

Legislative Council.

Thursday, 14 September, 1922.

Lotteries and Art-unions (Amendment) Bill—Wrightville Municipality Abolition Bill (second reading)—Coalmines Regulation (Amendment) Bill (second reading)—Boorabil Commission (Amendment) Bill (second reading)—Special Adjournment.

The PRESIDENT took the chair.

LOTTERIES AND ART-UNIONS (AMENDMENT) BILL.

In Committee (consideration resumed from 13th September, *vide* page 1772):

Clause 9. The Principal Act is further amended by adding the following new section:—

18. Whosoever—

- (a) in a street, sells or offers for sale any ticket in a lottery; or
- (b) in a right-of-way, doorway, or on any private land adjoining a street, sells or offers for sale to any person in such street, any ticket in a lottery,

shall be liable to a penalty not exceeding ten pounds.

The Hon. E. J. KAVANAGH: I move:

That after the word "whosoever" the following words be inserted:—"unless with the permission of the Attorney-General and the council of the city, municipality, or shire of the locality having control of the public roads and streets, and subject to the regulations of the city, municipality, or shire of such locality."

Whilst the Minister has been good enough to assist me to draft this amendment, he is not necessarily committed to what I am submitting. I put the amendment forward in the hope that the Minister and the Committee will accept it.

I think there is sufficient safeguard so far as the sale of tickets is concerned. It is generally recognised that this measure is necessary to deal with frauds in connection with lotteries, raffles, and art-unions; but whilst that is the case there has been no indication from the Minister, or from any hon. member who has spoken on the bill, that the Government desires to interfere with the sale of tickets in connection with *bona-fide* art-unions. The amendment I have submitted follows the lines of the suggestion I made on the second reading—that where permission is obtained for the carrying out of an art-union the promoters of that art-union

shall have the right to dispose of tickets in a legitimate and proper manner. As long as we impose sufficient restrictions there should be no complaint. Under the amendment in addition to obtaining the permission of the Attorney-General it will also be necessary to get the permission of the authorities directly responsible for the control of the particular district in which the art-union is to be conducted and tickets are to be sold. They are the people fully qualified to say whether the sale of tickets on a particular day in the public streets will or will not be a nuisance. If those interested obtain the consent of all the responsible authorities the public convenience will be protected. The Government might well accept the amendment and so provide that permission may be given for the sale of tickets.

The CHAIRMAN: I am not quite sure that under the Local Government Act there are now such places as "boroughs."

The Hon. Colonel ONSLOW: I suggest that the words "local governing authorities" will cover everything necessary to be covered.

The Hon. E. J. KAVANAGH: I only desire to cover everything; the proper authority is what I want to set out.

Clause postponed.

Clause 10. 19. The expression foreign lottery in this Act means any lottery conducted or to be conducted outside the State of New South Wales and whether legal in the place where it is conducted or not, or whether it is described as a lottery, or as a sweep, consultation, or golden casket, or called by any other name or designation.

20. Whosoever prints or publishes any advertisement, notice, or information relating to a foreign lottery, or displays upon any premises in his occupation any card, poster, or notice relating to a foreign lottery, shall be liable to a penalty not exceeding two hundred pounds.

21. Whosoever sells or offers for sale or accepts any money in respect of the purchase of any ticket or share in a foreign lottery shall be liable to a penalty not exceeding twenty pounds.

Amendment (by the Hon. Sir JOSEPH CARRUTHERS) agreed to:

That after the word "lottery," line 11, the following be inserted:—"in furtherance of the conduct of the lottery or announcing its result."

The Hon. J. B. PEDEN: The same amendment will be necessary after the word "lottery" where next occur

The amendment to which the Committee has just agreed relates to the printing of any advertisement, notice, or information relating to a foreign lottery. If it is not repeated in connection with the display of any advertisement, notice, or information the printer will be liable to punishment, but the person who puts up the notice will not be liable in the same way.

The Hon. Sir JOSEPH CARRUTHERS: I think the hon. member is right!

Clause consequentially amended.

