of an increasing percentage of expenses.

I do not believe that one individual in a hundred puts his money into these lotteries in the belief that he is going to help charitable institutions. I say that for this reason: He must know that something less than one-third of his half-crown will go to charities and he must also have a lingering suspicion that even that one-third may be devoted to charities with which he has very little sympathy. It seems obvious to me that any person wishing to make a contribution to charity would do it direct, knowing that the whole of the money would go not only to charity, but to the particular charity that he wishes to support. It is safe to say that practically all the money subscribed is invested in the hope of winning prizes. The more investors in the lotteries come to realise that only part of their money is running for them, the less will be their inclination to continue to invest in so very unpromising an enterprise.

I should like to say a few words in regard to the largest sweep of this description that has ever been permitted in the British Empire, the Irish sweepstake. I do so because I want to indicate certain points in which that gigantic undertaking has many great advantages over our local lotteries, and also to suggest that in spite of those great advantages, its beneficent influence on the community is very much open to question. I took the opportunity of visiting Dublin during the drawing of one of the sweeps. I made exhaustive inquiries, the result of which I forwarded to the Government here. The first of those sweeps was on the November, 1930, Manchester Handicap; and, to the infinite surprise of the promoters, it brought in subscriptions to the extent of £870,000. The first prize was over £200,000. The second sweep, on the Grand National in

March, 1931, brought in over £2,250,000. The first prize was not less than £354,000. In succeeding sweeps the prize money was divided into units of £100,000, and there were from 18 to 28 first prizes of £30,000 in each sweep.

In the three sweeps conducted in 1932 the prize money alone exceeded £7,500,000, the total subscriptions being in the neighbourhood of £13,000,000. The expenses were on a colossal scale, and the expenses and the profits of the promoters—I understand the promoters were confined to two or three persons, one or two of them being London bookmakers—at the outset were as much as 15 per cent. Later on, the amount deducted for promoters' profits and expenses was reduced to 11 per cent.; and the promoters did, as a matter of fact, undertake to keep the profits and expenses down to 10 per cent. I am not suggesting that because out of 10 per cent. those promoters could spend money on the most colossal scale and also make such profits as to convert themselves into millionaires—which it did in a comparatively short period—that our lotteries here could be conducted on a 10 per cent. basis or even on very much less than the present cost, because it is obvious that it is the volume that tells the tale. When £2,500,000 to £3,250,000 is coming in for a sweep, 10 per cent. represents a very large sum indeed.

I have here the balance sheet for the Derby sweep of 1934. The total proceeds were £2,835,000. The prizes amounted to £1,802,000. Just over £500,000 was paid to hospital trustees, the Government collected £173,000 for stamp duty, and the expenses and promoters' profits amounted to £280,000. That was just one out of three sweeps conducted in a single year. Coming more directly to the hospitals' shares out of these sweeps, in three years from the inception of the enterprise, and covering nine sweeps, the grand total handed over to the hospital trustees was £5,321,000. From that point, for certain reasons to which I shall briefly refer, the receipts declined, but up to the outbreak of the war the hospitals' share had reached a total of over £10,000,000. I was informed on the highest authority that portion of that amount had been, shall we say, temporarily retained by the Government, doubtless on the principle that the Government's necessities were greater than those of the hospitals.

So far as the hospitals themselves were concerned, although colossal revenues of that kind had a tendency to excite extravagance, I do think that, generally speaking, the money was well spent. At any rate there can be no question that from being ill-developed, under-staffed and improperly built and equipped, the Irish hospitals did become extremely creditable institutions, probably amongst the best in the British Empire. From all this it might be concluded that there was a great deal to be said in favour of this method of raising money, but I would point out that the one strong element in the Irish sweepstake was that practically the whole of the money came from outside the country. In our case, practically the whole of the money has to come from our own people.

After a time, the British Parliament passed legislation prohibiting the sale of Irish sweepstake tickets in Great Britain. That legislation was, to my own personal knowledge, evaded to a very large extent, but it did have a general application and cut down enormously the amount of money going from England and Scotland to this Irish sweepstake, and the promoters then entered upon a campaign in the United States of America. That was attended with some success, but the volume of subscriptions continued to decline. I do not know what has happened in the last few months, but according to advices I think that all the glamour has gone out of the Irish sweepstakes. They had practically become a dominating factor in the life of the country. Not only did the hospitals rely on them almost entirely—I might say entirely—for their upkeep and improvements, not only did the Government look to these sweeps for an annual revenue of upwards of half a million pounds, but thousands of people also looked upon them as their permanent form of occupation, and I cannot help wondering what is going to be the position in that country now that all this easy money has suddenly ceased to come in; a very unhappy position, I should think.

I have said that the great merit of the Irish sweepstake was that practically all the money came from outside the country. The Lotteries Commission's reports tabled in connection with our recent sweeps referred to efforts being made to obtain subscriptions in other parts of Australia and apparently

those efforts have not been attended with any great success.

Hon. H. Seddon: A fair number of prizes go there.

Hon. Sir HAL COLEBATCH: That is what might be expected, and I do not know that that is of any great advantage to us. Each of the reports contains a reference of this kind, practically in these words—

Sales in the Eastern States were considerably below the quota required under the terms of the agreement with the supervising agents, but the Commission approved of the payment of all over-riding commission.

That is, the Commission agreed to go beyond its undertaking, and I dare say was quite wise in doing so, because otherwise the agents would probably have abandoned the business altogether. More recently a publicity campaign has been embarked on involving a visit to the Eastern States by the chairman of our Lotteries Commission. I suppose it is too early to come to any conclusion as to the result, though I am not at all sanguine that it will succeed because the lotteries will be coming into competition with others more closely situated to the prospective investors, and in some cases more generous in the amounts allotted by way of prize money. It is unreasonable to suppose that anybody in the Eastern States will take lottery tickets in the hope of benefiting any charitable institution in Western Australia. That means, I think, that we shall never get any money from outside the State; if we do, we shall have to pay for it. The expenses will be on such a scale that, even assuming they get only a fair share of the prize money, there will be no advantage to us in any money we get from the Eastern States.

I referred to opposition by other activities of the same type, and that reminds me of the question of opposition generally. The Government is usually very swift to take action in order to overcome opposition to any of its enterprises. In the realm of traffic we find regulations introduced and legislation sought to ensure to the Government advantages over private competitors, and they are competitors in a thoroughly legitimate business. But what about competition with the State lotteries? There is the competition from the starting-price bookmakers. The money comes from exactly the same class of people, those who want to get rich quickly. It may be fairly

said that the chances from investments made with the starting-price bookmaker are perhaps better than those associated with participation in the State lotteries.

I do not know that they are very good; I would not advise anybody to try to make a fortune from the starting-price bookmakers, but there it is, and since there is that competition for this same class of money, I suggest—though it may seem inconsistent to suggest anything that would help these lotteries, which I hope will fade away and die—that the Government might, as it easily could, secure the early passage of the Bill introduced by my friend, Mr. Cornell, and, fortified with the extra powers that measure will give it, stamp out starting-price bookmakers, if only in the hope that that might result in stopping the present decline so far as the State Lotteries are concerned. I am aware, of course, that it is possible the Government will say, "Already we get half as much money in fines imposed on starting-price bookmakers as that received by way of charity sweep profits for the hospitals, and the money we get from the starting-price bookmakers goes into our revenue whereas the profits from the lotteries go elsewhere."

