

interests are more vital, and they should receive the consideration of this House, rather than the isolated instances of hardship imposed upon lenders in the unfortunate position of wanting to collect their money. I can assure the member for Canning that if the borrowers are in the position to pay off the mortgage they will be only too glad to do so at the first opportunity, because they would probably be able to borrow money at a much lower rate of interest than in 1931.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

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

House adjourned at 10.32 p.m.

Legislative Council,

Wednesday, 3rd November, 1937.

	PAGE
Questions: State Shipping Service freight rates to East Indies and Malaya	1497
Agricultural Department	1497
Mining, leases at Tallering and Wilgenia	1498
Bills: Whaling, 3a.	1498
Nurses Registration Act Amendment, recom.	1498
Jury Act Amendment (No. 2), 1r.	1498
Mortgagees' Rights Restriction Act Continuance, 1r.	1498
Financial Emergency Tax Assessment Act Amendment, 2r.	1498
Judges' Retirement, 2r., Com. report	1505
Anniversary of the Birthday of the Reigning Sovereign, 2r., Com.	1506
Lottaries (Control) Act Amendment (No. 2), 2r., Com.	1510
Forests Act Amendment Continuance, 2r.	1525

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

QUESTION—STATE SHIPPING SERVICE.

Freight Rates to East Indies and Malaya.

Hon. C. F. BAXTER asked the Chief Secretary: 1, What are the present net freight rates on flour to ports in the Dutch

East Indies and Malaya? 2, Has the Minister any knowledge of representations having been made to the State Shipping Department by Eastern States shipowners, Messrs. Burns Philp & Co. and K.P.M. Line, to agree to an increase in freight rates on flour to the Dutch East Indies and Malaya? 3, What tonnage of flour has been shipped from Western Australia in each year, 1927 to 1937? 4, What has been the tonnage carried by the State Shipping Service in the period 1927 to 1937? 5, What is the tonnage carried by other shipping lines from Western Australia? 6, Has the Minister agreed to an increase of freights charged by State Shipping Service? 7, Has any request for increases in freight rates been received from other shipping lines engaged in the business from Western Australian ports? 8, Is the Minister aware that refusal of the State Shipping Department to agree to any increase will have a beneficial influence upon all freight rates on flour from Australia to the Dutch East Indies and Malaya?

The CHIEF SECRETARY replied: 1, 30s. per ton of 2,000 lbs., ex Eastern States ports; 25s. per ton of 2,000 lbs., ex West Australian ports to main ports Dutch East Indies and Malaya. 2, Yes. 3, 1927, 15,610 tons; 1928, 19,184 tons; 1929, 23,267 tons; 1930, 23,451 tons; 1931, 19,146 tons; 1932, 19,335 tons; 1933, 24,015 tons; 1934, 37,084 tons; 1935, 39,833 tons; 1936, 35,504 tons; 1937, 36,631 tons; total, 293,060 tons. 4, 60,597 tons. 5, 232,463 tons. 6, No. 7, No. 8, This will depend upon the action of other shipping companies.

QUESTION—AGRICULTURAL DEPARTMENT.

Hon. H. V. PIESSE asked the Chief Secretary: 1, What is the number of employees in the Agricultural Department? 2, How many are resident in the country districts?

The CHIEF SECRETARY replied: 1, On the salaried staff there are 138 officers. 2, Sixty. It is pointed out there are also a large number of employees paid on wages sheets employed in country districts. Further, many officers with Perth as headquarters are almost continuously visiting country districts.

QUESTION—MINING, LEASES AT TALLERING AND WILGEMIA.

Hon. E. H. H. HALL asked the Chief Secretary: 1, Under what tenure have mineral leases at Tallering and Wilgemia been granted? 2, When and to whom, and under what conditions were they granted?

The CHIEF SECRETARY replied: 1 and 2, Tallering—Prospecting Area No. 592H of 3,000 acres under the provisions of Regulation 6 under the Mining Act, 1904, for prospecting for coal and iron was granted to William Annand Carcary on 19th November, 1936, for a period of 12 months with the right to apply for a renewal for a further six months. The conditions governing the area are set out in Regulations 6 to 16 under the Mining Act, 1904. Wilgemia—Mineral claims 20 and 21 of 300 acres each were granted under the provisions of Regulation 55 under the Mining Act, 1904, to Herman Mandelstam on 19th July, 1937, for the purpose of mining for iron. The conditions governing the claims are set out in Regulation 55.

BILL—WHALING.

Read a third time and transmitted to the Assembly.

BILL—NURSES REGISTRATION ACT AMENDMENT.

Recommittal.

On motion by the Chief Secretary, Bill re-committed for the purpose of further considering Clause 3.

In Committee.

Hon. J. Cornell in the Chair; the Chief Secretary in charge of the Bill.

Clause 3—Amendment of Section 5 of the principal Act:

The CHIEF SECRETARY: It is considered that the insertion of certain words is required in the proposed new Subsection 5 to make the position clear and to maintain the standard we have set in this State for infant health nurses. The practice here is for those nurses also to qualify as maternity nurses. In some of the other States it may be possible for a nurse to obtain her infant health certificate without the necessity to qualify as a maternity nurse. In order to

adhere to the standard we have maintained in this State, I move an amendment—

That in line 2 of proposed Subsection 5, after “and,” the following words be inserted:—“being a trained and registered midwifery nurse.”

If that amendment be agreed to, it will be necessary to insert the words again later on in the new subsection, and then the position will be quite clear and reciprocity with other States will be on the basis of their nurses requiring to possess similar qualifications to those possessed by our nurses.

Amendment put and passed.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: I move an amendment—

That in line 8, after “and,” the following words be inserted:—“being a trained and registered midwifery nurse.”

Amendment put and passed; the clause, as amended, agreed to.

Bill again reported with further amendments.

BILLS (2)—FIRST READING.

- 1, Jury Act Amendment (No. 2).
 - 2, Mortgagees' Rights Restriction Act Continuance.
- Received from the Assembly.

BILL—FINANCIAL EMERGENCY TAX ASSESSMENT ACT AMENDMENT.

Second Reading.

Debate resumed from the previous day.

HON. C. F. BAXTER (East) [4.45]: All taxing measures are unpalatable, but the Act this Bill seeks to amend, with which is associated the tax Bill, is most distasteful by reason of the fact that it imposes a special tax without deductions, which unfortunately has now developed into a class tax. The financial emergency tax was introduced in 1932 for the purpose of assisting the Government to meet the emergency that then existed. In the course of time the burden on those who are called upon to pay this tax has greatly increased in consequence of exemptions extended to a large section of the people who, whilst enjoying the benefits of the many free services provided by the State, contribute practically nothing towards meeting the cost of those services. Taxation is annually becoming more burdensome and

as a result is seriously interfering with private enterprise to the detriment of State finances. In 1931 State taxation per head of population amounted to £3 6s. 5d., and in 1936 it had increased to £6 3s. 5d. per head. It will therefore be seen that taxation has nearly doubled in the brief period of five years. Financial emergency tax collections this year are expected to reach £1,000,000, which is a colossal sum to extract from only a portion of our small population of 460,000 people. This special taxation is over and above other forms of taxation, such as the income tax. It must be remembered, too, that there are many taxes not shown, such as water supply, sewerage and drainage, motor tax, and other taxes. They would reach an imposing sum if they were all totalled. How much of a man's pound is left when he has paid all those taxes?

The Chief Secretary: Water supply is not a tax.

Hon. C. F. BAXTER: Of course it is a tax. It is spoken of as rates, but it is nothing but a tax. Anything charged by the State must be a tax. If we want to look at the real revenue, we require to look at what the State is actually earning. The total amount received from all forms of taxation for the year 1936-37 amounted to £2,400,000. Assuming that only one-third of the population are taxpayers, the amount per head is £16. I noticed recently that the Auditor General had gone out of his way to justify the necessity for the continuance of this special tax. His implied suggestion is that, if receipts from this tax were doubled, there would still be need for its retention. In other words, no matter how much revenue is raised by way of taxation, increased expenditure, extravagant or otherwise, is of itself sufficient justification for the continuance of a tax that will return the amount necessary to meet such additional expenditure. Last year Government expenditure on revenue account exceeded that of the previous year by £611,000. An examination of the returns will disclose in what direction expenditure is increasing. In 1933 the Railway Department employed 7,380 persons. In 1936 the number employed increased to 8,526, representing an increase in three years of no fewer than 1,140 additional employees. Expenditure on Government motor vehicles has increased enormously in recent years. The annual expenditure under this heading is quite unjustified. Very few horses are now being used for departmental purposes;

the expensive motor power has superseded them. Thus we find colossal sums being sent out of the State for the purchase of fuel, oil, tyres and spare parts. Boards have been appointed which, together with staffs, involve considerable additional expenditure annually. Listening to the radio at home the other evening, I heard a loud voice talking about Mr. Lyons, with his carpet-bag travelling. The voice said that Federal Ministers were doing a great deal of travelling at the expense of Australia. It came to me then that we in this State were not any better off, for the expenditure incurred by Ministers and civil servants, who are continually travelling both inside and outside the State, must reach a huge amount. In fact many items of Government expenditure could not be justified even if the State's revenue exceeded the expenditure by an appreciable amount. I do not say that Ministers should not make any trips, for in my opinion they must do so; but I say that during the last few years this practice has been overdone by every Government, and the army of civil servants travelling about, not only within the State but beyond the State, is considerable. One cannot pick up a newspaper without seeing that So-and-so is coming back by the Great Western Railway, or is going off by aeroplane. Surely all the expenditure there represented is not necessary.

Hon. G. B. Wood: Where do the Ministers travel to?

Hon. C. F. BAXTER: We do not require to debate that, because many of their trips are quite justified; but I say that the amount should be gradually curtailed.

The Honorary Minister: How much did the previous Government spend on these trips?

Hon. C. F. BAXTER: Whatever the amount may have been, the present Government are spending three times that sum. Many other forms of Government expenditure are not justified. Effort should be made to reduce expenditure in order that a gradual reduction in taxation may be brought about for the benefit of the people and therefore of the State. Session after session I have endeavoured to have this tax assessed on reasonable lines in order that everyone should be compelled to contribute to an emergency, instead of a very large section being exempt and the tax increased on the balance. This tax was brought in

with the idea that everyone should contribute to it. Hon. members will remember that.

Hon. V. Hamersley: Hear, hear!

Hon. C. F. BAXTER: It is true that the introduction of the tax was fought by a large section who are now on the Government side of the House. What has happened? The previous Government by this tax received only £212,000 in seven months, which for a full year would have meant £400,000 at most; but this tax has now been increased, and the exemptions have been enlarged. However, that is not the critical point, which is that a large body of taxpayers have been exempt altogether. I urge the Government to set their minds to the task of reducing the emergency tax by small amounts in each grade annually, until the tax disappears altogether. The Bill before us restricts our consideration to four sections of the Act, and those sections do not deal with the amount of tax to be levied. Being restricted to the four proposed amendments it becomes necessary for the House to take a firm stand in regard to Clauses 2 and 5. Clause 2 proposes to insert the words "basic wage." Parliament should not allow such words to be included in a tax Act. There should not be any departure from the special amount of exemption as decided on from time to time. At present it is £3 15s. Why insert the words "basic wage"?

Hon. G. W. Miles. Because it exempts a few more members of the Party.

Hon. C. F. BAXTER: I do not know that that is so. If we proceed on these lines one can expect to find future taxing measures referring to special exemptions for the A.W.U. and kindred organisations. A vital principal is at stake and the definition of "basic wage" should be deleted. The House should not pass Clause 5, which amends Section 13. What justification can there be for making this Act more severe than the Justices Act? Is there any justification for trying to make it appear that the taxpayers are being treated as criminals? Such amendments as these are harassing, and inflict still greater disabilities upon the taxpayer. Every session, the Government, backed by trade unions and a section of the public service, seeks to impose conditions which render more difficult the everyday work and lives of those who are not connected with its own particular organisations. I should like to say more on these questions but would not be allowed to do so. The emergency tax was put on for emergency purposes. Had

it not been so, the Government would have increased the income tax. The idea was to put on some tax that would die at a certain period, namely the following 30th June. That was the intention of the Government of that day. The Government of which I was a member was determined to fight the Loan Council against imposing further taxation upon the people of this State. It was realised, of course, that we could not carry on. We were forced to find £400,000, with the result that the only avenue that could be found was a temporary taxation measure in the form of a financial emergency tax. It appears that this temporary measure of taxation is now to remain permanently on the statute-book. If we are going to tax the people permanently, it is unfair to tax them without deductions as is the case under this Bill. Why not increase the income tax, and allow this to be merged into the income tax? The tax will be imposed at the source just the same. If there is to be a permanent tax it should be one tax only, more especially in view of the fact that the emergency tax taxes those who are down on a much lower scale than would otherwise be the case. This emergency tax is a tax inflicted upon the very people who were carrying the income tax before. I worked very hard to have the emergency tax rejected last session, but a compromise had to be arrived at and it was allowed to go through on the £3 15s. basis. Every year the Government is reaching out to get a little more out of this tax. The method this time is to add to the definition by bringing in the words "basic wage." Whilst I shall support the second reading, in Committee I shall very strongly oppose Clause 5 in particular.