The Hon. R. W. CRUICKSHANK: I desire to call attention to what appears to me to be rather a mean-spirited action in regard to a neighbouring State and to the effect this clause will have on the revenue of newspaper proprietors. We raise money in this State for charities by means of art-unions such as the Police and Firemen's Art-union. Last year the sum of £30,000 was raised through that art-union. A very considerable amount of that money was raised in Queensland and in the other States through advertising in those States. Thus the people of Queensland to a large extent contributed to the maintenance of our hospitals by subscribing to a form of lottery which is run on similar lines to the Queensland Golden Casket with this difference: that the Golden Casket is run under Government control and the Police and Firemen's Art-union is run under the control of the police and firemen. It seems to be grossly unfair for us to ask—as we shall ask, and as the promoters of those art-unions for charity will ask—the people of Queensland to subscribe generously, as they do, to the maintenance of our hospitals and charities while we take up the mean-spirited attitude of declining to allow them to advertise their lottery in the newspapers of this State. What will be the effect of such restriction on their advertising? The Golden Casket people spend about £5,000 a year in advertising in this State. If the clause is agreed to in its present form it will mean that those people will find channels of publicity apart from our newspapers. They will probably circularise through the post persons whose names appear on the electoral rolls. They will keep in touch with all their clients by the aid of the electoral rolls, and the

revenue of newspapers published in this State will not get the slightest benefit. It seems to me to be a bill which is going to operate detrimentally to ourselves. It is the duty of this or any other Legislature to take into consideration, mainly, the welfare and interests of its own people, and it appears to me that this provision will only act in a way that is detrimental to our people. I seriously think that the Government ought to exempt from the operations of this clause any lotteries run in other parts of the Commonwealth in the interests of charity, and authorised by the Government of the State concerned. I think we may safely act on the assumption that the Government of Victoria or the Government of any other Australian State, when it gives permission for the holding of an art-union, will be just as much concerned about the *bona-fides* of that particular art-union as we are. Of course the Government will do as it chooses in this matter, but I urge upon the attention of the Minister my view, which is that this provision will operate detrimentally to our own interests.

The Hon. Colonel ONSLOW: I submit that the argument of the hon. member is an entirely false one. He suggests that the people of New South Wales are unable to look after their own charities. I know that Australia lives largely upon borrowed money, but I say it is going a little too far to publish abroad, from the halls of the New South Wales Legislature, that we are unable to provide within our own State for our own charitable institutions.

The Hon. R. W. CRUICKSHANK: They assist us, anyhow!

The Hon. Colonel ONSLOW: They may assist us, but I maintain that the people of New South Wales are quite able to maintain their own charities, without going to the people of any other State for assistance. Beyond that, I would submit that the hon. gentleman pays a very poor compliment to the police and firemen, in comparing their art-union with the Golden Casket. Of all the swindlers that have been perpetrated in Australia, I think the Golden Casket ranks very high.

The Hon. Sir JOSEPH CARRUTHERS: The hon. member means "very low!"

The Hon. Colonel ONSLOW: Exactly, I mean "very low." I think it is one of

the biggest swindles that have ever been perpetrated upon the public of Australia.

The Hon. R. W. CRUICKSHANK: How is it a swindle?

The Hon. Colonel ONSLOW: Simply because of the enormous percentage which is taken from it by the Queensland Government. Moreover, I would say that the published accounts of the Golden Casket appeal to me as calling for an independent audit, and when the hon. gentleman instances the Golden Casket as furnishing a reason why we should modify the provisions of this bill, I say that the fact of such a lottery existing is ample reason for the passing of a far more drastic bill than the one before us. The hon. gentleman has cut away all ground for opposition to this clause by the argument he has put up against it.

The Hon. R. W. CRUICKSHANK: The Golden Casket paid £250,000 to the hospitals in three years. The hon. member is talking without any knowledge of the subject!

The Hon. Colonel ONSLOW: This clause should be passed, if only to prevent the Queensland Government from preying upon the people of New South Wales.