Another suggestion I would like to make—and I hope it may be taken into account even long after State lotteries have ceased to exist—is this: So long as we have State lotteries, we should follow the example set in other parts of the world and in other States of the Commonwealth, and provide that the responsibility for distributing the money should not rest with those who are charged with the business of collecting it. To my mind, entirely different qualifications are required. I have not one word to say against the three members of the Lotteries Commission. I know them all; they are all men that I esteem very highly, and I have no doubt they are well qualified for the task of conducting these lotteries. But I do not think they have all of the qualifications required for those who have the responsibility of distributing the proceeds. Incidentally I am not satisfied that the Commission is acting wisely, or rightly, in guaranteeing a portion of the interest on the capital cost of the Perth Hospital. I doubt whether that is a proper subject for a charitable distribution from sources of this kind. I desire to refer to what the Lotteries (Control) Act of 1932 has to say

with regard to this matter of distribution. Section 4 sets out the powers of the Commission. It states—

The Commission shall have and exercise the following powers and duties:—

- (a) Subject to the obtaining of a permit in every case as hereinafter provided, to conduct lotteries in the whole or any part of the State in order to raise money for charitable purposes;
- (b) To receive and make recommendations to the Minister in regard to applications to conduct lotteries by persons desiring to conduct the same; and to exercise such supervision and control over the conduct of lotteries by such persons as may be prescribed;
- (c) To hire and dismiss servants subject to such regulations as may be from time to time prescribed.

Those are the whole of the powers set out in that section of the Act. Does it not strike members as curious that there is no reference there to any power or authority given to the Commission in regard to distribution of the profits? If we turn to Section 10, we find that paragraph (c) relates largely to amounts raised by other organisations. Paragraph (d), which is the only one that can be said to give any authority to the Commission to distribute the profits of the lotteries, reads—

- (d) In any case where the Commission conducts the lottery, if, after payment of the expenses of conducting the lottery, the total amount of money allocated under the terms of the lottery to the payment of expenses is not spent, the Commission shall pay any excess to a special bank account in its name. The Commission may apply such moneys from time to time, with the sanction of the Minister, to any charitable purpose.

That seems to my mind to refer to only a very small section of the profits. "The total amount of money allocated under the terms of the lottery to the payment of expenses," and not spent. I do not see how that can be regarded as giving the Commission authority to distribute the whole of the profits. What is the practice elsewhere?

In the case of Ireland there is a very powerful and thoroughly representative hospital committee, while the Hospital Commission appointed under the Hospitals Act of 1933, which is the authority for distributing the money, consists of six members, two of whom are medical practitioners of high

standing. In Queensland I understand the distributing authority is quite apart from the collecting body. In Victoria there is no lottery but there is a Charities Board which does the same sort of work in regard to the money falling into its hands. That board consisted at the time of its formation of 14 members. I believe the number has since been increased to 16. I have merely referred to it in order to indicate the representative character of the board and its suitability for such a job. The Victorian Act provides that—

The board shall consist of fourteen members appointed by the Governor-in-Council as follows:—

- (a) Four persons nominated by the body known as the Metropolitan Hospitals Association, one at least of whom shall be a legally qualified medical practitioner;
- (b) Four persons nominated by the body known as the Country Hospitals Association, one of whom at least shall be a legally qualified medical practitioner;
- (c) Two persons to be appointed from persons nominated by the committees of subsidised institutions and benevolent societies within the metropolis (other than hospitals), one at least of whom shall be a woman;
- (d) Two persons to be appointed from persons nominated by the committees of subsidised institutions and benevolent societies outside the metropolis (other than hospitals), one at least of whom shall be a woman; and
- (e) Two other persons, one of whom shall be appointed as a member of the Metropolitan Standing Committee and the other as a member of the Country Standing Committee hereinafter provided for.

I do not suggest that there is any necessity at this stage to have a body of 14 or 16 members as in Victoria, but I think that there should be a committee charged with the distribution of these funds, representative as indicated in the constitution of the Victorian body. It should be representative of the medical profession; it should be representative of the metropolitan and country hospitals; it should be representative of the charitable institutions in the country and in the city.

I have touched on these points chiefly in the hope that we may secure some useful expression of opinion from Dr. Hislop, my newly elected colleague for the Metropolitan Province. I should like to know whether he

considers the same body that raises the money should also distribute it. I appeal to him as one having some special knowledge concerning matters of this description to let the House know if he thinks the body charged with the distribution of these funds should comprise a certain proportion of medical practitioners. Does he think that such a body should be representative not only of city interests but of country interests as well? A board of the type I have indicated would not be expensive to maintain. I understand that the members of the Victorian board serve voluntarily, except that those country members who have occasion to journey to the city are granted travelling expenses.

Hon. C. F. Baxter: What is the position in New South Wales?

Hon. SIR HAL COLEBATCH: I do not know exactly what the position is in that State; I have not had an opportunity to look up those particulars. On the other hand, I have not yet found a single instance in which the distribution of such funds is in the hands of the collecting committee. The collecting body here is composed of men admirably suited for its particular task, but I suggest the members of it have no qualifications at all enabling them to distribute equitably funds to the whole of the hospitals and charitable institutions of this State.

The Chief Secretary: The members of the Lotteries Commission will be rather surprised to hear that.

Hon. SIR HAL COLEBATCH: Can anybody imagine a commission that includes no medical practitioner as being suitable for the distribution of funds amongst the hospitals of the State? Can any member imagine as suitable a body that includes no country representatives to assist in deciding whether money should be spent in the country areas or in the city?

I repeat that I have the greatest respect and esteem for the three gentlemen comprising the Lotteries Commission of Western Australia. I do not question their qualifications, but I claim that their qualifications do not embrace the desired capacity equitably to distribute funds to all the hospitals and all the charities. I have indicated what is the position in Victoria, and the characteristics of the legislation in that State are absent from the legislation in this State. I leave the matter at that, with a simple expression of hope that in the not

far distant future the public of Western Australia will come to realise first of all that the present system is a very expensive way of assisting our hospitals and, secondly, that it is a very stupid way of trying to make a fortune.

HON. J. G. HISLOP (Metropolitan) [8.20]: On this, the first occasion I have risen to address the House, may I thank you, Mr. President, for the manner in which you have welcomed me to this Chamber, and for the assistance you have given me. To the Chief Secretary I would express my thanks for his very kindly remarks about me when I took my seat in this House. I also express my thanks to my colleague, Sir Hal Colebatch, who has adopted a very friendly attitude towards me, and I certainly appreciate his friendliness, guidance and assistance. To members generally I would say that I believe them to be sincere in their manner of welcoming me, and I trust that I may be long amongst them to learn to live and conduct myself in the way my predecessors did. If you will permit me, Mr. President, I would like to pay a tribute to my immediate predecessor, the Hon. John Nicholson, and to my former colleague the late Hon. A. J. H. Saw, in whose footsteps I trust I shall follow closely.