HON. J. CORNELL (South) [5.5]: If I may do so, I would offer a word of advice to the House, namely that it follows the usual procedure and holds up this Bill until the tax Bill comes along. One is complementary to the other.

Hon. C. F. Baxter: Very good advice.

Hon. J. CORNELL: The House has done that every session, and I hope will do it again. Last session I said the title of the Bill was wrong, that instead of its being a financial emergency tax it should have been dubbed a financial necessity tax. If I erred, I erred in good company. My digger friend, the Auditor General, has said something like that too. It does appear that this is like Charley's aunt.

Hon. C. B. Williams: Which one, my aunt?

Hon. J. CORNELL: She is here, and she is here to stay.

Hon. C. B. Williams: I hope the nephew is.

Hon. J. CORNELL: I cannot see how Western Australia is going to rid itself of the need for the revenue that is derived from this tax. We should square up the situation. It seems to me that either the income tax should be run into this tax, or this tax should be run into the income tax. We have reached the glaring anomaly of a proposal to place a higher exemption in this tax than we do in the income tax. Whilst some workers would escape payment of this tax, they would not escape payment of the income tax. I understand the exemption for income tax is £200 a year for a married person. The proposal under this tax is to bring the exemption to the vicinity of £250 a year for a married person. That is not equitable. If any married person is to be exempt from contributing under this tax, he should be exempt from contributing under the income tax, but he is not to be exempt from the income tax.

Hon. G. W. Miles: How do you know that?

Hon. J. CORNELL: Take the miner at Marble Bar.

Hon. G. W. Miles: You have not seen what the Government is going to do with the Assessment Bill.

Hon. J. CORNELL: I understand that is purely a machinery measure. I do not think the Government intends to raise any of the exemptions. The basic wage of a miner at Marble Bar is over £5 a week, equal to £270 per annum. He would not be exempt under the Income Tax Act. He might be exempt if he had children under a certain age, but if he was married and had no dependants he would not be exempt. We cannot stand for that kind of taxation. By putting one tax up against the other the liability to contribute appears to me in the circumstances to be greater in the case of the financial emergency tax than in the case of the ordinary income tax. The income tax was imposed in normal times, but the emergency tax was brought in to meet abnormal times. It was a time when the people were expected to

make a contribution to a state of financial emergency. Now we are faced with a situation that this worker would contribute to one tax, but not to another. I am not going to stand for that. I think certain anomalies must inevitably occur in all forms of direct taxation. It would be a very good thing if all wage earners and income earners had to contribute something to the exchequer. That would probably induce them to cast a more intelligent vote, at all events more intelligent than they did at the last Federal elections. It would make them think very hard. We appear to be a long way from that situation. Anomalies are bound to occur. I should like to know what the basic wage is in the gold mining areas.

Hon. C. B. Williams: Have we not enough troubles without going into that?

Hon. J. CORNELL: What is the basic wage there?

Hon. C. B. Williams: The surface wage is £4 19s.

Hon. J. CORNELL: Yes.

The Chief Secretary: Nothing of the sort.

Hon. C. B. Williams: It is £4 7s., plus 12s.

Hon. J. CORNELL: The basic wage, therefore, is £4 19s.

Hon. C. B. Williams: That is in Kalgoorlie only.

Hon. J. CORNELL: The Chief Secretary says it is not so. What did the Arbitration Court say with respect to men employed in the gold mining industry? It said that they were to have £4 7s. a week plus 12s. on the price of gold. That premium was to rise and fall according to the price of gold.

The Honorary Minister: That would not affect the Bill.

Hon. J. CORNELL: So that the basic wage becomes £4 19s.

The Chief Secretary: No, it is the minimum wage, £4 7s.

Hon. H. Seddon: The other is a bonus.

Hon. J. CORNELL: The court gave that amount because the miner had for so long been outside any due recognition to which he was entitled. Is not the income of the miner reflected throughout the State, particularly in the West Province, the waterfront Province? I submit that the basic wage of the miner is £4 19s. and not £4 7s. No man who can be employed in the gold mining industry will escape the tax.

The Chief Secretary: True.

Hon. J. CORNELL: Even if it is fixed on the basic income there. There will not be many wage earners who are not getting the benefit of this now. Notwithstanding that, the gold miners will still have to pay both the financial emergency tax and the income tax. There might be some sense in it all if we compared the actual basic wage received in the gold mining industry, without the gold bonus, with what men receive elsewhere. The anomaly is too great for me to support. I hope the Council will amend the Bill and see that the adjustment is made in money as heretofore. There is another point, and that is to make the employer liable for three years instead of one year, if he does not collect the employee's tax. There is no comparison between the number of contributors under this tax and the number who pay income tax. The emergency tax is levied at the source by the employer. Whilst the present Auditor-General occupies his position and he is listened to, I do not feel that there is any need for the three years' provision, and to say that the liability is to last for three years is in my opinion tantamount to condemning those responsible for policing the collection of the tax. I see no other course to follow than to support the second reading, but I support it in the hope that we shall square up the situation, and that before long we will amalgamate this tax and the income tax. We should do that and accept the inevitable. I am no Jeremiad, but if we look at the condition of our railway system, to say nothing of the tramway system, not only shall we have to accept this tax but we may even have to increase it year by year in order to meet the leeway that those two systems are making. I see no hope for many new avenues of revenue in this State to enable us to pay for our ever-increasing burden of social services. If we are to maintain those services there can be only one end, and that is to increase the taxes on those who are able to pay them. At the same time the sooner we get away from the financial emergency tax the better.

Hon. G. W. Miles: What about forcing the Government into amalgamating the two taxes?

Hon. J. CORNELL: I do not think this House exists for the purpose of defeating what the Government of the day considers is necessary to enable it to carry on. Sufficient for the day is the evil thereof.

Hon. G. W. Miles: Why cannot we force the Government?

Hon. J. CORNELL: I do not know that we could force the Government, but I do know that we could force ourselves into the position that when our monthly cheque came along the bank would probably return it marked N.S.F.

Hon. G. W. Miles: That would be a good thing.

Hon. J. CORNELL: It might be a good thing for the hon. member but not for me, and I think I can speak also on behalf of other members. However well circumstanced we might be we are grateful at the end of each month for our Parliamentary salary. I advise the Council to hold this Bill back until the Bill to impose an income tax comes along.

HON. L. CRAIG (South-West) [5.18]: I agree that this tax is necessary. We heard earlier in the session of the huge sums that had been written off on account of agricultural losses, and that farmers had had their debts reduced. Therefore it is necessary that this tax should go on. I agree with other members that it should be incorporated in the income tax, because it is apparently going to be permanent. I do not agree that basic wage earners should be exempt, but it is the declared policy of the Government that people on the basic wage shall be exempt, and the Government has been justified in making that declaration. I would prefer to see an amount fixed, but how that is possible I do not know. If the Government declares that the basic wage earner shall not pay the tax, and the basic wage varies in different localities—we are told it is £4 19s. at Marble Bar—

Hon. J. Cornell: It is more at Marble Bar.

Hon. L. CRAIG: The hon. member can make it as high as he likes. We are told it is £4 19s. at Kalgoorlie and £3 15s. down here. If it is the policy of the Government that the basic wage earners shall be exempt—and personally I think the Government has the right to carry out its policy—it is not for us to say that that policy should not be carried out. Unfortunately I disagree with that policy.

Hon. J. Cornell: Do you agree that a man should pay this tax and not income tax?

Hon. L. CRAIG: Who is paying this tax and not paying the income tax? The income tax exemption is £200, and workers in the metropolitan area would not be exempt from

paying the income tax. Under Mr. Cornell's proposal only certain people in the mining areas would be exempt—so I do not think his argument quite agrees with the facts. The employer is made responsible for the collection of this tax. I think that is reasonable. It would be difficult to trace employees who are moving from one place to another, but it is not difficult at all for an employer to deduct the amount from the wages he is paying, just as is being done in respect of the hospital tax. The Bill also provides for the collection of back tax over a period of three years. I agree with that also.

Hon. A. M. Clydesdale: You had better come over here.

Hon. L. CRAIG: If taxes are evaded and it is necessary to send inspectors round to see whether the taxes are being paid, then within 12 months we would require an army of inspectors. In the country districts it is only possible for inspectors to visit farmers or storekeepers or anyone else at very indefinite periods, and if those inspectors found that anyone had been evading the payment of the tax, we have a perfect right to say that we shall go back over a period of three years for the collection of the tax. That is reasonable. Laws are made to be observed, and if because we have not enough inspectors, a man is able to get away with it, that can only be regarded as an evasion of the law. I do think that more drastic action should be taken with regard to sustenance workers. A big proportion of the financial emergency tax is used up in providing work for sustenance men. There are to-day a number of sustenance men carrying out work that is really not necessary, especially in view of the fact that the State is so hard up for money.

Hon. J. Cornell: I think you will find that that work is provided for out of loan funds.

Hon. L. CRAIG: At the same time there are many farmers who are unable to obtain labour, and the sustenance men who are in the camps will not accept farming work that may be offering. I know of one instance, and I think the information I have is authentic, where work was offered to a number of sustenance men camped in the country, and who refused to take the work for the reasons I will state. A member of another place went to this camp and said that he could find employment for 40 men at £2 a week, and that they would be employed for three months. The work was offered by a tobacco company and 40 men agreed to take the

work, but on the understanding that at the end of three months they should be allowed to go back to the sustenance camp. The Minister for Employment was approached and he said "If those men go out they will stay out." Consequently the company had to send to Perth, pick up what men they were able to get and send them to Manjimup. If the sustenance workers had been engaged the Government would have been saved £80 per week.

Hon. A. M. Clydesdale: You say that the Minister refused to allow the men to leave the camp?

Hon. L. CRAIG: I understand that is so. To me it seemed to be a wrong attitude to adopt. It was not I who approached the Minister but I have on good authority the information I have given to the House. The Government should take drastic action with regard to men who are on purely sustenance work, and should be strong enough to say that sustenance work shall be on a lower plane than any other class of work.

Hon. H. Seddon: The point is that they have to stand down for a certain length of time after they accept a job elsewhere.

Hon. L. CRAIG: I know, but sustenance work should be on a lower plane, and instead of a man working two days a week and receiving, say, 30s., he should work a longer period for the same money and thus we would force him to take whatever work might be offering outside. But when work is offering the men will not accept it because they have got to the stage when they are satisfied with what they are doing. The Government should be strong enough to force them out, and if that course is not followed we shall have the burden of the emergency tax imposed on us indefinitely. I have nothing more to say except that while I do not agree with the Bill, I intend to support it. I do not agree that people on the basic wage should not contribute towards emergency taxation, but if it is the policy of the Government to carry it out, and the Government consider it is a mandate from the people, I am content to let it rest at that.

HON. E. H. H. HALL (Central) [5.29]: It is my intention to support the second reading of the Bill and I also support those speakers who think it is time we got away from financial emergency taxation and tacked on to income taxation the revenue we are receiving from that source. In Committee I shall not approve of the

lengthy period of three years over which the Government may go back to recover this tax. It has not required an army of inspectors, as has been stated by the previous speaker, to supervise the collection of money totalling nearly a million pounds raised under this Act. The hon. member has no justification for imagining that it is going to require such an army in the future.

Hon. L. Craig: How do you know that the tax would not have produced much more?

Hon. E. H. H. HALL: That is a fair question. The tax has already produced a lot more revenue than it was expected it would produce. It is not as easy to keep records of the receipts obtained under the Financial Emergency Act as it is to refer back to a copy of your annual assessment. I shall not support the Government in the desire to go back for three years. We heard speeches yesterday afternoon and this afternoon, and we have been treated in this House on many occasions to dissertations on the iniquity of extracting money from people for necessary Government activities. I do not profess to have made a study of the subject, like those members to whom I refer. I find it advisable not to refer to members by name, but those listening to me will have no difficulty in realising about whom I am speaking. But while I have not made a great study of the subject, I want to emphasise this point: People pay huge amounts in taxation and it is claimed by certain members of this Chamber that those who pay the huge sums are the people who are keeping the State going. I recall that many years ago, when in Geraldton, I used frequently to hear a man with whom I was associated claim that he was the biggest ratepayer in Geraldton.

Hon. L. Craig: Did he mean in size?