The Hon. T. WADDELL: I disagree with my hon. friend who has just spoken, and I am disposed to agree with the hon. member Mr. Cruickshank. It does seem to me that we are going very far when we use the word "foreign" in connection with one of our sister States. I do not like the term at all. We are straining at a gnat and swallowing a camel in this respect. We are allowing the worst form of betting, which does a great deal of injury, that is, betting with the book-maker, and we are proposing to stop other and milder forms of chance. I do not know whether anything has been proved against the Queensland Government as regards the way in which the Golden Casket has been worked. If there is anything wrong then that is unfortunate, but I do not see that it applies in such a way that we should take the steps now proposed. My own feeling all along has been that the Queensland Government has done the right thing, because, knowing that gambling will take place in Queensland, just as it will take place here, no matter what happens; it has decided to take advantage of the

[*The Hon. Colonel Onslow.*

fact, in order to raise money for a most worthy purpose. Everybody gambles—my hon. friend the Minister who is in charge of the bill gambles—except a few straight-laced gentlemen and ladies who do not take as happy and as broad a view of life as I think most of us do. My feelings are that this clause contains more than the people of this country appreciate, and it is going too far altogether for us to say to the Legislature of a sister State, if it choose to have what is called a "Golden Casket," or to adopt any other method of getting public money for the purpose of running hospitals, that it shall not be allowed to do anything whatever in our State in the way of raising money. I am opposed to the clause, and I am not too friendly to the bill.

The Hon. Sir JOSEPH CARRUTHERS: The Golden Casket is not run by the Queensland Government at all. It is run by a private promoter, but it is authorised by the Queensland Government. That is the distinction. It is a private affair, run by a syndicate, and it is no use putting it on a pedestal as a Government concern. As to the use of the word "foreign," I do not know of a better word, but perhaps the hon. gentleman who has just resumed his seat will suggest one. Had I said that some of his remarks were foreign to the question, he would not suggest I was inferring that he was a German or a Frenchman. The word is well known, and we all know its dictionary meaning, which in this case is "outside" of this State. The draftsman who framed the bill knew how to use a terse and proper expression, and we all understand its meaning. So far as sympathy with other Governments is concerned, that is all thrown away, because, as I have pointed out, the Golden Casket is not a Government institution at all.

I do not think we need worry about how the Police and Firemen's Art-union, or any other of our charitable art-unions are going to fare, because I do not think they will suffer a bit, and, as the hon. member Colonel Onslow said, it is for us, in any case, to look after our own charitable affairs. If hon. members will look at the Companies Act, they will find that the same expression is used. The word "foreign" is applied to companies which are outside of this State.

The Hon. J. M. POWER: Did I understand the Vice-President of the Executive Council to ask the House to believe that the Golden Casket is not under the control of the Queensland Government? If he said that he is not correct. It is run by a body that is controlled by the Government. The body by which it is run is very directly under the control of the Government, and the Art-union is run upon conditions laid down by the Government, which conditions cannot be departed from. I would like to assure the Minister, if there is any doubt about it, that the Golden Casket Art-union is legalised by the Queensland Government solely for the purpose of raising money to be distributed amongst the hospitals of Queensland. It is controlled by a committee upon which the Government has a large, if not a controlling, representation. The Government has practically a controlling power over the officers, as was instanced only the other day, in an incident that occurred regarding the management of that concern.

The Hon. Sir JOSEPH CARRUTHERS: What control has the Government over them in New South Wales?

The Hon. J. M. POWER: As far as I am aware the Queensland Government has no control over anything in New South Wales.

The Hon. Sir JOSEPH CARRUTHERS: We have no control over them, either!