In speaking on the second reading of the Bill, I apologise to the House should my remarks not be strictly in sequence because I still have some of those natural nervous characteristics usually apparent when one addresses this Chamber for the first time. I trust no one will read into any of my remarks a suggestion of personalities. I do not intend in any way to attack the members of the Lotteries Commission, all of whom I hold in the highest respect. Rather would I say that the community should thank the members of the Commission for the sterling services they have rendered. Neither do I wish to criticise the policy of the Government when I refer to that phase because the one policy has been pursued ever since I first knew Western Australia.

Here I would affirm that I find it extremely difficult to vote for the second reading of the Bill in its present form because I do not believe that the organisation that collects the money must necessarily be the organisation to distribute the funds so secured. Much as one might feel that the collection of such money represents a skilled

task, I do believe that the distribution of such moneys calls for an even wider degree of skill and of investigation of problems and that it involves an issue of much wider State concern. I believe that a separate body comparable with that operating in Victoria should be inaugurated in this State. New South Wales, with one or two minor differences, adopted almost in its entirety the Act passed in Victoria. The legislation was first introduced in the latter State in 1922, when a board was constituted in the manner Sir Hal Colebatch has already indicated. I will again briefly refer to that phase. The members of the Victorian board give their services in **an honorary capacity** and receive no fees whatever, apart from travelling expenses. On the other hand in New South Wales, whilst the Victorian legislation was copied almost in its entirety, a commission was set up consisting, I think, of five members who are paid for their services.

Let me briefly refer once more to the manner in which the Charities Board of Victoria is constituted. There are four members appointed from persons nominated by the Metropolitan Hospitals Association. Members will realise that that body can nominate persons for appointment but they are actually appointed by the Government. It is not necessary for organisations to appoint their own members, to which phase I shall allude later on. The Victorian Act provides further that four persons shall be appointed from those nominated by the Country Hospitals Association; two from persons nominated by committees of subsidised institutions in the metropolitan area; two from persons nominated by the committees of subsidised institutions outside the metropolitan area; two persons from those nominated by unsubsidised institutions; and two persons to be appointed as the Government's representatives.

Hon. T. Moore: That is 16 in all.

Hon. J. G. HISLOP: Yes, making 16 members all told. I do not suggest for one moment that if such a board were appointed in this State, that number of members would be necessary. I consider that half that number would be sufficient and that they should be appointed in a similar manner to those mentioned in the Victorian legislation. Of those nominated to represent metropolitan and

country hospitals associations, there should be medical practitioners on the basis of one to every four appointed to represent those groups. Of those nominated, and appointed, to represent subsidised institutions, one of each group should be a woman. I think that such grouping should be dealt with as I suggest respecting any committee that might be appointed in this State.

Perhaps I should outline to the House some of the chief duties, powers and policy of the Charities Board of Victoria. The Act sets out that it shall be the duty of the board to make inquiries and report to the Minister regarding what charitable relief is required to meet the needs of the diseased, infirm, incurable, poor or destitute persons resident in Victoria including children and convalescent patients; what institutions or benevolent societies should be subsidised; what sum of money should be allocated to such institutions and, finally, to recommend any amendments necessary in connection with existing legislation to ensure the efficient carrying out of the provisions of the Act.

I would point out that no such complete schedule covering the requirements of our charities is prepared in this State. Rather have we reached the position that the Minister has to decide how much he can afford to allocate to hospitals and to charities. Naturally those bodies must accept what they are given and find the remainder for their respective needs. They must get that extra money where they can and when they can—without any control of their appeals to the public. I maintain that the method adopted in Victoria whereby the Charities Board places before the Minister the requirements of the State represents a much more comprehensive procedure than is possible regarding the hospitals and charities of this State. Such a method of placing before the responsible authorities the needs of institutions removes from those concerned the feeling that they must make as good a story as possible in order to obtain the funds required. The board may go a long way further; it may recommend that an institution be closed, that two or more institutions be amalgamated or that one be used for some purpose other than that which it is carrying out. All these functions are laid down, carefully and clearly, in the Act. In order to show how complete the measure is,

let me quote from the Victorian Hospitals and Charities Act—

The board in the exercise of the powers conferred upon it shall not make a recommendation that a subsidised institution be closed unless the board has made careful inquiry into the matter and has heard the committee of managers of every institution or benevolent society to be affected by its recommendation, or given them an opportunity to be heard, and the recommendation is carried at a meeting of the board by an absolute majority of the whole of the members of the board.

The board controls also the opening of new institutions and establishing of new societies, and cancels the registration of each organisation that fails to exist or to carry out its functions. The Act further decrees—

There shall be established and kept in the Treasury a fund to be called the "Hospitals and Charities Fund." There shall be paid into that fund all moneys appropriated by Parliament for the purpose and all other moneys paid to the fund by this or any other Act. Out of the fund shall be paid the salary of the chief inspector or secretary, who shall be the chief executive officer, the salaries of his staff, all other expenses incurred in the carrying out of this Act, and all moneys allocated to hospitals and charitable bodies within the State.

Regulations are laid down as to the allocation of these moneys, and one important feature is that the board shall require from every subsidised institution a proper keeping of accounts in the manner and in the form prescribed. I may say that I have here had personal knowledge of lack of a proper costing system in at least one of our institutions.

So much for a brief resumé of the powers of the board under the Victorian Act. The board controls policy relating to hospitals and other charitable institutions throughout the State. Later I shall refer to our lack of policy. The Lotteries Commission itself appears to be aware of some necessity for reviewing the needs and the expenditure of our institutions; but the board has neither the authority, I maintain, nor the necessary experience to do so. I shall not enter into any details this evening, but merely desire, if I can, to lay down the broad policy of how the distribution of our money should be cared for in this State. I go on to exemplify the work of a body such as I consider to be necessary. The Charities Board of Victoria controls all building works at hospitals and charitable institutions. It both governs the broad policy of development of

those hospitals and institutions and indulges in expert and close scrutiny of the smallest details of the maintenance and functioning of each hospital or institution.

Let me give one or two examples of how the State of Victoria has benefited by the policy which has been adopted by its Charities Board and let me compare the corresponding conditions in our own State. Victoria has been zoned into ten base hospital districts, each surrounded by district hospitals. Then, each of these base hospitals is fully equipped and, for investigational purposes, serves the needs of the district hospitals surrounding it. This is in direct contradistinction to our own policy.

I could go on for a long time discussing the policy that has been adopted regarding our country hospitals, but let me just point out that the granting of assistance towards the purchasing of a small X-ray plant for every minor country hospital has proved a failure and a danger. I shall not take up the time of the House by detailing either the dangers or the abuses that have followed this placing in small district hospitals of X-ray plants of that nature. It would be far better to have in a base hospital an X-ray plant costing more like £3,000 than £300 and capable of doing the work required. It is extremely difficult to ask a plant that is incapable of doing the work to be other than a danger when it cannot produce satisfactory films and then those films are read by a member of my profession not skilled in radiology.