Hon. E. H. H. HALL: No, in the amount of rates he paid. Although, Mr. President, I should not take notice of the hon. member, I should like to tell him that the man to whom I refer was, in size, the biggest man in Geraldton.

Hon. L. Craig: Then that is what he meant.

Hon. E. H. H. HALL: He did not mean anything of the kind. He meant he was the biggest ratepayer in Geraldton. But where did he get the wherewithal to pay the rates?

Hon. J. M. Macfarlane: I will be the big mug; tell us.

Hon. E. H. H. HALL: The hon. member will be the mug all right. He knows as well as I do. All members know as well as I do, but somehow they are inclined to forget. The man that hon. members seem to be so anxious to make pay direct taxation is the man who enables the big taxpayers to pay their big taxes. There is not the slightest doubt about that. I heard the present Minister for Works (Hon. H. Millington) put this idea over in the municipal council in Geraldton, and he is quite right. We had a public meeting to request a lower water rate. We pay 3s. a thousand gallons and considered that we were entitled to a lower rate. The business people told the Minister of the high rates they paid, and Mr. Millington reminded them of the source from which they got their rates. It is chiefly the basic wage earners that enable our big taxpayers to pay their taxation. Members cannot get away from that. There may be some exceptions but I am speaking by and large when I say that in the majority of cases the big taxpayer is enabled to pay his tax from the profits made by the great bulk of the people.

Hon. G. W. Miles: That is only one section of the community.

Hon. E. H. H. HALL: I am saying that that is so in the majority of cases. I am giving my opinion, which I am entitled to do.

Member: You cannot expect us to swallow it.

The PRESIDENT: Order! I wish hon. members would allow the hon. member to proceed with his speech without interruption.

Hon. L. Craig: He is in a good mood today.

The PRESIDENT: Order!

Hon. E. H. H. HALL: Hon. members may use their own discretion as to whether they swallow what I say or not. That does not matter to me one bit, but I think it is time that people who set themselves up as students of this matter, and entertain us with learned speeches on the subject, realised that the big taxpayers are enabled to pay their taxes from the money they make out of the bulk of the people. If any hon. member will endeavour to enlighten me as to where I am wrong, I shall be only too pleased to listen.

Hon. G. W. Miles: What about squatters?

Hon. E. H. H. HALL: There are exceptions, as I have mentioned. Anyway, that is my opinion, and I have knowledge that some members have not got. I had the pleasure

of bringing up five children and am still having that pleasure. Some people who talk about taxation have not had that pleasure. When one considers the case of the married man on the basic wage—and that basic wage is arrived at in an altogether unjust manner because it provides a wage based on the needs of a married man with two children only—one wonders how such people as he make ends meet. The idea of asking people to pay direct taxation when they are taxed indirectly will never have my support in this House or any other House, irrespective of what anybody might say. I support the second reading of the Bill and reserve the right to vote for any amendments in Committee.

HON. L. B. BOLTON (Metropolitan)

I move—

That the debate be adjourned.

Motion put, and a division taken with the following result:—

Ayes	17
Noes	9

Majority for	8
--------------	----	----	---

AYES.

Hon. C. F. Baxter	Hon. G. W. Miles
Hon. L. B. Bolton	Hon. H. S. W. Parker
Hon. J. Cornell	Hon. H. V. Piesse
Hon. L. Craig	Hon. H. Seddon
Hon. J. T. Franklin	Hon. H. Tuckey
Hon. V. Hamersley	Hon. C. H. Wittenoom
Hon. J. J. Holmes	Hon. G. B. Wood
Hon. J. M. Macfarlane	Hon. L. B. Bolton
Hon. W. J. Mann	(Teller.)

NOES.

Hon. A. M. Clydesdale	Hon. E. M. Heenan
Hon. J. M. Drew	Hon. W. H. Klitson
Hon. C. G. Elliott	Hon. T. Moore
Hon. E. H. Gray	Hon. C. B. Williams
Hon. E. H. H. Hall	(Teller.)

Motion thus passed; the debate adjourned.

BILL—JUDGES' RETIREMENT.

Second Reading.

Debate resumed from the 28th October.

HON. J. CORNELL (South) [5.42]: My purpose in moving the adjournment of the debate yesterday was that Mr. Nicholson previously secured the adjournment: but he is still too ill to attend the House. My contribution will be very brief. Last session I voted for a similar Bill and I cannot see any reason why I should alter that vote now. If there is going to be a fixed standard for the retirement of other public ser-

vants, there cannot be any objection to that applying to the judiciary. We provide that the Crown Law adviser shall be compulsorily retired at 65 and in this Bill we propose to give judges five years longer. I do not think any judge would be financially inconvenienced by having to retire at 70. If that should happen, machinery could be put in motion whereby that could be obviated.

HON. L. B. BOLTON (Metropolitan) [5.44]: This is another of those inconsistent measures of the Government with which I do not agree, and I intend to vote against the second reading. When the Bill was before the House previously I voted against it and I do so on this occasion for similar reasons. The position of a judge is entirely different from that of a civil servant. A judge does not very often get an opportunity to serve the State until he has reached middle age, and he does not have that service that the average civil servant has. The calling of a judge is a very special calling, but while I agree that every man who serves the State is entitled to some reward in a reasonable measure, I have said in this House before, and I repeat it now, that in my opinion the State pays altogether too much in pensions. I think I am right in saying there are hundreds of civil servants who could render excellent service for years after reaching the age of 65, and I oppose the Bill on that ground. I also oppose it on the score of the inconsistency of the Government. If an officer does not meet with approval, he is promptly retired at the age of 65; in fact, most officers are retired at that age, but I can give an instance of an employee of the Government having been reinstated at the age of 75. This occurred in the last three months: a man who had reached the age of 75 was re-employed in a Government department.

HON. H. SEDDON: Do you know the department?

HON. L. B. BOLTON: I have absolute knowledge of it. There is no consistency in reinstating a man after the age of 75 years, asking this House to approve of the retirement of judges at 70 years of age, and retiring civil servants at the age of 65. I will oppose the second reading.

HON. E. H. H. HALL (Central) [5.47]: I fail to see where there has been any inconsistency on the part of the Government.

I supported a similar measure last year. Members will be inconsistent if they continue to talk about making room for the younger men and at the same time refuse to pass legislation that would prevent men remaining in their positions after the age of 70. I care not whether such men be judges or other officials; there should be a retiring age, and 70 is quite a fair age at which to require the retirement of a judge. We have many young men leaving our University awaiting a chance in life, and we have to do something to give them a chance. Yet members would argue that the Government are inconsistent in bringing down a Bill of this kind. I congratulate the Government on having introduced the measure, which has received commendation in very high quarters—quarters that are not always favourably disposed towards the Government. I regret that the measure of last session was rejected, and I trust members will now repair the mistake made on that occasion.

HON. C. F. BAXTER (East) [5.49]: My thoughts do not follow along the lines of those voiced by Mr. Hall. It must be conceded that the safest men to occupy the position of judge are those of ripe experience and sound constitution. Though some men enjoy sound health and are in full possession of their faculties after the age of 70, others are not. The position of judge is of more vital importance than that of members of Parliament or an office in any other section of Government service. On the decision of a judge often depends the life and liberty of people, and much damage might be done if a presiding judge were suffering failing health. We know from personal experience that if we are not enjoying good health we cannot exercise sound judgment.

Hon. V. Hamersley: That applies to some men of 50 years of age.

Hon. C. F. BAXTER: Yes, some men of 70 are better than are others of 45 or 50. Seventy years is a good ripe age, though occasionally we find men beyond that age enjoying robust health and retaining all their faculties. Still, we have to consider the importance of the position. I support the Bill, and commend the Government for having introduced it. If a judge is retired at 70 years of age, he will retire on a pension. We cannot run the risk that would

inevitably arise if men of failing health were permitted to retain judicial positions.

The Chief Secretary: This Bill will not affect the present occupants of the bench.

Hon. C. F. BAXTER: I am aware of that, but we have to legislate for the future. The present occupants of the bench are under what amounts to a contract. Not often do I see eye to eye with the present Government, but on this question I do. I support the second reading.

THE HONORARY MINISTER (Hon. E. H. Gray—West—in reply) [5.53]: I am pleased at the reception given to the Bill. Mr. Bolton's remarks, I consider, were effectively replied to by Mr. Hall. I was astonished to hear Mr. Bolton's statement that the Government had reinstated an employee at the age of 75. His information might be correct, but I cannot imagine its having been done with the knowledge of the Minister.

Hon. T. Moore: It might be a keep-out-of-the-road job.

The HONORARY MINISTER: I think it a tall story. I should like to see every working man entitled to receive superannuation on retiring. The hon. member made a big point of 65 as a retiring age, but this Bill provides for 70 years, and has received support in quarters from which we do not often get support. I believe that the legal profession support the Bill, which I consider absolutely just. As pointed out by the Chief Secretary, the present occupants of the bench will not be affected.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

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

BILL—ANNIVERSARY OF THE BIRTHDAY OF THE REIGNING SOVEREIGN.

Second Reading.

THE HONORARY MINISTER (Hon. E. H. Gray—West) [5.56] in moving the second reading said: The purpose of this short Bill is to enable the Governor to declare, by proclamation published in the "Government Gazette," that the holiday to celebrate the birthday of the reigning Sovereign shall be observed on a special date,

irrespective of the date fixed by any other Act of Parliament. Members are aware that the birthday of our present King falls on the 14th December. When the King ascended the Throne, he expressed the wish that the celebration of his birthday should not be permitted to interfere with Christmas business. As the date is very close to Christmas, there can be no doubt that the holding of a holiday at such time would cause a certain amount of dislocation. An attempt made early this year by the Commonwealth to obtain the co-operation of all the States in fixing a uniform day for this anniversary was not successful. As a result, the holiday has been observed on different dates in the various States. The Government of this State have agreed that the birthday should be celebrated this year on Monday, the 15th November, which date will be specified in the proclamation to be issued by the Government if the measure becomes law. It was hoped that a day other than the actual birthday of His Majesty could have been fixed without the necessity for special legislation. Certain Acts of Parliament, however, stipulate that the holiday must be held on the actual birthday of the Sovereign, and it therefore became necessary to introduce legislation to overcome the difficulty. I hope that before next year a uniform date will have been fixed throughout the Commonwealth.

Hon. J. J. Holmes: This measure will not create an additional holiday?

The HONORARY MINISTER: No. I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

HON. J. CORNELL (South) [6.0]: I am anything but a jingo. However, if there are two episodes which are indelibly written on my mind, they are Queen Victoria's birthday being celebrated on the 24th May, and the birthday of King Edward the Seventh on the 9th November. It does appear to me that for business reasons an attempt is being made to convert King's birthday into a sort of Aunt Sally. In a Christian Empire such as ours, the foremost holiday should be Christmas Day, and the next holiday in point of importance King's birthday.

Hon. L. Craig: King's birthday is not a compulsory holiday even in England.

Hon. J. CORNELL: Why make it a holiday at all?

Hon. L. Craig: Why not?

Hon. J. CORNELL: Mr. Craig asks, why not?

Hon. L. Craig: I think it should be.

Hon. J. CORNELL: If the Australian Commonwealth intends to honour the King by keeping up his birthday, there should be uniformity.

Hon. L. Craig: I agree with you.

Hon. J. CORNELL: I consider King's birthday should be kept on the actual day. As far as my knowledge goes, this is the first attempt to depart from the age-old practice. The motive for the departure is merely that to keep King's birthday on the actual day would interfere with business.

The Honorary Minister: The Bill represents the King's own wish.

Hon. J. CORNELL: There was a difficulty in keeping his birthday last year. Let us do the thing properly or not do it at all.

Hon. J. J. Holmes: What do you suggest would be doing the thing properly?

Hon. J. CORNELL: Make the Bill a temporary measure and not a permanent one. To do the job properly we should face the situation and keep King's birthday on the right day, irrespective of sordid motives.

Hon. L. Craig: Under the Bill the Government can alter the date from year to year.

Hon. J. CORNELL: Why make an Aunt Sally of King's birthday? Let us honour the day on the date upon which it falls.

Hon. G. W. Miles: Even then it would be altered to the nearest Monday.

Hon. J. CORNELL: I am not agreeable to that either. The principle has always been to keep King's birthday on the day upon which it falls. I support the second reading of the Bill in the hope that uniformity will be achieved throughout the Commonwealth in keeping King's birthday on the actual day.