The Hon. J. M. POWER: No, any more than the New South Wales Government had any control over the persons who were selling tickets in Brisbane, as I myself saw them being sold, in connection with the New South Wales Police and Firemen's Art-union. Precisely the same position exists there. I think the whole trend of this discussion indicates a spirit which I thought had long since departed from Australian politics. It is the meanest form of parochialism I have heard of for a very long time, and it is diametrically opposed to the very best spirit which, in the interests of the Commonwealth, should be developed. There can be no objection to the principle itself, as I have reiterated a dozen times, but a deliberate effort—and a feeble effort which is doomed to failure—is apparently being made to crush out the activities of

people in other States, amongst whom are many of our own people. The mere prohibition of advertisements will have no effect whatever, as is shown by the operation of legislation some years ago, when the Vice-President was, I think, a Minister. In that Act a section was inserted designed to prohibit newspapers from publishing the odds that might be obtained about racehorses prior to a race-meeting. That law is being openly flouted to-day.

The Hon. Sir JOSEPH CARRUTHERS: The hon. member cannot give a single case where a newspaper publishes the odds before the races!

The Hon. J. M. POWER: I can give innumerable cases where a man of ordinary intelligence can take up a newspaper and tell you the odds that are being offered about horses for certain races.

The Hon. Sir JOSEPH CARRUTHERS: Not before the day of racing!

The Hon. J. M. POWER: Yes. When people are allowed to indulge in betting on racecourses, and when they can go into clubs and make bets on horse races, any attempt to prevent the circulation of such news amongst the community is nothing but pious pretence. I would not be a party to penalising people if they circumvented a law which is not in effectual operation. The same thing will apply to this provision. There are only two lotteries likely to be affected. One is the Golden Casket, and the other, Tattersall's sweep, should appeal to the representatives of the Government which is now in office in New South Wales, inasmuch as it is run in the interests of private enterprise. It is run as a private concern, for private profit, and the supporters of the Government cannot cavil at that. The promoters of that sweep will be able to continue, as there will be no embargo placed upon them as regards openly circulating through the post invitations to subscribe to their lotteries, and lists of events upon which the consultations are to be held. In the same way there will be no hindrance to their furnishing their subscribers with lists showing the results of the drawings. You cannot prevent it. As far as Queensland is concerned, if there is anything wrong in subscribing to that lottery, the wrong must be lessened in the minds of reasonable persons.

because notwithstanding what the hon. member Colonel Onslow has said, I am sure it will bear the closest scrutiny of any independent body. It is carried on fairly and above board, and the Queensland hospitals have benefited in the past from its operations to an extent to which I would like to see New South Wales hospitals benefit.

If the Government is really concerned about stamping out these lotteries and art-unions why does it not come down with a courageous measure and make it a penal offence to purchase a ticket in a lottery? I object to the sentiment expressed in connection with legislation of this character, irrespective of the organisations to which the law may apply at the moment. The bill is of a restrictive and unnecessary character, and does not reflect credit on the Government or on the Legislature. It is a demonstration of the determination of a Government to do something, wise or otherwise, useful or needless, to compel the people to recognise that there is some body in existence for the purpose of telling the public what they shall do, irrespective of whether it is good or bad. There are far bigger and better things that might well engage the attention of Parliament, instead of harassing and annoying the people, and doing no good to anybody, by passing a measure such as this. I have some figures here which I am going to quote showing the net sums paid to the Queensland hospitals. After all Queensland and New South Welshmen are very often brothers and cousins. The Queenslanders of to-day may be the New South Welshman of to-morrow and *vice versa*. There can be no better purpose for raising this money than that of tending the sick and needy and we have no better means in New South Wales of raising it than by permitting harmless gambling on the street. The sum raised in the first year was £66,785; in the second year £100,778; and the third year £178,625.

AN HON. MEMBER: What did the promoters get?

The Hon. J. M. POWER: The promoters got nothing. There are no promoters in the sense in which the term is generally used. There is a committee controlled by the Government and representing the benevolent bodies of

[*The Hon. J. M. Power.*

Queensland, and excepting those officers who devote their whole time to the work, nobody receives any payment whatever. If the Government will come down with a business-like proposal to finance and maintain our hospitals without making these appeals to the people I shall be pleased to support it. Until it does do that, it should not hamper appeals in its own State to get money for that purpose, and should not exhibit a mean, narrow, parochial spirit by embarrassing the efforts of good Australians in another State who are doing excellent work in assisting those who are unable to look after themselves. The Committee would be well advised to eliminate the clause with regard to advertising, and not continue the hypocritical pretence that the prevention of the publication of advertisements will have the effect of preventing gambling in lotteries.