I would not stop at this. If an X-ray equipment is necessary in those base hospitals, then pathological and physiological investigation is also necessary. Blood counts and other forms of pathological examination are just as urgently and frequently required as an X-ray examination, though I admit that they have not the dramatic appeal, nor the remnants of witchcraft, which the X-ray possesses.

The Victorian Charities Board has also built up in suburban districts clinics which take over the duty, to a certain extent, that is now discharged by the out-patient departments of public hospitals. Today in our city the out-patient department is a considerable source of worry and anxiety. Despite the number of men who have enlisted, the attendance has hardly lessened, while the number of honorary doctors has

diminished considerably. Had we had such a policy of clinics in suburbs on which we could have fallen back, we would not today be in nearly the same difficulty. It really means that the general practitioner looks after the indigent of his suburb. Some of these cases are attended to by visiting specialists, and they are only sent to the public hospitals for such investigations as cannot be carried out at the clinics. As our city grows, some such method of dealing with out-patients will become just as necessary here as it has been found to be in Melbourne.

The board has arranged also for an extension of convalescent homes to improve the turnover of city public hospitals and accommodation for aged and infirm, with infirmary wards for chronic cases. This is an aspect of our hospital life that is always a source of worry. Convalescent beds are verily like lumps of gold. In the Perth Hospital I have known a patient occupy a bed for weeks waiting for a convalescent bed. The present wording of our Health Act makes the private convalescent home virtually an impossibility. For the provision of further convalescent beds in this city a re-drafting of the legislative provisions concerning private convalescent homes is also an urgent necessity.

In regard to beds for the aged and infirm, the same thing applies. It takes on an average weeks to transfer a patient from the Perth Hospital to the Home of Peace, and I have known the time approach more nearly to months. The Old Men's Home has not sufficient ward accommodation. It may surprise hon. members to learn that when doing my round one day last week at the Perth Hospital in Ward No. 2, I found that on one side of the ward, with the exception of one bed which was occupied by a young man, the beds were filled with men over 70 years of age. Now, I do not mean to infer for one moment that the man over 70 years of age should not have the best of medical treatment. He should. But when all he requires is rest in bed, with possibly a visit once a week from a medical attendant, a bed in the Perth Hospital, an institution equipped with nurses' training school, resident medical officers, medical registrars, and medical superintendent and honorary staff, is a most expensive means of providing the necessary rest. Neither is it very good for

nurses to do part of their training in a ward where half the patients require very little medical attention.

The Victorian board has also developed a policy of modernisation of country hospitals to community hospitals, with special provision for maternity beds. Most of our country hospitals are in urgent need of modernisation. I venture to say that with the exception of possibly half a dozen, all of them would need demolishing were modernisation demanded. The only course that has been adopted regarding country hospitals in the silencing of the clamour of the residents has been to give them something, or add on a portion to a building that was never really planned. It is the duty of some body—I mean some body of men or a board—to take a broad view of the needs of our country hospitals and work to that plan, and when the needs of the community, or the district, grow, to forward that plan another step.

Looking at the Victorian board from another angle, it has survived all the early opposition to it. When it was inaugurated, the statement was made that it would never be a board worth anything. Today it is a world-renowned authority on hospital administration and maintenance. It must have proved itself to be of great worth when, after five or six years, New South Wales adopted the Victorian Act almost in its entirety. The members of this board are men of the highest standing in the State. As I mentioned previously, it is not necessary for an organisation to appoint its own representatives to that board, or rather its own members. It can ask any man of standing or repute in the community to nominate for appointment by Cabinet to watch its interests on that board.

As far as I can gather the cost of the board has never exceeded  $\frac{1}{2}$  per cent. of the money it has allocated annually; surely a very cheap way of guarding money and carrying out the investigations it has done. In the last few years it funded £3,000,000 towards the building of new hospitals in Victoria. During my recent visit to the Eastern States, when I saw almost every hospital in Melbourne and Sydney now in the course of erection, I found the hand of the board everywhere in designing and in layout, even to such things as the interior illumination of the hospital, and details of that description. No matter what part of

the hospital I investigated, I found the advice of the board had been requested. Details had been worked out, the final plans and decisions arrived at and accepted by the committee of the hospital in question.

During the days of the planning of our own hospital, when our building committee felt it needed more assistance, to whom did it turn? To the Charities Board of Victoria and through the good graces of the Premier of this State and the Premier of Victoria, we were granted the services of Mr. McVilly, the chief executive officer of the Victorian Charities Board. He rendered to us services of no mean order and gave us advice which has meant that our hospital will bear comparison with any modern hospital in Australia. We shall not be one whit behind any other.

As I draw to a conclusion, let me point out that Sir Hal Colebatch read the details of the distribution of the money in this State under the Lotteries Control Act. I have indicated the distribution of the money under the Victorian Act. It now covers more than 36 pages; ours but two small portions. I estimate that if the money from this State were placed in a fund controlled under an Act similar to that enacted in Victoria a board such as I suggest would have charge of an expenditure of between £200,000 and £300,000 annually. That is a conservative estimate. Our method of distribution, looked at in the light of this Victorian Act, must make us all stand aghast. At the moment it is a question purely of the Lotteries Commission deciding, when asked for assistance, whether it can afford to give it. Its method of distribution reminds me, to a large extent, of how I deal personally with begging letters. Either I give, knowing that I will be asked to give more later, or else I give forgetting what the morning mail may bring.

I know by hearsay, which I am convinced is reliable, that one institution was granted a large sum of money by the Lotteries Commission on the ground that it would not appeal again for two years. That is not organisation, but far from it. I know of an institution that does not receive an annual grant from the Lotteries Commission. It has 109 quarter-caste children—the result of white man's depravity. It does not get an annual grant possibly because it does not ask. I admit that the Lotteries Commission

did assist it some years ago by building a cottage so that more children could be accommodated, and it did give a secondhand refrigerator, but I ask members: Have they seen where those courageous women work? Have they seen the three small wood-stoves on which they cook for 120 persons? Have they seen the room 4 ft. by 4 ft. in which the milk is kept and in which the flies take complete control because the wire-netting on the doors has rotted away? Were I able to do so I would seek an adjournment and take every member to see the magnificent work done by these women in their fight against poverty and want of efficient gear. They do not ask for anything. I would take members at the same time to see the happy smiling children.

Are members aware that, until recently, if they desired to admit into this institution a child not sent by the State, in order to obtain the necessary mattress a handful of kapok would be taken from each mattress to make one up for the new child? But friends have stopped this practice. Do members realise that these noble women appreciate the present of a bed more than anything else because it means they can take in another child? Do members realise that they believe there are still between 300 and 400 quarter-caste children in aboriginal camps in this State, whom they desire to take into the home? Do members realise that one woman, 80 years of age—Sister Kate—is in charge of that home, and that in her possession is a box of letters sent to her from boys at the front? Admittedly these boys are from her Parker-ville days, and all these letters start, "Dear Mum"—the only mother they have known! Ought we to ask such an institution to request monetary assistance, or should we not rather devise some method whereby its needs would be safeguarded?