HON. H. S. W. PARKER (Metropolitan-Suburban) [6.4]: When controversy arose as to the date on which King's birthday should be celebrated, I was hoping that the Government would take into consideration all the various Acts, awards and other laws—if I may put it that way—which provide for various holidays, and that we should get uniformity. Where it is already provided that a certain number of holidays in the year shall be kept as consecutive days, the

effects are useful and beneficial. All businesses give their employees a fortnight's or three weeks' holiday annually, and the Government do the same. But interspersed with those holidays are a number of what may be termed loose holidays, which are inconvenient and unnecessary. Frequently it happens that holidays are not wanted, and the people on those days have nothing to do. Some people work on those days, and others do not. King's birthday is a holiday on which some people work while others do not. There are various holidays under the Bank Holidays Act on which one finds Commonwealth officials working and State officials not working. On other holidays State officials work and Commonwealth officials do not. Again, there are holidays on which insurance offices and banks are closed while all other forms of business are open. Then there are occasions when one finds the Supreme Court closed—for instance, on Whit Monday. All sorts of odd holidays are dotted throughout the year, and that is inconvenient for business. I regret that the Government have not seen fit to go into the question of a uniform set of holidays. As regards King's birthday, I cannot see any display of loyalty to the King when we are supposed to celebrate his birthday a month before the actual date. I believe that those who desire to celebrate his birthday in the ordinary way, would celebrate it after they finished their work on the 14th December. With all due respect to past Governments of this State and other States, I have never heard of any celebrations that celebrate the King's birthday. No doubt a salute will be fired on the 14th December; or possibly a salute will be fired on the 14th November—I do not know. But what does the Bill really mean? It really means that we are going to have a holiday on a certain date and are going to call it King's birthday. The Bill says in effect, "We do not care when the King was born, but we are going to have a holiday." The Government should go into the matter thoroughly before next session, and revise the whole of these bank holidays and court holidays, and get something uniform. If possible, this should be applied through the Arbitration Court as well. The present holidays are most confusing. I hope that next session we shall have before us something better than this Bill. Nobody knows when King's birthday will be celebrated next year. According to the Bill,

it will be celebrated on whatever date the Government may think fit. I make the suggestion that in the metropolitan area, where after all said and done the great bulk of the population is, the Royal Show will be a far more fitting occasion in connection with which to declare a complete public holiday than the half-and-half public holiday we have had hitherto. Show Day up to the present has been a half-and-half holiday, on which certain people work and others do not. The Royal Show would be a highly fitting occasion for the celebration of King's birthday. Some better measure than this Bill is needed to deal with the whole question of holidays.

HON. L. B. BOLTON (Metropolitan) [6.9]: I support the remarks of Mr. Parker. The question of holidays should be thoroughly overhauled, and some uniformity arrived at. The manner in which holidays are either kept or partly kept under present conditions is most disconcerting. We have Anniversary Day on the 26th January, Foundation Day on the 1st June and various other holidays. Factories and shops find this highly inconvenient. If holidays were definitely laid down and factories and shops forced to close on them, people would know just what was expected of them. With reference to the Bill before the House, I have already been approached by fully half-a-dozen different factories in and about the city with inquiries as to what is intended to be done on the 14th of this month. They ask, "Are we closing? Is it to be a universal holiday?" I support the second reading of the Bill in the hope that some time limit will be imposed during the Committee stage, and that before next session the Government will thoroughly overhaul the question of holidays, so that something definite may be arrived at. We should not have the present system, under which, as pointed out by Mr. Parker, banks close to-day, the Customs to-morrow, and so forth. The system does not operate fairly in a great many instances. In many industries a holiday such as King's birthday is paid. In other industries employees not working on that day lose their pay. If the matter is left open, factories which are slack could close and their employees would lose a day's pay. I suggest to the Government that during the recess they

overhaul the question of holidays on the lines suggested by Mr. Parker.

HON. G. B. WOOD (East) [6.11]: The Bill deals with King's birthday, and has nothing to do with any of the other holidays mentioned by Mr. Parker.

Hon. H. S. W. PARKER: We want it to.

Hon. G. B. WOOD: This is something entirely different. The Bill deals with the day on which the King's birthday shall be celebrated.

Hon. H. S. W. PARKER: No. It deals with the proclamation of it.

Hon. G. B. WOOD: Hardly any holiday is kept on the actual date. It is generally kept on the succeeding Monday. Anyhow, King's birthday would be kept on the actual date only once in seven years, when it happens to fall on a Monday.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Hon. V. Hamersley in the Chair: the Honorary Minister in charge of the Bill.

Clause 1—agreed to.

Clause 2—Governor may proclaim a day to be observed as the birthday of the reigning Sovereign:

Hon. H. S. W. PARKER: Do not a number of industrial awards provide a holiday on King's birthday?

The Honorary Minister: Yes.

Hon. H. S. W. PARKER: I submit that the Bill would not cover that holiday. I take it that the Public Service are intended to have the holiday on the same day. The Bill applies where any Act is made for the observance. I do not know whether it could be maintained that the Industrial Arbitration Act provides for this holiday. Should not the opening words of the clause be "Where under any Act or award of the Arbitration Court"?

Sitting suspended from 6.15 to 7.30 p.m.

The HONORARY MINISTER: During the tea adjournment, I made inquiries regarding the point raised by Mr. Parker. I have been advised that the Bill will override Acts of Parliament only, and will have no effect whatever with regard to awards of the Arbitration Court. Employers and employees will be free to make their own arrangements.

Hon. H. S. W. PARKER: In those circumstances the Bill will go but halfway and will only interfere with the Bank Holidays Act. I suggest to the Honorary Minister that he report progress and confer with the Employers' Federation and Trades Hall with a view to their agreeing to the inclusion of an amendment so as to bring awards as well as Acts within the scope of the Bill. That is really what the Government desire, and I feel sure that both the employers and Trades Hall would agree to that suggestion. If the Bill be agreed to, we might find the 14th November fixed for banks, insurance companies and shops, whereas Arbitration Court awards would decree that the employees should have their holiday on the 14th December. That would make confusion worse confounded.

Hon. J. CORNELL: Mr. Parker should be well aware that a proclamation cannot upset a decision of the Arbitration Court.

Hon. H. S. W. PARKER: I do not know that that is so, if an Act of Parliament says it can.

Hon. J. CORNELL: It would be very undesirable if that were so. The position that arises as between employer and employee is really one relating to a condition of contract. Anzac Day is a statutory holiday and it has always been a burning question with returned men that some have been required to work on that day while others have been granted a holiday. At the Midland Railway Workshops ex-A.I.F. men have been granted a holiday on that day, but that consideration has not been shown to ex-Imperial men. I do not know that any good purpose would be served by further adjourning the consideration of the Bill.

Hon. H. S. W. PARKER: If King's Birthday is declared to be a public holiday then shops and warehouses must close on that day. But in certain shops and factories industrial Arbitration Court awards apply, and some provide that King's Birthday shall be a holiday. That being so the employers affected must observe that day as a holiday in honour of the King's birthday. That is not the intention of the Government, and that position could be overcome by inserting the words "or award" in the appropriate place in the Bill. The intention is not to give the workers anything additional but merely to enable them to observe the holiday on one day instead of on another. As shops and factories will have to close on the 14th November, or on the Monday following

that date, obviously the employees cannot work there on that day, and some trouble might arise. The employees might claim that they were legally entitled to their wages for that day on the ground that they were shut out of the shops or factories. Then on the 14th December, which is the date fixed in the awards for the observance of the King's birthday, they could claim their holiday again. In that event the peculiar position would arise of the shop or factory being opened and no employees being present. That position could arise or, on the other hand, the employees could claim double time or time-and-a-half as their pay for that holiday. Of course, there would probably be a gentleman's agreement arrived at on the point, but if the claim were lodged, an industrial magistrate would be bound to order the employer to pay.

Hon. J. M. MACFARLANE: Mr. Parker has provided a real reason for further consideration. I recognise that under awards employers are not free agents. It will be remembered that some time ago the Transport Union, when Anzac Day fell on a Saturday, demanded holiday pay for work on that occasion. Rather than contest the point as similar circumstances would not arise again for many years, we paid as demanded. Something similar might arise regarding the holiday fixed in awards for the 14th December. I would be quite prepared to support the Government in their objective provided there were no repercussions, but I do not see that I can support the Bill in view of all the circumstances.

The HONORARY MINISTER: Out of deference to the wishes of members, I will report progress so that further inquiries may be made.

Progress reported.

BILL—LOTTERIES (CONTROL) ACT AMENDMENT.

Second Reading.

Debate resumed from the previous day.

HON. C. F. BAXTER (East) [7.43]: This Bill is one of our hardy annuals, and judging by the speeches of members who have preceded me, it seems certain to remain such. The principal Act was agreed to by this House on the ground that charities would benefit considerably from the proceeds of sweeps and, more particularly,

that the Act would at least materially restrict the many dangerous gambling devices, which at that time were in full swing. It was also contended that it would obviate the sending of large amounts annually to other parts of the Commonwealth for investment in sweeps. Notwithstanding the illegality of investing in sweeps in other parts of Australia, while the amount so invested has been reduced, money is still being spent in that direction. Everyone must admit that while there are very valid objections to the conduct of lotteries, there has been considerable improvement in the position as compared with that which existed in 1933. When I introduced the Bill for the parent Act in this House, I felt it an unpleasant duty. Had I considered it from a personal standpoint, I would not have been a party to it, but the great extent to which gambling in many different ways had entered into the lives of the people influenced me to take some action to protect the people against themselves. Consequently it was a choice of the lesser of two evils and I naturally chose this way as an improvement. Unfortunately, under the claims of charity the lotteries are being exploited far in advance of any commercial concern. I direct the attention of members to this morning's newspaper, wherein are many extraordinary advertisements appealing to the unsophisticated to invest in lottery tickets. There is no doubt that the money provided by the lotteries has been very beneficial to various charitable institutions, but on the other hand grants have been made to concerns which cannot, by any stretch of the imagination, be considered charities, and most certainly were never contemplated as such by the Government of which I was a member and so responsible to this House. Although the Lotteries Act and the Hospital Fund Act have relieved the Government expenditure, both apparently have influenced the Government and the Government departments in excessive expenditure in many directions. What might be termed free services are very much higher than they were before they were relieved from many commitments by these two Acts and by the Federal aid road grants which have freed the Government from sending money to aid local governing bodies. The Bill seeks to place the Lotteries Act on the statute-book permanently. Had one been disposed to agree to this, irrespective of other vagaries, the action of the Commis-

sion in regard to printing would warn them not to do so. Since Mr. Kenneally assumed the chairmanship of the Commission, he has done work characteristic of his usual habit of full-hearted application. I commend him for the services rendered by the making of country visits, which were very necessary and beneficial. Excellent results have been obtained. He has gone out to various parts of the country interviewing organised bodies, noting what the position was before a grant was made, and calculating what improvement would be brought about as a result of making the grant. I know of several occasions when his advice has been very beneficial to hospital boards. From my standpoint I sincerely hope that Mr. Kenneally will not give up those visits to the country, but will continue them for the reason that they have proved very beneficial. Prior to the inviting of tenders for the printing, the secretary called for prices from certain printers before Mr. Kenneally assumed office. This was a check on the Imperial Print, which I might add is controlled by ex-service men. Tenders were called by the Government Tender Board, but the Tender Board did not decide upon the successful tender. The tenders were handed over to Mr. Kenneally. They contained prices below those of the Worker Print. As the position was assuming an ugly aspect, Mr. Kenneally appointed a committee comprising Mr. Holman, secretary of the Printers' Union, Mr. Baldwin, an officer of the Government Printing Office, and Mr. Chappell, secretary of the Master Printers' Association. After some discussion Mr. Chappell became so incensed and so convinced that the printing was definitely designed for the Worker Print that he withdrew under protest. The question arises, what is the Government Tender Board constituted for? Seemingly, after calling for tenders, its services are concluded. Surely this board, which is constituted of 10 of the State's most capable heads of departments, well equipped with knowledge, should be a deciding factor, instead of which it was superseded by a union secretary, a Government Printer's representative and an employers' representative.

Hon. G. W. Miles: Is it not true that the Primary Producers' Association get their printing done by the same firm?

Hon. C. F. BAXTER: Yes, I believe that is right. But, as I ask, what is the Govern-

ment Tender Board constituted for if not to examine tenders and make recommendations? In view of these happenings, I regret that I cannot support the placing of the Act permanently on the statute-book. Rather do I feel, like other members who have spoken, prepared to allow it to be one of our hardy annuals. I am astounded at this printing incident, because Mr. Kenneally has the reputation of being a very strong man. He certainly stood up to a large body of employees when they wanted something which was not just. On another occasion he did what he thought was right, but that was only in respect of one concern and that a concern with which he himself had been associated for a large number of years. I do not think it can be said that the printing previously done for the Commission was at fault.

Hon. G. W. Miles: He was a strong man when he insisted upon the collection of 5s. from the sustenance workers.

Hon. C. F. BAXTER: I am not going into that. This, I think, is the first time that Mr. Kenneally has slipped, but slipped he has, and so I cannot support the Bill.