The Hon. Dr. NASH: I would like to call the attention of hon. members to a misapprehension which has arisen in connection with this matter. The expression "foreign lottery" is defined in section 10 of the Act and if hon. members refer to that definition they will find it only refers to lotteries carried on in other countries, money for which is collected in this country. It is a fair thing that the Government should take action against them. Spanish, French, and German lotteries have come into this country and have made heaps of money out of us. I do not think that should be allowed. As regards the Queensland lottery why should not the people of Queensland have sufficient pride in themselves to keep their own hospitals? We have sufficient pride in our own city to keep our own hospitals and we do not ask anyone else for money.

The Hon. R. W. CRUICKSHANK: Yes, we do!

The Hon. Dr. NASH: Whom do we ask and where do we go?

The Hon. R. W. CRUICKSHANK: To Queensland!

The Hon. Dr. NASH: Not under the patronage of Parliament. Some art-unions possibly may send tickets to the other States, but they are not patronised by Parliament nor run by Parliament for its own benefit. How much money does the

Queensland Government get out of these lotteries? The hon. member Mr. Power did not tell us that.

The Hon. J. M. POWER: The Government does not get anything, but the Federal Government takes 13 per cent. of the prize money!

The Hon. Dr. NASH: As regards the Golden Casket Art-union it was stuck up for a time because some lady would not sign the cheques.

The Hon. J. M. POWER: That lady was president of the committee!

The Hon. Dr. NASH: We, as a State, make no appeal outside the boundaries of the State for help for our hospitals.

The Hon. R. W. CRUICKSHANK: Would you refuse a rich donation from someone residing in Queensland?

The Hon. Dr. NASH: I object to the Government being mixed up in this matter. If a proposal is brought forward to enable the Government to obtain money by a lottery I shall oppose it, because it impeaches the honesty of the citizen. Has not the citizen to pay for his own affairs? Why should he appeal to the people in other countries for money? If he goes to those whose business it is to lend money, and he is prepared to pay for a loan, that is a legitimate transaction; but it is not a legitimate monetary transaction to say you must get money through any form of sport or gambling. The hon. member Mr. Power had a good deal to say about the amount of money got by means of its lottery. But it must not be forgotten that the object of the Queensland Government is to relieve itself of the responsibility of keeping its own hospitals.

The Hon. G. F. EARP: That is the point!

The Hon. Dr. NASH: The Queensland Government has managed its affairs so badly that it has been stuck up for money, and it has had to come not only here but it has had to go to other parts of the world, even to a foreign country, to get money.

The Hon. R. W. CRUICKSHANK: Nonsense!

The Hon. Dr. NASH: Is not the United States a foreign country? Truly it is not a fine thing for a part of the wonderful British Empire to have to go to a foreign country and say, "Give us money

to enable us to carry on our work." That is what I call miserable, mean and low. Last year, directly and indirectly, we spent in this State in various charitable ways and on hospital maintenance about £1,832,881.

The Hon. J. M. POWER: That was the population!

The Hon. Dr. NASH: Suppose it is the population? It is far more in proportion to the population when you add the money subscribed by the citizens and given indirectly through lotteries and art-unions. But the figures I have quoted merely represent the contribution of the State.

The Hon. R. W. CRUICKSHANK: Does not the Government in Queensland contribute £ for £ to the money raised for hospitals?

The Hon. Dr. NASH: I do not know. The Queensland Government certainly does not pay anything like the amount I have mentioned because it has not got the money. Nor has Queensland any hospitals comparable with ours. We have as good hospitals as are in the world. Prince Alfred Hospital figures as one of the great hospitals of the world. We keep these institutions going on our own. If any private individual likes to contribute that is his business, but the Government, when it contributes, contributes as trustee for the people who pay taxes, and the Government has no right to go outside the boundaries of its own State and poach upon the money of another country unless it goes in a legitimate way to borrow and pays for the accommodation. Even then it should not go outside the Empire. As a matter of fact a greater amount is spent by the Government of this State, and, if private donations are taken into account, far more is contributed in this country than in Queensland.