I have only touched on one institution. There are others equally deserving that do receive assistance. Do they receive adequate assistance? If we have to pay more let us know, and I am certain the State will stand behind us. I have, Mr. President, finished, but my hands are tied. This is a continuance Bill to which I cannot move an amendment. I cannot, as a private member, introduce a Bill to create such a board as I envisage because it would entail the use of public moneys and the appointment of sal-

aried officials. Were I to ask for the defeat of the second reading of this Bill I would be producing chaos amongst those whose needs are great. I leave my dilemma in your hands, Mr. President, and in the hands of every hon. member. I ask the Government to do what it can in assisting towards the introduction of legislation to deal with this matter.

**HON. L. B. BOLTON** (Metropolitan) [8.57]: It was not my intention to address the House on this Bill this evening, but I feel I would be lacking in my duty as a colleague of the last speaker, Dr. Hislop, if I did not take this opportunity, together with Sir Hal Colebatch, to tender to him not only the appreciation of every member of this Chamber, but also their thanks for his excellent and informative maiden speech. It seems only fitting that Dr. Hislop should have, as his first subject, something very near and dear to him—charity.

Those of us who have known our new member for a number of years are aware of what he has done in the charitable world of the City of Perth. We, in this Chamber, can look forward to his help and guidance in the future. The House has been very fortunate in having, in addition to the speech of the hon. member, such an excellent address from my other colleague. Though I may lack the eloquence of Sir Hal, and the knowledge of Dr. Hislop, I should at least be given credit for the sincere appreciation I offer to our new member.

In speaking briefly to the measure before the House, I intend to support the second reading, because I feel it is my duty so to do. I am not in any way antagonistic to the members of the Lotteries Commission; neither do I desire to criticise them in any way. It is the policy about which I am concerned. I agree with Dr. Hislop that it is wrong for the body responsible for the collection of the funds to have the allocation of them. I support his suggestion to the Government that consideration be given to the practice in Victoria. Members will agree that some of the information given by Dr. Hislop was surprising indeed, and those who have been associated with the work of hospitals or charitable institutions in this State will appreciate what he has told us. My association with the Fremantle Hospital certainly enabled me to appreciate

many of the aspects that have been pointed out tonight. Particularly does this apply to the remarks about the equipment in various country hospitals.

I for one would not deprive any country hospital of the right to get the requisite equipment, but I support Dr. Hislop in his contention that it would be better to have superior equipment in one area. I frequently visit country hospitals, and one certainly cannot blame them for exerting every effort to get all the equipment they can. I think it will be realised, however, that this policy is not the right one; definitely it is not the one that will give the greatest satisfaction. There is nothing in the Bill that calls for criticism, but I hope serious consideration will be given to the remarks that have been made tonight with a view to the suggestions being embodied in the Bill that will be brought before us next year.

**HON. H. TUCKEY** (South-West) [9.3]: I congratulate Dr. Hislop on his very informative speech. As one who has had some experience of hospital boards, I certainly was surprised to hear some of his statements. For instance, he considered it wrong to introduce X-ray plant into country districts. In the past we have been led to believe that the opposite was the case, that such plant would be of very great service and would spare patients the necessity of being sent all the way to Perth for treatment. We understood that the plant would enable doctors in the country to locate broken bones and other troubles.

Hon. J. Cornell: Therein lies the danger.

Hon. H. TUCKEY: Such equipment is not placed in country hospitals thoughtlessly. It is generally installed on the recommendation of the doctor, and one would hardly expect a medical practitioner to advocate the installation of an X-ray plant if he was not capable of operating it.

The Honorary Minister: Doctors, like lawyers, change their views.

Hon. H. TUCKEY: I think it would be a distinct disadvantage to people in the country if anyone suffering from a broken limb or requiring other X-ray treatment had to be sent to Perth. As regards the building of hospitals, I agree that a wrong policy has been adopted. In some country centres additions have been made to existing hospitals, and in one case where I have been trying to

get something done on a comprehensive basis, the cost of additions has been two or three times as much as would have been the cost of providing a more up-to-date building. However, money controls the whole situation. If something along the lines of the Victorian Act would enable us to raise the requisite money, no doubt we should be able to accomplish just as much as Victoria has done.

We in Western Australia have derived very great benefit from the allocations of the Lotteries Commission. As a matter of fact, I do not know what some of the small country districts would have done without that help. The South-West Province has certainly been treated very fairly in the distribution of the money. Of course, all our requests have not been acceded to, but we have done very well, and I do not know how we would have managed without the help of that money. If the Government introduced a measure on the lines of the Victorian Act, I think it would receive the support of Parliament, but I repeat that finance governs the situation. In existing circumstances we have much to be thankful for, especially the help we have received from the Lotteries Commission. I support the second reading, and I hope that next year the Government will tell us whether it is possible to adopt a hospital policy similar to that of Victoria.

**HON. A. THOMSON** (South-East) [9.7]: I should like to indicate to one or two members why a continuance measure is presented to Parliament annually. On several occasions the Government has proposed a continuance of the Act for more than 12 months, and has even asked Parliament to make the Act permanent, but Parliament has invariably insisted upon a continuance for one year only in order that it might have an opportunity to discuss the administration of the Lotteries Commission and to retain control. I was a member of another place when this legislation was originally introduced and I offer no apology for having supported it. At that time, large sums of money were being sent to the Eastern States in support of the lotteries conducted there. As a matter of fact, much money is still being sent to the Eastern States for the same purpose. Queensland set an excellent example of the way to conduct lotteries for the benefit of hospitals. There

is no doubt that the Queensland system has proved effective and has resulted in material help being given to hospitals in that State.

That also has been the experience in this State. Sir Hal Colebatch, in the course of an excellent speech, inferred that we would get just as much money from the people if they were approached for contributions. Experience has proved quite definitely that that is not correct. Members should cast their minds back to the time when lotteries were introduced in New South Wales, and the then Premier, Mr. Lang, acceded to the request of a deputation who guaranteed to raise all the money required in a voluntary way. Mr. Lang gave the deputation 12 months, but it fell down on the job very badly. The country hospitals have benefited greatly from the help of the lotteries.

**Hon. J. Cornell:** We tax up to the hilt to win the war. Why do not we tax in the interests of the public generally?

**Hon. A. THOMSON:** That sounds logical, but those who pay the bulk of the taxation would have to find the money for the hospitals, whereas a large number of people who are practically free from taxation support the lotteries.

**Hon. J. Cornell:** Who pays the hospital tax?

**Hon. A. THOMSON:** I do not think that 90 per cent. of those people who take tickets in lotteries, including Tattersall's, have any desire to support the hospitals or the charities that benefit. They buy tickets in the pious hope that they will be successful in winning prizes.