HON. W. J. MANN (South-West) [7.56]: Before I can promise to support the Bill I wish to make one or two suggestions. I was one who originally was very keen on the Government instituting State lotteries, because I recognised that each week a vast amount of money was going out of the State which should have been retained in the State, and that if we followed the lead of the other States and set up our own lotteries, we should conserve to our own charities quite a lot of money that would otherwise have been lost. The best feature about this Bill is the fact that a very large number of people who were not considered in a direct way givers to charities, and who will have their mild gamble, are purchasers of lottery tickets. Everyone who has bought a ticket in the lotteries knows that portion of the money paid is going into charities. That, I think, is one of the best reasons that can be advanced for the continuance of lotteries in this State. Some people say that if the lotteries were discontinued, it would be an impetus to direct giving. I do not think so, in fact I am certain it would not be. Because of the hospital tax, a great number of people say that they refuse to make straight-out gifts for the support of hospitals. It is true that in some towns and districts there are com-

mittee hospitals, and the committee has to raise money to supplement the Government grant for the institution; but I think the art of direct giving has become almost a thing of the past, at all events for charities. For that reason alone I think the Lotteries Commission is serving a good purpose. The time has arrived when there is no longer necessity for at all events more than one Commissioner. We have one Railway Commissioner, one Commissioner for Public Health, and hosts of other services that are conducted by one man. The Lotteries Commission is only a minor concern. Why three or four men are needed to control its activities is beyond me. One man beside the present secretary and the necessary clerks should be quite sufficient.

Hon. A. M. Clydesdale: No fear!

Hon. C. F. Baxter: The hon. member has been there.

Hon. W. J. MANN: I have yet to be convinced that the job is too big for one man. I am not partial to the idea of an honorary Commission, but it should be sufficient if some small payment were made to three or four men to allocate the money. They need meet only once or twice a month to control that side of the business. Some reference was made to advertising. Considering the amount of money involved and the profits made, there is not much ground for objection in that direction. I took the opportunity this morning to go to an official source to ascertain the actual amount spent in advertising on the last three consultations.

Hon. L. B. Bolton: By the Lotteries Commission?

Hon. W. J. MANN: Yes.

Hon. C. F. Baxter: I was referring to outside agents.

Hon. W. J. MANN: The consultations were Nos. 56, 57 and 58. On consultation No. 56, spread over the whole State, and including all phases of advertising, £202 was expended, or .11 per cent. of the subscription.

The Honorary Minister: A very small amount.

Hon. J. Cornell: What is the advertising for?

Hon. W. J. MANN: Does not the hon. member understand the meaning of the word?

Hon. J. Cornell: I thought the Act was passed to curtail gambling.

Hon. W. J. MANN: On consultation No. 57 the amount expended on advertising was £197, or .15 per cent., and on No. 58 the sum of £205 was spent, or 1.27 per cent.

Anyone who can cavil at that does not know much about publicity. It is very cheap publicity. Other States are prohibited from advertising in this State, but my recollection of the amount of money spent by the Queensland Government on advertising the Golden Casket is that the sum was many times greater than that which has been spent here. Considering the results achieved, and the charitable objects that have benefited, I think the expenditure was fully justified. I was more than surprised at the figures. They represent a 25 per cent. cut made by the Commission in their advertising allotment some little time ago. The initial advertising was greater than that. As the response has been beyond expectations, the expenditure has been cut down by 25 per cent.

Hon. C. F. Baxter: What about the agents?

Hon. W. J. MANN: Their advertising has nothing to do with this House or anyone else. If members will search the newspapers, they will find that there are no more persons advertising than there are fingers on my right hand. Certain figures were quoted in the House last year showing what people received from the sale of lottery tickets. Those people only get huge returns by reason of the fact that they put nearly all the money they made in the first 12 months into advertising. One man in particular, who knows the value of advertising, and has been in the atmosphere all his life, immediately saw the opportunity of something big. As his returns came in, he spent freely on advertising, and to-day is reaping the benefit. I understand there are something like 800 agents. More than 600 of these draw less than £1 per month from their selling commissions. That amounts to less than 5s. a week.

Hon. J. J. Holmes: Then 200 must be drawing many thousands a year.

Hon. W. J. MANN: Probably less than a dozen people are making big incomes. The majority of those handling tickets for the convenience of the public are making practically nothing out of the business. They probably saw in the sale of tickets the opportunity to popularise their business in other directions, but their drawings from the sale of tickets are infinitesimal. Some agents have told me the game is no good. People will come along and take a couple

of tickets and promise to fix up at the end of the week, but fail to do so.

The Honorary Minister: Perhaps until after the draw.

Hon. W. J. MANN: Consequently, the agent was minus not only his commission but the money he had to return to the Lotteries Commission. I realise that any reduction in commission would bear harshly upon 600 of the agents; nevertheless I think there should be some slight limitation in commissions earned over a certain figure.

Hon. H. V. Piesse: That is not done in the ordinary run of business.

Hon. W. J. MANN: A commission of 10 per cent. is fairly big. Whilst I have no firm convictions on the matter, I feel that in the larger communities of the metropolitan area sales are much more easily effected than they are in country towns or small suburban shops. One would hardly feel disposed to cut down the commission of the small salesmen, although I recognise that 10 per cent. is fairly high for the other people. My main objection to the Bill is the continuation of the present system of having more than one Commissioner. It will take a lot to convince me that one man cannot handle this business, with the assistance of a secretary and the necessary staff.

HON. A. CLYDESDALE (Metropolitan-Suburban) [8.10]: This measure has always led to argument to the effect that the commission on the sale of tickets should be reduced, and that the term of office for the Commissioners should not exceed 12 months. The Lotteries Commission has been operating for five years. The reason for its appointment was not to increase gambling, but to induce the public to spend their money in this State instead of contributing to sweeps elsewhere. Exception has also been taken to the expenditure on advertising. Members fail to realise that the Lotteries Commission has to face competition from the Eastern States, and that members of it are obliged to treat their job as a business and run it on business lines. If the sweeps are not successful, it will be said that they are incompetent. If the sweeps are oversubscribed, it will be said that they are taking too much money from the public. Suppose the Commissioners curtailed their activities! They have to consider the opposition from the Eastern States. The large

prizes given in the Eastern States will tend to attract money from this State. I was one of those who were instrumental in having the Lotteries Commission formed. Indeed, I may claim to have been principally responsible for its formation. I fought for ten years to have the money kept in the State. Millions of pounds have left Western Australia for sweep tickets. I am inclined to think that the lotteries have been too successful for some people, and that that is why the business is being criticised. I sympathise with anyone who is connected with the Commission because of what they have to put up with. I am very keen that the Lotteries Commission should take the Perth Hospital under its wing. We want a new Perth Hospital, and the Commission could build it within a reasonable time. When I was chairman of the Commission, I was offered all the money required, by one of the bank managers. It could have been raised for the Perth Hospital, and the building could have been erected within a reasonable time at a reasonable rate of interest. The Government could tell the Commission to set aside a certain sum of money each year. So that the job could be started immediately, I would give the Commission statutory power to borrow a certain amount, and let the Government provide the balance.

Hon. H. S. W. Parker: You would only want one manager then.

Hon. A. M. CLYDESDALE: Just as many would be required then as now.

Hon. H. S. W. Parker: If you gave all the money to one object?

Hon. A. M. CLYDESDALE: I said a certain amount should be given each year. The Lotteries Commission could be requested to set aside £15,000 a year for this object. Had that been done when the lotteries were first started, we would have had £75,000 now, and £15,000 a year out of the £80,000 that is being distributed set aside for that institution. What chance have we of obtaining a hospital unless something is done on those lines? We have been talking for years about the building of a new hospital. The Lotteries Commission made a grant of £15,000 for a new building at King Edward maternity hospital. That was several years ago and only just now a commencement has been made with the work. At the same rate of progress God only knows when a com-

mencement will be made with the work of erecting a new Perth Public Hospital.

Hon. H. S. W. Parker: It is like the Town Hall.

Hon. A. M. CLYDESDALE: We can leave the Town Hall out of it. The same argument applies to the commission that is given on the sale of tickets. Mr. Mann has stated the position. We are continually bearing comparisons made with the lotteries in the Eastern States. New South Wales conducts a lottery every four days and there are always people waiting in queues outside the lotteries office to be served. How is it possible to compare the lotteries conducted in that State with the lotteries conducted in Western Australia?

Hon. J. J. Holmes: Is that not a one-man job?

Hon. A. M. CLYDESDALE: I do not know, but I do know that there are 182 people employed in the office and here we have eight or ten.

Hon. J. J. Holmes: There is one Commissioner in New South Wales.

Hon. A. M. CLYDESDALE: That may be so. From what I can gather, there are 12 agents here that are showing a reasonable profit and some a good profit from the sale of tickets; but the average number of books sold by the agents outside those 12 is five per sweep. That means that each is making 25s. from the sale of the tickets. What a magnificent remuneration! Just a few shillings obtained from each sweep towards paying the rent of the premises in which the tickets are sold. This question has been gone into thoroughly and now we hear that we should not allow the ticket sellers to make such huge profits. There is a man here known as Whitty who is making a considerable sum of money per week, but at the same time a man whose premises are opposite cannot make £1 a week. Mr. Mann advocates the fixing of a commission on the basis of the number of tickets sold. How are we going to do that? How is it possible to fix commission on any kind of basis? I have never heard any concrete scheme put up to this Chamber on the question of the sale of tickets. Anyway, why should we penalise a man for being successful in respect of the sale of tickets?

Members: Impossible!

Hon. A. M. CLYDESDALE: Of course it is impossible.

Hon. H. S. W. Parker: They would carry on just the same.

Hon. A. M. CLYDESDALE: The advertisements that are appearing in the Press are being paid for by the agents—who are making the money—instead of the Lotteries Commission. If we stop advertising, the sale of tickets will be curtailed. One hon. member said that the expenses should be reduced to 10 per cent. It was just a bald statement. Nothing was said in support of it and no figures were given. It is costing 14 per cent. to-day to run the lotteries and I say that is a reasonable figure. If we reduce it to 10 per cent., we will make the sweeps less popular than they are. What are the members of the Commission to do?

Hon. C. H. Wittenoom: Why will it make the sweeps less popular?

The PRESIDENT: I ask members not to interject. There will be opportunities when the Bill is in Committee for them to ask questions.

Hon. A. M. CLYDESDALE: I am quite prepared to admit that some agents are making too much money, but no one has yet been able to evolve a scheme to overcome that. If we reduce the commission, many of the agents will not bother about attempting to sell tickets. Although each agent, outside the few that I mentioned, is selling only five books in respect of each sweep, in the aggregate it means a considerable number of books being sold. That has really brought about the success of the consultations—the large number of people selling tickets, even though each one is selling only a few books. Mr. Holmes advocated the opening of offices in various parts of the State for the sale of tickets. On an average of five books each, would they not grow very fat from the sales? This was tried in the city, but the people said, "No, we prefer to go to the lucky agents." I repeat that the sale of tickets must be conducted in conjunction with a business of some kind.

Hon. W. J. Mann: Tickets in New South Wales are sold only in the Sydney office.

Hon. A. M. CLYDESDALE: But how can we compare Western Australia with New South Wales? Why, we are only like a suburb of Sydney. It is not possible to make a comparison.

Hon. J. J. Holmes: According to you, even the Commission cannot sell tickets.

Hon. A. M. CLYDESDALE: People will not walk down to the head office of the Lotteries Commission to buy tickets. Reference has been made to the Commissioners' visits

to country hospitals, and members have declared that those visits are not justified. I say they are justified in every respect. The trips are made only once in a certain direction and then only once in every two or three years. Many applications are received by the Commission for assistance and the members of the Commission have a better opportunity of finding out the value of the requests by personal visits to the places. We have heard arguments against the appointment of more than one Commissioner. Mr. Kenneally is an excellent chairman but I will not give Mr. Kenneally or any other man the power to distribute by himself £80,000 per annum—

Members: Hear, hear!