With regard to the provision in this clause to prohibit advertisements in connection with foreign lotteries from being published in our newspapers, I do not think the Government has considered what it will cost not in money but in reputation to do this; because when the elections come on the newspapers are a big factor in helping certain men who desire to win positions. The newspapers have sensitive spots because they are either companies or rich individuals; and

if their source of income is cut into like this they will not forget it. I regard this bill as hardly worth bothering about except for what it purports to do, and that is to keep our streets clean and free from people interfering with the legitimate occupations of other people. It is degrading to our women folk and boys that they should go round selling tickets as they do on Eight Hour and other days. That is what I object to. I believe in raising up our women and children, not degrading them. I would cut out foreign lotteries every time, and as this clause aims at foreign lotteries I thoroughly approve of it.

The Hon. Dr. WALL: I am surprised to hear the hon. member Dr. Nash say that our hospitals are adequately equipped and that they are the best hospitals in the world. As a matter of fact our hospitals are so congested that it is almost impossible for a private practitioner to obtain admission for a patient even though he be on the point of death. One might try five or six hospitals before he obtains the necessary accommodation; and the Public Health Department is so well managed that it cannot afford to keep a man on duty at night to deal with the admission of patients into the hospitals. If by running an art-union or by any other charitable method our hospitals can be adequately equipped and looked after by one who would be inclined to allow them to be run. If the hon. member could suggest any other means by which we could adequately support our hospitals I would be against the bill. But I fail to see it. Our children's hospital is not half the size it should be; our maternity hospitals and central city hospitals are not half the size they should be. Art-unions and lotteries are now run in most country towns and suburban areas with the object of obtaining funds for the local hospitals. Take the Burwood district for instance. They recently gave a carnival week and conducted an art-union, and as a result the local hospital benefited by some thousands of pounds. That enabled them to get a bigger grant from the Government and to extend the hospital in their own district.

The Hon. Sir JOSEPH CARRUTHERS: This clause does not stop that; it helps it by stopping another country from

[*The Hon. Dr. Nash.*

coming here and taking away money which according to the hon. member's statement is necessary for our own hospitals!

The Hon. Dr. WALL: I do not see how by prohibiting the sale of tickets here in connection with an art-union run by the Queensland Government we can possibly affect our hospitals.

The Hon. Sir JOSEPH CARRUTHERS: How can it help our own hospitals?

The Hon. Dr. WALL: Our own hospitals are doing nothing in this direction.

The Hon. Sir JOSEPH CARRUTHERS: But it is our money that is going away!

The Hon. Dr. WALL: People will gamble, and you cannot stop them. Therefore, it is just as well to allow these art-unions and lotteries to be run if they are for a charitable purpose. Chocolate wheels were allowed in aid of the soldiers on Red Cross and other days, and there was no outcry. My own opinion is that you should allow anything which will help the cause of the sick in this State.

The Hon. G. F. EARP: Let us do it in an honest way!

The Hon. Dr. WALL: I agree with the hon. member.

The Hon. G. F. EARP: This is not an honest way!

The Hon. Dr. WALL: I agree that it should be done in an honest way, but if the Government takes taxation from the bookmakers and legalises the totalisator I see no difference between that and running an art-union or lottery.

The Hon. G. F. EARP: I am touched by the anxiety shown by the hon. member Mr. Power for the character of members of this House. The hon. member seems very much concerned about our piety and our character generally—only it has nothing whatever to do with the case. Let me ask him a question or two. Does he consider gambling an evil? If he does not, I request him to consult the judges of our courts, and they will enlighten him on the subject.

The Hon. J. M. POWER: They are all gamblers themselves!

The Hon. G. F. EARP: If it is an evil, why should the Queensland Government be allowed to continue it in this State?

The Hon. J. M. POWER: I have seen judges on the racecourse!