That we are being taxed up to the hilt to win the war was suggested by Mr. Cornell. If the Government introduced a tax Bill providing for an additional £40,000 or £50,000 purely to benefit hospitals, I am afraid it would not be too popular. If we so desire, we have power to scrap the lotteries in this State, but to do so would be of no benefit to the State. We would not reduce the volume of gambling, and the money now being contributed to our lotteries would be sent to similar consultations in the Eastern States. It would be interesting to ascertain the amount of money still being sent to Eastern States lotteries. If the whole of that money could be diverted to our own lotteries, instead of the total being £40,000, it would probably be nearer £100,000.

Hon. J. Cornell: It cuts both ways; tickets in our lotteries are sold in the Eastern States.

Hon. A. THOMSON: But not in the same proportion. When this legislation was originally introduced, the idea was to retain some of that money in the State, and we have been successful in doing that. I do not know whether the board suggested by Dr. Hislop would be an improvement on the Lotteries Commission, but I can say that when a case is put up to the Commission, it receives a sympathetic hearing. The hospital with which I have been associated received no payment from the Commission unless it first submitted its balance sheet and showed how the money was to be expended. Further, the members of the Commission have visited the hospital to make sure that value was obtained for the money donated to it. While the expenses incurred by the Commission may seem to be a little on the high side, I am rather in sympathy with other members who have said, by way of interjection, that 10 per cent. was an unduly high rate to pay for selling tickets. That rate might possibly be reduced somewhat. There is, however, no question as to the benefits received by country hospitals from the Commission, and I speak as one representing a country district.

As far as X-ray plants are concerned, speaking from memory, I think it was the intention and the hope of the Government some years ago to establish base hospitals, on the lines suggested by Dr. Hislop. That idea did not altogether meet with the approval of country people, for the reason that a base hospital would be established in the larger towns, and the people living 40 or 50 miles away felt they also were entitled to hospital accommodation. When we return to normal conditions and more doctors are available, I hope that all country people will be able to receive adequate hospital accommodation. After all, they are entitled to it. I am not suggesting for a moment that Dr. Hislop has any desire to take away the privileges the country people now enjoy; but I point out that the smaller hospitals certainly have proved of great benefit to country residents. When the small X-ray plants were first introduced, the object was—as pointed out by Mr. Tuckey—that they should be used to assist the doctor in diagnosing fractures, etc. I hope the day

will soon come when effect will be given to Dr. Hislop's suggestions.

I would very much like country residents to have the same facilities for hospital treatment as are enjoyed by residents of the metropolitan area. I take this opportunity of saying that no Minister for Health in this State was more sincere in his desire to extend hospital facilities to country districts than was the late Mr. Munsie.

Hon. J. Cornell: The reverse is the case today. The Government is cutting down country hospitals wherever it can.

Hon. A. THOMSON: We admit that. It is unfortunately owing to the scarcity of doctors.

Hon. J. Cornell: No, to the desire to save money.

Hon. A. THOMSON: I am glad of Mr. Cornell's interjection, because it reminds me of another factor. If people expect a doctor to remain in their district, a hospital must be provided in which his patients can be treated. While the Lotteries Commission may not have lived up to all that has been expected of it, I do not think that is the fault of the members of that body. They, in my opinion, have honestly done their best. Sir Hal Colebatch remarked upon the fact that the income of the Commission is declining. That may be so, but I feel sure that an examination of the accounts of the lotteries in the other States would probably also disclose reduced incomes. It must be borne in mind that many of our young men have gone oversea. They were probably optimists and hoped one day to strike a patch. I have been an optimist, having subscribed to every lottery, yet I never struck a patch. I say quite openly and frankly that I did not invest for the sake of charity, but in the hope of winning the first prize. I have much pleasure in supporting the second reading of the Bill, which, after all, is merely a continuance measure. The Commission has proved of inestimable value to residents of country districts.

**HON. E. H. H. HALL** (Central) [9.22]: I rise again to stress the opinions that I have expressed every time a Bill for the continuance of this Act has come before this Chamber. I do not want to be misunderstood. I have no fault to find with the gentlemen now acting as the Lotteries Commissioners. Mr. Thomson was at some pains to point out that he thought they had done

a very good job, but do any of us think otherwise? Why should not they do a good job? That is a pertinent question. The fact that the Commissioners are paid for their services is no reason why they should not do a good job. Apart from that, in my opinion they would have done quite as good a job had they been acting in an honorary capacity. My point is that I consider men could have been secured to act on the Commission in an honorary capacity who would have carried out the duties just as satisfactorily as have the present members. I repeat, that is my point, and I am not alone in that view today. I am very often alone. I admit on this occasion that I think some other members perhaps agree with me.

I would like to express the pleasure I had in listening to the speech of Dr. Hislop. I have been the secretary of a hospital committee for many years. His remarks about the purchase of X-ray plants were only too true as far as Geraldton, anyhow, is concerned. Two country residents—primary producers—who have gone to their long rest left a fine bequest to the Geraldton Government Hospital. That hospital is not controlled by a committee, but by the State; nevertheless, the money was left to it by those two men. A doctor who was leaving the district offered his X-ray plant to the hospital committee for £300. This happened many years ago. The committee asked the then Government if it would go fifty-fifty in the purchase of the plant. Eventually the Government agreed; £150 was paid out of the bequest, the Government paid £150, and the plant was purchased. Perhaps I had better not say anything further about it.

Hon. L. Craig: Yes. Go on with the story. You have whetted our appetite.

Hon. E. H. H. HALL: Well, we had three doctors, all of whom had a go at that plant. I do not know whether any man would be disposed to allow three other persons to have a go at his motor car. I know nothing about X-ray plants, but I ask members whether they think good results could be obtained from such a plant by three doctors, all taking snapshots of poor unfortunate victims. It was not satisfactory, but we were not deterred.

Being anxious to do the best we could for the unfortunates in that district, and being advised by the Medical Department that a very fine X-ray plant could be purchased

for £750, we put the matter up to the Government again. The Government shared in the expense equally with the committee and we bought the plant. What happened then? A certain institution built and equipped an extremely fine hospital in the district. The hospital contained an expensive X-ray plant. What is more to the point—it had an expert radiologist, who did most of that work. Now our plant is lying practically idle. I ask members to put this to themselves: The medical men send their patients to the other hospital where there is this fine plant and an expert radiologist. I therefore think that Dr. Hislop has made his point. I know how strenuously the hospitals in our smaller centres would fight any suggestion that they were not entitled to have an X-ray plant. We all know how strenuous, earnest and enthusiastic are the people in these small country centres for their local hospitals.

Hon. A. Thomson: They have to find half the cost of them.

Hon. E. H. H. HALL: That point has been thrashed out often in this Chamber, and I do not want to touch on it tonight. The fact remains that Dr. Hislop has made suggestions which, for the future good of this State, should be acted upon as early as possible. Mr. Tuckey asked what the people in country districts would have done had it not been for the Lotteries Commission. I would inform the hon. member what I think could easily have been done. We could have indulged in a little more self-help. It was the Mitchell-Latham Government that introduced the hospital tax. Mr. Munsie, who was looked upon as one of our best Ministers of Health, opposed that tax, and so did the members of his party, as they considered it to be against their principles. They remained to—

Hon. A. Thomson: Bless it.