HON. A. M. CLYDESDALE: I do not care who that man might be. The main work of the Lotteries Commission is not solely in the distribution of the money. There is abundant work for the whole of the staff to do. If members who have spoken were in the office of the Commission, and were able to learn the manner in which the acid was put on the members of the Commission, they would say "God help the man who attempts to carry out this job alone." The members of the Commission go thoroughly into the applications that are received for assistance and every year comparisons are made and sometimes some hot arguments take place before finality is arrived at. It would be giving too much power to one man to say, "You alone are to distribute £80,000 per annum." What are the members of the Lotteries Commission to do? Are they expected to go ahead and make a financial success of the consultations by selling as many tickets as possible, or are we to say to them that they are to curtail their operations? I have received letters from ladies representing various organisations and in the main I agree with what they say. But they never point out how it is possible to prevent money going to the Eastern States. If they can do that, and show us how we are to finance the hospitals and other institutions, then I will support them and not before. If the consultations here are to compete with those of the Eastern States they must not be hampered in any way. Just look at the sweeps that have been conducted in connection with the Melbourne Cup. Queensland conducted a lottery of 200,000 tickets at 15s. each, and the first prize was £50,000. In this State the

public will not agree to the Lotteries Commission conducting big sweeps. It would be much better to have the bigger consultations because the public go for the big money, and so a considerable sum goes out from the State for investment in those lotteries that offer the substantial prizes. More money has left the State this year than for many years past on account of the bigger inducements offered by the Eastern States lotteries. I do not know that it matters very much whether we limit the existence of the Lotteries Commission to one or three years. From what I have gathered from the speeches that have been made on the Bill the period is going to be one year, but we must give the commission some objective, and I do hope that the Government will say to the members of the commission, "It is your duty to build the Perth Public Hospital with our assistance, and you must do it." I support the second reading of the Bill.

HON. C. G. ELLIOTT (North-East) [7.55]: It is my intention to support the second reading of the Bill for the following reasons: Firstly it can be said that the majority of the people in this State are in accord with the idea and the necessity for State lotteries. It is well to realise that the State lotteries system of raising money for hospitals and other charitable institutions is here to stay; secondly it must be recognised that the lotteries have performed very good work because of the financial assistance they have rendered to the hospitals and other institutions. When we remember that in this vast and sparsely populated State of ours we have a very large number of hospitals to attend to, a greater number of hospitals than that in Victoria, we must realise the importance the lotteries are playing in assisting the institutions in this State. It has been said by various speakers that the lotteries were responsible for the drying up of contributions from the charitably disposed public. I do not agree with that statement. Had the blame been placed on the depression, or on the incidence of the hospital tax of 1½d. in the pound, I am sure that would have been nearer the mark. The Lotteries Commission has been blamed for the high percentage of cost in running the sweeps. I think if we were to blame Parliament for laying down arbitrary laws and in not providing a reasonable and workable Act, that would be closer to the truth.

Hon. C. B. Williams: What do you suggest? Would you amend the Bill?

Hon. C. G. ELLIOTT: Take for instance one provision in the Act where it is set out that only 15 consultations shall be conducted per annum. The result is that each consultation is over-subscribed, and that in itself is responsible for unnecessary expenditure, I understand, to the extent of £30 per consultation. This is brought about by the checking and refilling the barrels with the marbles. In New South Wales where there are no arbitrary rules, each sweep is closed on the sale of 100,000 tickets and the 100,000 marbles representing the tickets remain in the barrel where they are sealed by the Auditor General after each drawing. The Auditor General, who is also present at the drawing, checks and returns the drawn marbles and again locks and seals the barrel. The simplicity of the procedure should appeal to us. I hope when the Bill comes before us again next session it will be possible to amend it in the direction of assisting the Commission. I support the second reading.

THE HONORARY MINISTER (Hon. E. H. Gray—West) [8.30]: I desire to support the Bill, and I hope it will be carried without amendment. I do not agree with much of the criticism levelled against it nor against the Government in respect of the appointment of the members of the Commission. Mr. Holmes made caustic remarks with regard to the retirement of the Mayor of Fremantle from the Commission membership. The Mayor of Fremantle was a member of the Commission, and I consider it is good policy in connection with organisations of that character to spread the selection of representatives over as many people as possible—people interested in that particular kind of work. The Mayor of Fremantle has rendered great public service to the State. He holds a lot of positions. He is the Government nominee on the Milk Board, is chairman of the Fremantle Tramways, is on the Fire Brigades Board, while his office as Mayor of Fremantle involves considerable work and takes up a lot of his time. Besides that he has to earn his own living. His hands are very full. The man appointed in his place on the Lotteries Commission was not a strong Labour Party man and he has filled the position with very great efficiency and has done good work. No ex-

ception could be taken to his appointment. Mr. Bolton was inconsistent in his address. First he complained of the Commission giving relief to the unemployed, and then he complained because assistance was not given to the scheme for the employment of youths. It is therefore hard to understand his arguments. I take strong exception to the remarks made with regard to the object of the appointment of the Commission. It was never stated by any responsible authority that the object of the Commission was to abolish street appeals. Mr. Bolton said that there were 52 street appeals in the year. As a matter of fact there are only about eight or nine street appeals in the year. If collectors were available, between £200 to £400 could be obtained any Friday provided the collectors were placed at vantage points in the city and the collection was being made for a good cause. That is a great tribute to the generosity of Western Australian people. There is as much money being raised to-day by voluntary effort as ever there was in the history of the State, with the exception perhaps of the collections for hospitals; and the Commission has not been responsible for the curtailment of moneys collected for hospitals. The hospital tax is responsible. If Mr. Munsie's first Bill had been carried we would not have had that trouble with regard to the hospital tax. The average individual to-day thinks that the 1½d. in the pound tax should provide and does provide ample funds to build and maintain hospitals throughout the State. We know that that is not correct. It would be a bad thing if street appeals were abolished. It is within the power of the Police Department, were it Government policy, to stop any street appeal to-morrow. People require to have the permission of the Police Department before they can run a street appeal, but there is no Government, either the Labour Government or any other Government, that would dare to issue an instruction to the police which would abolish street appeals. The success of the Commission has been such that it has encouraged people to raise money by voluntary effort. This has been an outcome of the Commission's visits to the country. Mr. Kenneally makes a strong point of this. His idea is not to go into the country to push the sale of tickets but to encourage

country communities to work with a view to gathering money to help themselves. It is astounding to consider the amount of money that people are raising all over Western Australia for various charitable enterprises in the State. It would be a sorry day for Western Australia if people became so self-satisfied, so selfish and so complacent that they considered it unnecessary to appeal to the public for money. I would be sorry to see a day come when such a state of affairs existed. The Commission to-day encourages people to raise money. The only drawback is that the number of people prepared to go out and work in an honorary capacity to raise funds is smaller than it used to be years ago. The cause, I think, is a growing selfishness on the part of our young people, many of whom to-day are concerned only about running clubs for their own pleasure, and are not prepared to devote a certain part of their leisure time to assist the various movements rendering a social service to the people. Members of the Commission are to be commended for what they have done in this regard. I do not agree with the statements made by Mr. Hall in regard to the Perth Public Hospital. The publicity given to the Perth Public Hospital authorities and those who came from the Eastern States and made certain suggestions for the improvements of our hospitals has been very much overdone. Certainly we do urgently want a modern Perth Hospital, but the hospital is not as bad as it was painted by those who came from the Eastern States, and who, I believe, led people astray. We need a bigger hospital, but the hospital is not nearly so hard pushed as the publicity people of the Perth Hospital would lead us to believe. It is necessary that the Act should be made permanent for three years, as pointed out by Mr. Clydesdale, so that the Commission may take a long-range policy and make plans to build up the Perth Hospital.

Hon. J. Cornell: The Act does not provide for that.

The HONORARY MINISTER: Twelve months is too short for a long-range policy to be adopted. If the members of the Commission is carried without amendment the Commission will be able to undertake a long-range policy.

Hon. J. J. Holmes: The Bill proposes to give them a permanent life.

Hon. J. Cornell: Eternal life.

The HONORARY MINISTER: I believe in that. Why should we have this argument every session? Why should we not settle down to a permanent institution and let the Commission do as much as it can in the interests of the public of Western Australia? I support the second reading of the Bill and I hope it will not be amended.

HON. T. MOORE (Central) [8.40]: In supporting the Bill I would say that to get an impartial view of the work done one has to look back a few years. I could not understand anybody wishing to revert to the position which existed before the Commission was set up. Mr. Mann was one of those who voiced the very strong opinion at that time that something ought to be done about the matter. Hon. members will recollect that at that time one could not go down the street at any period of the day without being approached by men, women and children asking one to subscribe to a lottery.

Hon. L. B. Bolton: It is nearly as bad to-day.

Hon. T. MOORE: I will deal with that remark as I go along. That was the position then. It has been said here that there is some extravagance with regard to the amount the Commission is costing. I recollect statements being made that the promoters of the particular sweeps which were in existence before the appointment of the Commission were getting 40 per cent. commission. Those sweeps were run by private enterprise, and promoters were getting 40 per cent. for their own profit.

Hon. J. Cornell: I know one or two who got the lot.

Hon. T. MOORE: That may be so, too. That was what happened in those days when the holding of the lotteries was uncontrolled. Almost anybody could set himself up as a sweep promoter and start a get-rich-quick campaign.

The Honorary Minister: They did well, too.

Hon. T. MOORE: When the Commission was brought in by Act of Parliament, many men suffered in this State. It will be recollected that in the cleaning up which was necessary men who never should have suffered politically did suffer. I am surprised to think that anybody should find fault at

the amount it costs to collect this £80,000 a year in Western Australia. The charge is very small indeed. It has been stated that there is too much advertising. I am one of those who are not prepared to see too much advertising. I do not wish to see it overdone, nor do I wish to see the spectacle that we witnessed in days gone by. It is made out that we are, through the operations of the Lotteries Commission, taking everybody along the road to be first-class gamblers. Let us see what that amounts to. In the old days on the gold-fields, in order to run their own hospitals, men contributed £2 or £3 a year out of their own pockets. They are doing it to-day. If any man in the street here to-day subscribed to all the lotteries, to the whole 15 which are held in a year, knowing that his money was to go into charitable channels—into hospitals and other deserving places—he would only contribute 37s. 6d. in the year. So that we are not spending very much money. There is not much gambling being done in that direction. It has been remarked that you must offer the public something before they will subscribe to charities. They will not subscribe money straight out. They will take this forlorn hope of getting something back for the half-a-crown they invest. But as for any harm accruing to a growing family, I consider that there are many influences at work in the community more likely to make gamblers of a growing family than the existence of the lotteries. There are many other forms of gambling much more conducive to teaching growing youths to become gamblers. On that account I am not misled by letters we have had read although I know that the ladies whole-heartedly believe that we are doing the wrong thing. I do not condemn them for the stand they are taking but they have not seen as much of the world as some of us who have hit it along the road in various places. I maintain that we are doing little or no harm from the point of view of gambling; neither are we inducing young people to indulge in gambling as those good ladies would have us believe. The reference to the visit of the Lotteries Commissioners to the country was really responsible for my rising to speak. In order that we might get something like a fair deal, we want the Commissioners to visit the country. Their headquarters are in the city, where everybody can buttonhole them. As the former chairman of the lotteries said, the acid is put on fairly solidly.

And so it is, daily, too. What chance have the people of the country to do that? Little or none. It has been suggested that members who represent country constituencies should not go to the lotteries office in order to put up a case for their areas. When the Commissioners visited the country—they have been only once to the large area I represent—they had a good opportunity to see what had been done with the money provided for that district. They were also able to gauge what would be done with money that had been asked for, and so for a good while ahead they will be fully conversant with the position, and will be able to act accordingly. Therefore it was a trivial matter to refer to, especially as the visit was made at very small expense. I hope the Commissioners will find it possible to go to the country more often in future than they have done in time gone by. The cost of their visit was fully warranted in view of the allocation of such large sums of money, and so I hope that such criticism will not be heard here again. On the question of making this legislation permanent I point out that we have had five years' experience of it, and I would certainly be content to see it continued at all events for five years. What have we learnt from the debate in this House after five years' experience of this legislation? The criticism has been so trifling that now is the time to decide what is to happen for the next five years. As there has been no worth-while criticism of the events of that five years, members should agree to give the Act a five-years duration at any rate. Commissioners will come and go, but let us have the Act for five years in order, as Mr. Clydesdale said, that something might be done for the Perth Hospital. I join issue with Mr. Gray regarding the Perth Hospital. I visit the institution occasionally and am not proud of it, particularly regarding its cramped condition. The patients are crowded out. On each of my visits the accommodation has been overcrowded, and everyone who has visited the institution will readily admit that. If the Commission had a tenure of five years I believe that something could be done to improve the hospital. I might be asked why I am interested in the Perth Hospital, seeing that I represent a country constituency. Let me say that numbers of patients from the country go to the Perth Hospital, because the outback areas have not the facilities with which to treat certain cases.

The Honorary Minister: Send some of them to Fremantle. We have room there.

Hon. T. MOORE: We are quite satisfied with the Perth Hospital treatment, though we want to see it enlarged and improved so that all concerned, including patients, doctors and nurses, might have something better. I hope members will take a broad view of the Bill and not adhere to the idea that it should be brought up for discussion every year. There has been no solid criticism of the last five years, the lotteries have come to stay, and, given a better standing, will accomplish much better work in the next five years. I support the Bill.