The Hon. G. F. EARP: It does not alter the opinion of the judges about gambling being an evil. They have expressed their opinion over and over again in the courts, and pointed out the vast evil it is doing in the community. Why then should Queensland be allowed to promote the evil in this State, in order that the Government there may be saved from the burden of supporting its own hospitals? That is what the Queensland Golden Casket amounts to. And as to saying that people will gamble, of course they will when all these temptations are put in their way. But reduce some of the temptations and you will reduce the evil.

The Hon. J. M. POWER: Shut up the racecourses!

The Hon. G. F. EARP: Because you cannot shut up the racecourses should you do nothing? Because you cannot shut the racecourses should you carry lotteries into the very homes of the people and bring the children up to be gamblers? Because you cannot shut the racecourses should you carry gambling into the homes and pump it into them like mother's milk? Everyone gambles says the hon. member. I never heard anything more futile. One hon. member complains that race books are sold, but in buying a race book you get value for your money.

The Hon. Dr. WALL: I say that if you tax the bookmakers tickets and take a percentage from the totalisator—which, after all is said and done, is a lottery—you should not object to the sale of art-union tickets!

The Hon. G. F. EARP: In remedying an evil you must begin somewhere. I see here a measure which tends in some respects to mitigate this evil, and therefore I support it. Is it to be said that because the Government cannot sweep the gambling evil away at once it is to do nothing? As to what should be done in this State to support our hospitals I do not think that has much to do with this clause, but we are doing a good deal towards supporting our hospitals without gambling, and if the people are appealed to and their sympathies are aroused they will support our hospitals. When there is an evil, a canker, that is putting our community

back, and we have an opportunity to do something to check it, surely we should not turn round and say that, because we cannot stop gambling on the Stock Exchange and the racecourse, we should not do anything to stop this evil being inflicted upon the coming generation. With regard to the present generation perhaps it is difficult to stamp out, but there is some chance with the young people, the growing generation, and when we get a chance, as we get it here, of doing something to stop it, let us take that chance. It is said that the people will gamble. Of course they will, particularly if you bring the children up to it and drive into them at every street corner the idea that they may get £1,000 or more for 1s. Let us make a beginning and do something. Here we are making a beginning, and I congratulate the Government upon having courage to do what it has done, because those interested in gambling are bound to be up against the Government. The Government is bound to make enemies through this legislation: It is entitled to the thanks of this House and of every member of the community for what it has done.

The Hon. R. W. CRUICKSHANK: I should like to move an amendment to test the feeling of the House on the matter. The general question of gambling does not enter into the case very much. I am not a gambler myself. I do not go to racecourses although ten years ago I saw the Melbourne Cup run to satisfy my curiosity. Tattersalls' sweep in Tasmania is permitted by the Government there and vast sums of money are drawn from the different States to that State. The Tasmanian Government derives a huge revenue from Tattersalls' sweeps. We have to deal with the evils as they are. I believe that Tattersalls has not received so much money from Queensland or New South Wales since the Golden Casket was inaugurated. Considerable sums of money have been diverted from Tattersalls' sweep to the Golden Casket and the Police and Firemen's Art-union. The blotting out of Queensland and cutting ourselves off from Queensland is a paltry parochial way of dealing with members of what we so loudly acclaim as the same family. We are always claiming that we are of

the same family as our kinsfolk in the Old Country, and yet we are bringing in a bill to tell Queensland that we shall cut it right off from New South Wales. That is inconsistent, because if a Queensland squatter sent along a cheque for £10,000 for our hospitals we would be glad to receive it. After all what is the degree of gambling involved when a man takes a 5s. ticket in the Golden Casket or buys an art-union ticket in the street? The revenue comes in from the street selling of tickets. Our business people show their generosity. Motor-car firms have given motor-cars as prizes. Retailers give certain things as prizes ranging in value from £10 to £100 and over. All that goes to make up the list of prizes which induce the people to put less money into the "pubs" and more into the hospitals through the art-unions. I desire to insert after the word "designation" the following:—

Except where such sweep consultation or Golden Casket or lottery called by any other name or designation is run in the Commonwealth in the exclusive interests of charity.