Hon. E. H. H. HALL: Yes.

Hon. J. Cornell: They came to curse, but remained to pray.

Hon. E. H. H. HALL: I have consulted people in a position to know and they inform me that the hospital tax has done more for the equipment of country hospitals than has the Lotteries Commission. Few of us seem to realise how much is collected by way of hospital tax; I think it amounts to £250,000 per annum, at a rate of 1½d. in the pound. Many working men are inquiring why the Government does

not go the whole distance and strike a tax that would give us free hospital accommodation. I do not believe in comparing the Commonwealth with a State, yet we do not have to go outside Australia to find an example. In the little State of Tasmania the people are provided with free hospital accommodation, including maternity services. If that can be done in a hard-up State like Tasmania, it is time we made an effort to bring about a similar result in this State.

I am not in agreement with the remarks of Sir Hal Colebatch regarding this continuance measure. While the Lotteries Commission serves a most useful purpose, while it has been a very present help in the time of trouble to country hospitals and other charitable institutions, that does not alter the fact that the principle is wrong. I again refer to Mr. Cornell's interjection, when he said that if it is good enough for us to be taxed for war, we should be taxed to provide for our sick people. I support the second reading, but repeat that it is time the money spent on the lotteries should be applied wholly to charitable purposes, for which it is raised. An effort should also be made to get public-spirited men and women to act on the Commission in an honorary capacity.

**HON. G. B. WOOD** (East) [9.30]: I intend to support the second reading, but I am disappointed that I am not in a position to support a continuance of the Commission for three or four years. We have a debate like this year after year but nothing is ever done to alter the constitution of the Commission. We all eulogise the Commission and its good work, but I am disappointed that the situation remains unaltered. I know the Government received a set-back last year in the defeat of its proposal to extend the term to three years. Like Mr. Tuckey, I often wonder where we in the country would be but for the sympathetic treatment we receive from the Commission. I will quote one instance. For ten years at York we wanted a maternity hospital. There was considerable argument about the best way to raise the money, but it has been procured without any effort at all. It is one of the easiest pieces of financing with which I have ever been connected. First of all we received a promise from the Medical Department that it would

subscribe on a pound for pound basis. That provided £1,000. The Lotteries Commission found £1,500, the road board found £500 out of its revenue and the municipal council contributed a similar amount from its revenue. So we have a £3,500 maternity hospital in York today. When that sort of thing happens, how can one say anything against the Lotteries Commission? I support the second reading.

**HON. H. V. PIESSE** (South-East) [9.33]: I support the second reading. I would not have spoken, but as Mr. Wood has provided an example I can perhaps go a little better. The Katanning Hospital is a building worth from £10,000 to £12,000. Through our road board we taxed the people of the district and the Government found half the cost. It was not a question of asking the Lotteries Commission.

Hon. A. Thomson: It was not in existence!

Hon. H. V. PIESSE: That is so. Had the Commission been in existence we would have asked it for help. There is no doubt that the people who have to pay what they do for hospital attention, deserve all the Commission gives them. But we appreciate the fact that the Commission does visit the hospitals and though the members may not be altogether experts in their job, they take the advice of our medical men in the country and we have had excellent gifts from them. Admittedly for every gift, we have found an equivalent amount of money, if not more, and have contributed in the rebuilding of the nurses' quarters and in providing other adjuncts to our hospital at Katanning. I have pleasure in supporting the second reading.

**HON. F. R. WELSH** (North) [9.34]: I desire to say a few words in connection with this matter. The Lotteries Commission, constituted as it is, is doing a very good job. I think most if not all of the hospitals on the North-West coast were equipped by the Commission. I have approached the members of that body on many occasions and have found that wherever a local effort has been made and a good case submitted they have not hesitated to meet the requests for assistance. Most of the hospitals have been equipped with X-ray plants. It is 1,000 miles from here to the North-West and it is not possible for people to get

down for X-ray examinations and consequently the doctors advised the installation of X-ray equipment which the Commission had no hesitation in supplying where a local effort was made. I would like to congratulate Dr. Hislop on his very informative address and I hope with him that at some future time the Government will see fit to meet some of his wishes in regard to the allocation of the funds. I support the second reading of the Bill.

On motion by Hon. H. Seddon, debate adjourned.

## **BILL—LAND DRAINAGE ACT AMENDMENT.**

### *Second Reading.*

Debate resumed from the 12th November.

**HON. L. CRAIG** (South-West) [9.36]: This is a Bill which one unfortunately must support.

Hon. A. Thomson: Why unfortunately?

Hon. L. CRAIG: We have had very unfortunate results from the operations of drainage works.

Hon. G. Fraser: A lot of money has been spent in the country.

Hon. L. CRAIG: And a tremendous lot of rates have had to be paid, too. The Bill seeks to establish that there shall be no doubt that the Government has power to construct and control works within any area declared to be a drainage district. It is conceivable that a farmer who is opposed to works being constructed on his property under the present Act might be able for a considerable time to retard necessary works, that is, works that are necessary for the district as a whole. The Bill will establish the right of the Government to construct and maintain drainage works within any area declared a drainage district. That is necessary. If we are to agree to a drainage scheme, there must be a drainage authority with full power.

The Bill also provides that minor works—and this is where I think we may need to make some amendments—may be constructed within the area without complying with the conditions laid down by the present Act. At present if it is desired to construct works through a man's property certain conditions must be complied with. There must be advertising and other action occupying about two months. The Bill provides that

minor works may be constructed without the necessary notices being given and without compliance with certain conditions. The question I ask is: What is a "minor work?" The Bill does not say. I am not sure that we should not define a "minor work."

Hon. A. Thomson: It is dangerous unless we do.

Hon. L. CRAIG: Yes. I have given considerable attention to this matter and find that it is very hard to define a "minor work." A drain through a large property might be a mile long and a foot deep. Would that be a minor or a major work? I think that it would be a major work because of its being a mile long.

Hon. W. J. Mann: Major works are big channels.

Hon. L. CRAIG: It all depends. In some cases it may be a major work but the same drain going through a 10-acre block would certainly be a minor work. The damage to that farm would be just as great as the damage caused by a mile-long drain on a bigger property. I do not know how to define a "minor work," but I think it should be defined. Whose opinion shall decide whether the work is minor or major? Can the Minister say? Who shall decide?

Hon. G. B. Wood: A government expert.

Hon. L. CRAIG: Shall it be on value or depth of drain or damage occasioned? I do not know, but I feel that there should be a definition. Otherwise I support the Bill. We have had very unfortunate results from drainage works in the South-West. Officers come and officers go, but the drains go on for ever.

Hon. T. Moore: Unless they are blocked!