HON. E. M. HEENAN (North-East) [8.51]: I support the Bill. I have listened with interest to the speeches made in favour of and in opposition to the measure, and have been impressed by the remarks of those who have supported the proposal to make the Act permanent. I have had an opportunity to see some of the work made possible by the Commission in places like Laverton, Leonora, Menzies and Esperance. Although some people argue that the establishment of the lotteries has tended to increase the gambling propensities of the people, I, having seen what has been accomplished in the places mentioned, believe that the good done far outweighs whatever might be urged against the lotteries. I was impressed with the remarks of Mr. Clydesdale. The suggestion regarding the Perth Hospital alone warrants the passing of this Bill. Everyone realises that if the Commissioners have a definite term of three years ahead, their work will be facilitated, and they will be enabled to draw up a more comprehensive plan and carry out the functions of the Act more adequately.

THE CHIEF SECRETARY (Hon. W. H. Kitson—West—in reply) [8.53]: It was only to be expected that the introduction of this Bill would arouse a certain amount of discussion and create argument against the proposals contained in the measure because, for some years past, there has been a clear division of thought amongst various sections of people as to whether Governments should take any steps to legalise what one section consider to be an evil. There is the other school of thought who

consider that, while lotteries might be an evil, they are something that the public of Australia, and the people of this State in particular, desire, and that it is far better to have that so-called evil regulated and controlled in a form somewhat similar to, if not exactly in the manner in which it is controlled to-day. Those who subscribe to that view have every reason to do so because, as pointed out by Mr. Moore, only a few years have elapsed since the condition of affairs in this city regarding the sale of lottery and sweep tickets, unauthorised by anybody, prevailed, the results of which sweeps and lotteries did not always reach the object intended, but more often than not gave very big returns to private individuals. It is a fact that one could not walk down the street on any day without being importuned to buy a ticket, not in one lottery but in many lotteries. It is perfectly true to say that the present position is far preferable to that which prevailed then. We have had five years' experience of the control of lotteries, and we know the very urgent requirements, not only of the Perth Hospital, but of many other charitable institutions, and the Government believe that the time has arrived when members of this House would agree that there would be no harm in making the Act permanent and extending the period of office of members of the Commission from one year to three years in order that the Commissioners, no matter who they might be, may put into operation a long-range policy. This they cannot do to-day, because the Act is on the statute-book for one year only, whereas under the provisions of the Bill, they could give to hospitals and charitable institutions far more effective assistance than has been possible up to date. The reasons I have outlined, I consider, are sufficient justification for the proposals in the Bill. When I moved the second reading I realised that the Bill would arouse a lot of discussion, but I never dreamt for a moment that members would be so hard-pressed for arguments against the Bill as to descend to the type of argument they have used. They have not been content to criticise the principles underlying the Bill or the control of the lotteries. They have gone further. They have offered gratuitous insults in some instances to men whom they do not even know. Merely because those men are supposed to

have a leaning towards one political party, they have been offered gratuitous insults. I want to say to one or two of those members that the men who were criticised are just as good as, if not a little better than, their traducers.

Hon. W. J. Mann interjected.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: I am trying to use parliamentary language. At times I find it very hard to reply and give vent to my feelings in a way that will not call forth your displeasure, Mr. President. I was very pleased to hear one member last night draw attention to what he termed the piety and eloquence that had been evoked in this Chamber by the presence of a few ladies. I want to tell him that he was mistaken—no doubt honestly mistaken. It was not piety he was listening to at all, but sheer hypocrisy.

The PRESIDENT: Order! I think the hon. member ought not to reflect upon members of the Chamber.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: As I have said, Mr. President, I find it difficult to express myself on matters of that kind in a way that is parliamentary.

Hon. J. Cornell: They have said much harder things about me than I have ever said about them.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: That may be. Criticism of that kind does not get us anywhere. It does not alter the fact that the Lotteries Commission is constituted to-day to do a certain job. I believe I am right when I say that the present Commissioners have given every satisfaction to 99 per cent. of the people who have had any dealings with them. Again, the debate on the Bill has caused members to make statements which they probably believe but which are not in accordance with the facts. At the same time I have a feeling that in view of so many members having already committed themselves, hook, line and sinker, to oppose the Bill as it stands, it would be futile for me to endeavour to follow them through all the statements they have made. I do consider it desirable, however, at least to deal with a few of those statements. In the first place I would refer to a statement made by Mr. Cornell in drawing a comparison between distribution of funds by the Western Australian Lotteries Commission and distribution of funds by the Queensland Golden Casket. The hon. member stated definitely that all the funds from the Queensland lotteries were spent on hospital maintenance

and equipment. He further said that the hospital system of Queensland to-day was the best in Australasia because of the operations of the Golden Casket and the large sums of money expended, as a result, on the various hospitals. It may be admitted that as the result of moneys received from the Golden Casket the Queensland hospitals have had large funds at their disposal. It may also be admitted that the Queensland hospital system is something of which the people of that State may well be proud. But it is not correct to say that the whole of the money raised by the Golden Casket was spent on Queensland hospitals because there is a marked similarity between the distribution of Golden Casket funds and the distribution of funds from our lotteries. A number of Queensland institutions which receive pecuniary contributions from the Golden Casket are very similar to numerous Western Australian institutions catered for by our Lotteries Commission. In addition, in Queensland clothing and monetary assistance to unemployed are provided out of Golden Casket funds. The Queensland items of distribution to a great extent cover the main items of distribution by our Lotteries Commission. Mr. Cornell had something to say with regard to the method of distribution here. I would like to tell the hon. member and this Chamber that comparatively recently our Lotteries Commission reviewed the various disbursements which have been made annually during several years. As a result of that review the Commission does not now in some cases contribute as much as had been contributed previously, whereas in other cases more is contributed than has been given in the past. The reason is that the Commissioners inquired into the real necessities of the institutions in question. Where the Commissioners were satisfied that there was a real necessity for more money, they found more money. Where they were not satisfied that there was necessity for such large sums of money, they were strong enough to say, "We do not think you really require so much," and a reduction was made. That reminds me also that there has been some discussion regarding the necessity for the present number of Commissioners. Let me say that I am not wedded to a Commission of four, but I also say there is a lot in what was urged by Mr. Clydesdale, that he did not think it would be right for one

Commissioner to have the distribution of the amount of money raised through lotteries in this State. One hon. member said there was only one Commissioner in New South Wales. I speak subject to correction, but I think that in New South Wales the Commissioner is not concerned with the distribution of funds, but is solely occupied with their raising. As regards Western Australia, according to returns which I receive as Minister from time to time, I am more than convinced that there is ample work not only for the Chairman of the Lotteries Commission but also for another Commissioner or other Commissioners. I repeat, I am not wedded to a Commission of four. But the number of requests received by the Lotteries Commission from all parts of the State—every one of them needing and receiving the attention of the Commission—is so large that it must take a considerable amount of time to sift out those which are really worthy of consideration from the Commission's point of view. Thereupon the Commissioners have to determine the extent to which the requests should be granted. One can readily see that requests are put forward frequently for much larger sums than those who make the requests really hope to get. We know that that is the method frequently employed. Probably £1,000 is asked for when £500 would be more than welcome. So it is that the Lotteries Commission, carrying on work of that kind, find a fair amount of activities occupying their time. I am doubtful whether there are many men in this city or in this State who would be able, even though they might be inclined, to give the necessary time to the position of Lotteries Commissioner; that is, to the same degree as the Commissioners now operating. There are many other phases of Commission work that do not come under the public eye but which require a good deal of attention. I think I am correct in saying that never a day goes by but there are requests, not only for money, but for permission to conduct sweeps or lotteries, large or small, for charitable purposes. All these things have to be dealt with by the Commission. Moreover, the Commissioners have to be consistent. They must lay down a policy. They must be fair to all sections of the community and all portions of the State. Consequently I say, notwithstanding statements made during this debate, that much of the work done by the Commissioners is

not really understood by members who have spoken on the Bill. One matter I wish specially to refer to because during the second reading debate it has been mentioned in a manner I consider derogatory to the present members of the Lotteries Commission. It relates to the question of printing, first raised by Mr. Cornell. I do not want to go into a great deal of detail, but I do desire to inform the House that the records of the Commission show that until that time no quotations had been obtained for the printing required by the Commission, and that up to that time the printing had always been given to one firm. The present Chairman of the Commission decided that that had to stop. He considered that the Commission's requirements should, wherever possible, be obtained from Government departments. In regard to the printing he and his fellow-Commissioners considered that it was time tenders were called for the necessary printing. As the result of calling for tenders the Lotteries Commission has saved at the rate of £250 on the printing which has been done this year. I suggest that the mere fact of calling for tenders which resulted in a saving even if it be only £250—on £1,300 a rather large percentage—is something on which the Commission should be congratulated rather than criticised as they have been for not having continued a system which apparently was costing £250 a year unnecessarily.

Hon. W. J. Mann: Did they accept the lowest quotation?

The CHIEF SECRETARY: I do not think they did.

Hon. W. J. Mann: Possibly they could have saved more.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: Perhaps they could, but without getting the satisfaction they are getting at the present time. The hon. member knows full well that it is not always the lowest tender which is accepted, and that often the lowest tender is not necessarily the most advantageous.

Hon. J. Cornell: "The Worker" is not the only printing office in Perth that can do the work.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: Mr. Holmes suggested that if the Act were made a permanent statute, Parliament would lose control of the Commission's activities. I believe the hon. member on previous occa-

sions took a prominent part in insisting that certain accounts should be presented and laid on the Table of the House monthly or after the drawing of every lottery. The Act will not be altered in that respect; it contains provisions whereby the auditing of the accounts and financial affairs of the Commission is in a position in which the accounts of no other concern in this State are. The Lotteries Commission at present have two sets of auditors. The hon. member was keen to see that there should be no loophole, and as a result we have today not only a private firm of auditors looking after the accounts and financial affairs of the Lotteries Commission, but also the Auditor General. That is laid down by the Act and if there is one alteration required to the measure it is an amendment to save the Commission the additional expenditure that is incurred as the result of two sets of auditors dealing with the accounts of the Commission.

Hon. J. J. Holmes: I think the Auditor General should do the job.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: I agree, but that is the position. A private firm and the Auditor General are both concerned in the work of auditing, because the Act says it must be so.

Hon. L. Craig: Why did you not include an amendment dealing with that in the Bill?

The CHIEF SECRETARY: I think I would be justified in doing that.

Hon. J. J. Holmes: It is not too late now.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: I think perhaps we have had quite sufficient with regard to the Bill so far, and I am afraid it really does not matter what I say because most members have committed themselves to such an extent that it is hardly possible to affect their decision.

Hon. J. J. Holmes: It is not what you say but what we want you to do.

Hon. W. J. Mann: Try us from a new angle.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: Criticism has been offered regarding the Commissioners travelling about the country. I have been asked to inform members that the Commissioners did not make those visits until they were asked to do so.

Hon. J. M. Macfarlane: They were invited.

Hon. L. Craig: And they should make those visits.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: They were invited to visit the country centres because

the people considered that unless they did so, the Commissioners could not take a proper view of the financial problems affecting those particular districts. As a result of those visits, I am justified in saying that the members of the Commission are able to deal with applications with the advantage of first-hand knowledge of what is necessary in the particular districts concerned. Communications between those districts and the Lotteries Commission will be more readily understood, and it will now be far easier for members of the Commission to come to a decision as to the amounts to be fairly allocated for district requirements. I would like also to refer to a statement made by Mr. Bolton with regard to street collections. Members of the Lotteries Commission have no control whatever over street collections.

Hon. J. M. Macfarlane: Who is in control of that?

The CHIEF SECRETARY: The Police Department.

Hon. L. B. Bolton: What about lotteries and raffles?

The CHIEF SECRETARY: The Lotteries Commission has to give permission for lotteries and raffles to be conducted, but in those instances the decisions are submitted to the Minister from time to time. It was never intended that with the establishment of the Lotteries Commission there would be an end to every charitable effort in the form of a sweep or a lottery.

Hon. C. F. Baxter: You are quite right.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: It was intended that the Lotteries Commission would regulate them, and would not grant permission to every applicant to conduct a sweep. It was intended that we would get away from the old condition of affairs that I have already described, and that the Commission would be able to take steps to ensure that the particular objective, for which a lottery was conducted, would receive the benefit of the money to which it was entitled. The members of the Lotteries Commission can rightfully claim that they have succeeded to that extent. If Mr. Bolton suggested that the Commission had granted too many applications for the conduct of raffles or lotteries, one could not complain at his expression of his point of view. But if he could only see the large number of applications that have been refused, he would then understand what position the Commissioners are placed in when dealing with matters of that description. Then again, I would like

to remind the House that prior to the establishment of the Lotteries Commission certain organisations had been practically given the right over a period of years to conduct one big lottery annually. In some instances I think I am correct in saying that while those organisations had been in the habit of conducting those sweeps or lotteries, I have received complaints that following upon the establishment of the Lotteries Commission those organisations have not been granted permission to conduct their annual lotteries and, in addition, have not received much support from the Commission. Speaking by and large on that particular point, I can say very sincerely that the Lotteries Commission have dealt with such matters to the best of their ability. They have made all possible inquiries and have endeavoured to carry out the provisions of the Act as it was intended they should do. One argument against the continuance of the Act was that since the Commission has operated, direct giving has dropped to zero. Some surprise was expressed by some members this afternoon when my colleague, the Honorary Minister, Mr. Gray, made a statement to the effect that more money was being raised to-day by means of direct contributions than for many years past. I think there is a good deal of truth in what he said. The members of the Lotteries Commission frequently make it a condition that a certain amount of money must be raised by means of local efforts before they will contribute anything towards their assistance. I believe that by that method a considerable amount of money has been raised as a result of direct giving. By means of entertainments of various descriptions and in other ways the amount of money raised would easily be equal to that contributed formerly in the history of the districts concerned. While it may be perfectly true to say that a large number of people do not give directly towards the maintenance of hospitals now, compared with the experience in years gone by, it cannot be claimed that that is as the result of the establishment of the Lotteries Commission. In country districts where assistance has been received from the Lotteries Commission, it has always been insisted that the local people must make a contribution towards the upkeep of the hospital. So I conclude by saying that, in my opinion, the Lotteries Commission has justified its existence. It has certainly brought about a state of affairs far prefer-

able to that which existed prior to its establishment. Knowing the chairman and the members of the Commission as I do, I appreciate full well that they would be only too pleased if they could inaugurate what I have already described as a long-range policy of assistance, not only to the Perth Hospital but to other deserving institutions in the State. What Mr. Clydesdale said is perfectly true. If the members of the Commission had a longer tenure than they have at present, more than one financial institution would be prepared to guarantee the amount of money necessary for purposes of that description, because they would know that the Lotteries Commission was in a position to earmark a sum of money annually, perhaps £15,000 or £20,000 as Mr. Clydesdale suggested, which would meet interest and sinking fund charges and by that means it would be quite possible to finance the raising of a large sum of money. On the other hand, no financial institution would consider for one moment doing anything of the kind in view of the fact that it was quite possible for the Act to lapse within 12 months.

Hon. L. Craig: In any case, the Act could always be repealed, and the financial institutions would have to be guaranteed by the Government as well.

THE CHIEF SECRETARY: At present the Act is operative for 12 months only. If members here vote in accordance with the way they have talked, the Act will cease to operate at the end of this year. There can be no question about that. In the circumstances they cannot expect any financial institution to consider a proposition of that kind while there is a risk of that taking place. I have not set out to endeavour to justify the running of lotteries, but I have tried, in as temperate a manner as possible, to justify the activities of the Lotteries Commission under the provisions of the Act. Whether that Commission is allowed to carry on from year to year or whether the Act is to be made a permanent measure, members can rest assured that the present Commissioners or anyone else appointed in their places will be keen to do what is humanly possible to assist the various charitable institutions that have been assisted to date and may require assistance in the future. I have a great deal of confidence in the present chairman and I was pleased to hear more than one member remark to-day on

the fact that he has a very fine reputation. I have every confidence in the other members of the Commission and I feel sure that, irrespective of the very much undeserved criticism offered regarding them during this debate, they will be only too pleased to carry on and do the best that is possible under the Act they are administering. I had hoped when I introduced the Bill that the House would agree to the proposals contained therein but I now realise from the way members have spoken that there is little chance of that. If the House determines that the Act shall be extended for a further period of one year only, it means that the other amendment included must go by the board, and in the circumstances the Commissioners cannot be appointed for a longer period than 12 months. But I want to urge upon members of the House that unless they agree to the Bill it will be necessary for the Act to come up for revision again next session. In the meantime they should give a little more consideration to this subject with a view to assisting in the way we desire them to assist, by giving the Commissioners an opportunity to conduct a long range policy which will lead to greater benefits to the hospitals and other organisations than it is possible for them to get under existing conditions.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Hon. J. Cornell in the Chair; the Chief Secretary in charge of the Bill.

Clause 1—agreed to.

Clause 2—Amendment of Section 3 of the principal Act:

Hon. H. SEDDON: I propose to move that Clause 2 be deleted.

The CHAIRMAN: The hon. member will vote against the clause.

Hon. H. SEDDON: It is unnecessary for me to reiterate the arguments I have already used against the clause, so I will just say I hope it is defeated.

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

Ayes	7
Noes	14
Majority against ..	7

AYES.	
Hon. A. M. Clydesdale	Hon. W. H. Kitson
Hon. J. M. Drew	Hon. C. B. Williams
Hon. E. H. Gray	Hon. C. G. Elliott
Hon. E. M. Heenan	(Teller.)
NOES.	
Hon. C. F. Baxter	Hon. H. S. W. Parker
Hon. L. Craig	Hon. H. Seddon
Hon. E. H. H. Hall	Hon. H. Tuckey
Hon. V. Hamersley	Hon. C. H. Wittenoom
Hon. J. J. Holmes	Hon. G. R. Wood
Hon. J. M. Macfarlane	Hon. E. H. Angelo
Hon. W. J. Mann	(Teller.)
Hon. G. W. Miles	
AYES.	
Hon. G. Fraser	NOES.
Hon. T. Moore	Hon. A. Thomson
	Hon. H. V. Piesse

Clause thus negatived.

Clause 3—Section 21 of the principal Act repealed:

Hon. H. SEDDON: I move an amendment—

That all words after “hereby” be deleted and the following inserted in lieu thereof:—“Amended by striking out the figures ‘1937’ and substituting the figures 1938.”

Amendment put and passed; the clause, as amended, agreed to.

Clause 4—agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN: It will now be necessary to amend the Title.

Hon. T. MOORE: First I wish to test the feeling of the House by moving—

That the following new clause be inserted before Clause 4:—“That the Commissioners may visit each hospital in the State other than the North-West once a year.”

The trouble is that metropolitan members want to keep the Commission in the city, so that they can wait upon the Commissioners with requests for donations for charities, whereas country members have little or no chance to wait upon the Commissioners. Only 15 sweeps are drawn per annum, and so not the whole of the time of the Commissioners is taken up, but unfortunately they do spend too much time in the metropolitan area. I appeal to country members to support this new clause. From some of the criticism uttered here to-day, the Commissioners may think they ought to stay in the city, and so I want this House to issue a direction to the Commissioners to visit the country hospitals once in each year.

Hon. J. J. Holmes: Would you send one Commissioner, or all of them?

Hon. T. MOORE: Since they are paid officials it will not mean much extra expense for all of them to visit all the hospitals in the State.

Hon. H. S. W. PARKER: Would the hon. member agree to members of the licensing bench acting as agents for the Lotteries Commission, on the ground that they already travel around the country?

Hon. C. H. WITTENOOM: I support the proposed new clause. I should be glad to see members of the Commission visit the country hospitals, and look into the requirements of country towns.

Hon. W. J. MANN: The proposed new clause would not improve the position. It is already within the discretion of members of the Commission to visit country centres if they think fit to do so.

Hon. T. MOORE: There has been a certain amount of criticism concerning one visit paid by the Commissioners to country districts. I have moved this new clause lest they should think they had not the right to go to the country. It is all very well for members representing metropolitan provinces to ridicule the activities of these gentlemen. I appeal to country members to support the new clause.

Hon. J. M. MACFARLANE: I would have appreciated it if the hon. member had made his new clause more definite. As it is, I look upon it as a waste of time.

Hon. T. Moore: That is your opinion as a city member.

Hon. J. M. MACFARLANE: I do not know that members of the Commission have any authority to make trips into the country. This is a distributing body, not an investigating body. It is an easy matter for country people to have their claims put before the Commission as necessity arises, and it is easy for the Public Works Department to see that the works that are financed from lottery funds are properly carried out. I am in no way reflecting upon the Commission itself.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: I question whether the new clause is in order. I can find no authority in the Act for the expenditure of money by the Commission in making trips to the country. To tell the gentlemen concerned that they may travel at their own expense is to make a burlesque of the whole thing. The new clause should be dropped.

Hon. T. MOORE: I want to make it plain that members of the Commission are entitled to pay visits to the country. They have to investigate every case in which an attempt is made to obtain financial assistance from the funds at their disposal.

Hon. L. B. BOLTON: I see no necessity for the new clause. If it is carried, people in the country will be continually asking for visits from members of the Commission. Mr. Kenneally is thorough enough in his work to make such visits when he deems them necessary.

The CHAIRMAN: Mr. Holmes has doubted the relevancy of this new clause. The Standing Orders say that any amendment may be made to any part of a Bill, provided it is relevant to the subject matter and otherwise in conformity with the Standing Orders. The Bill is for an Act to amend Section 3 and to repeal Section 21 of the parent Act. The subject-matter is that it provides for increasing the tenure of office of the Commissioners and for making the parent Act permanent. I am reluctantly compelled to rule the new clause out of order.

Title:

Hon. H. SEDDON: I move an amendment—

That the Title be amended by striking out the words "to amend Section 3 and to repeal Section 21," and by inserting in lieu thereof the words "continue the operation."

Amendment put and passed; the Title, as amended, agreed to.

Bill reported with amendments and an amendment to the Title.

BILL—FORESTS ACT AMENDMENT CONTINUANCE.

Second Reading.

THE HONORARY MINISTER (Hon. E. H. Gray—West) [9.59] in moving the second reading said: This is a Bill to continue the operation of the Forests Act Amendment Act for a further period of twelve months as to the 31st December, 1938. As explained on previous occasions, Subsection 2 of Section 41 of the Forests Act, 1918, provides that three-fifths of the net revenue of the Forests Department shall be credited to a special fund at the Treasury for the improvement and re-forestation of State forests. An amending Act passed in 1924, however, provided that 10 per cent. of the net revenue from sandalwood for that year, or £5,000, whichever was the greater, should be paid into a special account for the re-forestation of sandalwood, and that the balance should be paid into Consolidated Revenue.

This principle was followed during each of the ensuing five years. Throughout that period extensive experiments were conducted by the department in the artificial regeneration of sandalwood. While, as a result of those experiments, the department was able to perfect a technique whereby the successful germination of sandalwood could be secured from nuts sown under host plants, the expenditure incurred did not produce practical results mainly on account of the attacks of rabbits on the young plants. In 1929, the department abandoned its scheme to develop sandalwood re-forestation by artificial methods, and, consequently, no provision was made in the amending Act of 1930 for the allocation of any sum to the Sandalwood Trust Fund. Instead, that measure provided for the payment of the whole of the revenue from sandalwood into Consolidated Revenue. This practice has been approved by Parliament in each of the subsequent years, and it is now proposed that the amending Act be continued for a further period of twelve months. I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

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

House adjourned at 10.3 p.m.

Legislative Assembly.

Wednesday, 3rd November, 1937.

	PAGE
Questions: Water supply, Great Southern	1526
Milk for children	1526
Bills: Jury Act Amendment (No. 2), 3R.	1527
Mortgagees' Rights Restriction Act Continuance, 3R.	1527
Income Tax Assessment, Com.	1527
Whaling, 1R.	1541
Farmers' Debts Adjustment Act Amendment, 2R., Com. report	1541
Land Act Amendment, 2R., Com. report	1542
Colli Hospital Agreement, 2R., Com. report	1546
Financial Emergency Act Amendment, 2R., Com. report	1546

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

QUESTION—WATER SUPPLY, GREAT SOUTHERN.

Mr. WATTS asked the Minister for Water Supplies: When does he expect that the investigations that are being made into the question of a hydraulic survey of possible water supplies for the Great Southern and districts east thereof will have progressed sufficiently to enable him to make a statement thereon?

The MINISTER FOR WATER SUPPLIES replied: The vastness of the ramifications of the project, the collation of data, and the necessary intensive consideration of same, preclude any statement being made for a considerable time yet.

QUESTION—MILK FOR CHILDREN.

Mr. NORTH asked the Minister for Health: 1, Is the issue of a daily ration of whole milk the best and cheapest form of protective food for children? 2, Is it now established that such an issue of milk during childhood should have a material effect in reducing hospital cases later in life? 3, If the answer to No. 2 is yes—(a) will he use his influence to enable (by amending legislation or otherwise) the Lotteries Commission to subscribe annually from its funds the amount necessary to provide milk in cases where it is needed but not provided; and (b) will he impress upon the Treasurer that according to the answer (2) above, the action proposed would tend progressively to reduce the heavy demands now made upon the existing hospital tax?