Hon. L. CRAIG: When the particular area in which I am situated was to be declared an irrigation district, the then Under Secretary for Works, Mr. Munt, together with other officers visited the district and when asking the settlers to agree to the irrigation scheme Mr. Munt said it might be necessary to construct drainage works. Immediately the settlers asked, "Who will pay for them?" He said, "Where no benefits are derived from drainage, no rates will be charged." In my particular area in the opinion of the settlers and the departmental officers no drainage was required. The direct question was asked of Mr. Munt at a public meeting, "Will drainage works be required?" and the answer was, "No." The question was then put, "Will any drainage rates be

charged in this area?" and the answer was again "No." But Mr. Munt has passed on and another officer has been appointed. The views of the drainage board or somebody else have changed, and though no drains have been constructed in that particular portion, except at the extreme end, I will quote what has happened in my own case. The nearest drain to my property is a mile and a half away. No drainage works have been constructed closer than that. Not one drop of water is taken from my property that did not run off before. There is a fall of 25 feet from my property to the drain. I am rated £23 per annum for drainage.

Hon. H. V. Piesse: But you get water.

Hon. L. CRAIG: I am talking about drainage. They are taking water off, not putting it on! The hon. member is thinking of sprinklers. We have nothing in writing, and the drainage board said, "It is just too bad, but the water from your property eventually gets into this drain we have constructed a mile and a half away." I am not sure myself that it does, but they say it does. It goes through other properties first. At any rate, I am rated to the extent of £23 per annum, which is a very serious matter. It puts an added value of £400 on my 400-acre farm; that is £1 per acre capitalisation for drainage alone for which I receive no benefit. That is one particular instance. There are other instances where the rate is reasonably low and the work has improved the property 200 per cent. or 300 per cent.

Settlers are very concerned about drainage works being constructed in their area. A man may have a wet property for which he has not paid a great deal—perhaps £2 or £3 per acre. It may be 1,000 or 2,000 acres in extent. Drainage works may be constructed within that area and he may be rated £100 per annum. His property does not produce one penny more than it did before, though it will eventually do so. His potential production capacity has been created by the drains, but the immediate earning capacity has not been increased at all. Some of the settlers are in an unfortunate position. Their properties have potentially improved in value, but they themselves are mortgaged up to the neck and the potential improvement of their properties is of no avail to them. The additional rates become payable immediately. Generally speaking,

the position is quite serious, particularly when it is realised that an appeal against rates of that description is hard to maintain. The board will point out that the farmer's property has been drained, and that contention must be admitted. The fact remains, however, that the draining of his property has not produced more money for the owner and to bring wet land into production costs up to £10 an acre. Although the additional potential value is there, that mere fact does not help the farmer to pay the extra rates.

The Chief Secretary: The capital value of the property is increased.

Hon. L. CRAIG: Yes, but not the selling value of the property. Of course it increases the potential sale value—when values revert to normal. While today it would be impossible to sell the property, it will in future become valuable. Some land has a low value because so much capital is required to develop it. While one might be able to sell ten acres of land today, to dispose of upwards of a thousand acres would be impossible. A drain put through a district suddenly makes potential production possible over a big area, and any land that changes hands there will certainly be the picked areas, which do not require the expenditure of much money for developmental work. I suppose the drainage scheme in my district has been less profitable to me than to any other man in the South-West. My property was in a satisfactory condition before the drain was put through.

Hon. G. B. Wood: The Bill provides the right of appeal.

Hon. L. CRAIG: Yes, but the settler has no good argument to advance in view of all the circumstances. I am rated because a river runs alongside my boundary. The river bank is the highest point on my property, and yet I am rated because it drains my holding. I have yet to see water run uphill! The fact remains that settlers are much concerned about works constructed by the Government because they are required to pay in every instance. There is nothing else to do but to support the second reading of the Bill because it embodies some small amendments that are necessary. At the same time I would greatly appreciate the assistance of members generally in defining what will constitute "a minor work."

**HON. H. TUCKEY** (South-West) [9.50]: I agree that the Government is entitled to some assistance in connection with the drainage system, but nevertheless I am not wholeheartedly in favour of the Bill. In some respects it reminds me of the old saying, "The chickens have come home to roost." Drains have been constructed in this State during the past 50 years and the farmers have been content to allow the Government to put them in. In some instances the farmers urged the construction of the drains; in others they have not sought the construction. They did not think they would be called upon to pay anything towards the cost of the drains in the latter category. The Government is bound to collect more money seeing that the provisions of the Bill will apply to all parts of the drainage areas.

For several years past drainage work has been resorted to by the Government in order to provide employment for sustenance men. The Harvey drain cost over £270,000 and that work was undertaken merely to place sustenance men in employment. The Harvey people did not ask for the drain to be constructed and from that standpoint it is certainly hard that they should be asked to pay the maintenance costs. The work should rightly be regarded as a national undertaking. Other drains have been constructed in the South-West for a similar purpose and I know that in some instances they have not proved satisfactory nor were they required. The fact remains that the settlers will have to pay the full maintenance cost involved in the undertaking. It is unsatisfactory that landowners should be forced into such a position. On the other hand, I do not know how the problem can be overcome. It is difficult to say that some farmers shall pay rates in respect of one drain while others will not be required to do so where a similar undertaking has been put in hand.

I agree with the point raised by Mr. Craig regarding "minor works." An engineer can go on to a property and lay out works that may damage the holding. The land owner will have no redress. I suggest that minor works should be confined to those the estimated cost of which will not exceed £200.

**Hon. L. Craig:** An expenditure of £200 on a five-acre block would be quite a lot.

**Hon. H. TUCKEY:** Perhaps a smaller amount could be adopted, but I think that method would be the best by which to overcome the difficulty.

**Hon. J. J. Holmes:** I think a basis of so much per acre would be better.

**Hon. H. TUCKEY:** I feel bound to support the second reading of the Bill, but I hope the Government will see to it that the rates levied will not be made too heavy. All these imposts represent so much added burden upon the primary producers.

On motion by the Chief Secretary, debate adjourned.

*House adjourned at 9.55 p.m.*

## Legislative Assembly.

*Tuesday, 18th November, 1941.*

	PAGE
Question: Goldfields Water Supply Department, appointment of Joseph E. Edmonds ....	1945
Bills: Main Roads Act (Funds Appropriation) (No. 2), 3A. ....	1946
Workers' Compensation Act Amendment, Council's amendments ....	1946
Increase of Rent (War Restrictions) Act Amendment, Council's Message, Assembly's request for conference ....	1951
Financial Emergency Act Amendment, returned	1956
Mortgagees' Rights Restriction Act Continuance, returned	1956
Public Trustee, Council's amendments ....	1956
Broome Tramway Extension, 2A., Com. report	1956
Child Welfare Act Amendment, 2A., Com. ....	1978
Loan Estimates, 1941-42, Com. ....	1958

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

### QUESTION—GOLDFIELDS WATER SUPPLY DEPARTMENT.

*Appointment of Joseph E. Edmonds.*

Mr. STYANTS asked the Minister for Water Supplies: 1, Did the notice appearing on page 993 of the "Government Gazette" of the 8th April, 1904, appoint one Joseph E. Edmonds as an officer of the Goldfields Water Supply Department? 2, If not, what did it mean? 3, During the