That will enable the bill to operate against commercially conducted sweeps such as Tattersalls while it will prevent our interfering with the charitable operations of the other States. It may also prevent what might be retaliatory legislation on the part of the other States. If the bill is passed in its present form the Queensland Government will be quite justified in preventing the sale of our Eight Hours Art-union tickets and Police and Firemen's Art-union tickets in that State. The Queensland Government has as a result of the Golden Casket been able to distribute £250,000 amongst the hospitals of that State in the last three years. In connection with the Police and Firemen's Art-union the ticket-sellers dispose of them to persons in motor-cars down at the Spit for instance and to persons on the ferry boats. Practically the whole of the money raised last year was raised in the streets and last year that art-union raised over £30,000 which with the Government subsidy represented to the hospitals about £100,000. This is the most ridiculous and paltry brand of legislation I have ever seen.

The CHAIRMAN: Under standing order No. 117 an amendment may not be moved
[*The Hon. R. W. Cruickshank.*

in a clause after a later part of that clause has been amended. The hon. member will see that an amendment has been made later in the clause than the line in which he proposes to insert his amendment.

Amendment (by the Hon. R. W. CRUICKSHANK) proposed:

That the following be added at the end of the clause:—"This clause shall not apply to any sweep, consultation or Golden Casket conducted throughout the Commonwealth in the exclusive interests of charity."

The Hon. Sir JOSEPH CARRUTHERS: I have listened to-day to more what may be called spurious argument than I have ever heard since I have been a member of the Legislature. The object of the bill is to tighten up a law of which everyone approves which declares that lotteries are illegal except in certain permitted cases. Art-unions are illegal except in certain specified cases. Here we have what are called foreign lotteries the promoters of which do not trouble to get the permission which any citizen of New South Wales must get before he can run an art-union or a lottery in this State. You are going to give the citizens of Queensland or the Commonwealth a privilege which the New South Wales citizens do not enjoy. No New South Wales citizen can run an art-union without the permission of the Attorney-General but you are going to give that privilege to people outside our own State.

The Hon. R. W. CRUICKSHANK: Why restrict it?

The Hon. Sir JOSEPH CARRUTHERS: The hon. member comes here with strange ideas but he will not in this life-time get a majority to support him unless the country goes mad. All these arguments are spurious arguments in favour of Queensland and New South Wales is given very little consideration. There has been some slandering of the people of this State, and the hon. member Dr. Wall has not been quite free from it, in challenging the conduct of our own hospitals. Our hospitals are a credit to this country and the people who maintain them are nobly doing their duty. We do not need to run Golden Caskets nor anything else of the kind in other countries in order to support our hospitals.

Let them shut down on us in Victoria or Queensland, or where they like, and I

will not complain. We spent on our hospitals last year £1,200,000 while Queensland spent only about £360,000, and, according to the statements which have been made here by hon. members this evening, £100,000 or £200,000 of that was got by the spurious method of selling these tickets to unfortunate women and children in our community.

One of the curses of the South American communities, and one of the curses of the community in the islands lying in the Carribean Sea, which has become a by-word, is this business of lotteries which are subsidised and organised by the State. A set of harpies in the community live upon the sale of those tickets, and we are getting that set of harpies in this country; men who do not work, like other men, in honest labour and toil; men who are not producing anything at all, but who run their tobacconist's shops and other little shops, and are living by the sale of these Golden Casket tickets and sweep tickets. The sooner we wipe a cancer and sore of that sort out of the country the better for the country, and I will say to my hon. friends who have been speaking against this bill to-night that the sooner the Labour party realises that it must wipe out this set of men, who are living as parasites and harpies on the poorest of the community, and who are doing it in the great and sacred name of charity, the better it will be for the Labour party.

God help the name of "charity." The hon. member Mr. Cruickshank, with his good old Scotch blood, knows that in the Scottish race there is a far nobler idea of charity than that which we have heard him expressing here to-night. I myself am descended from that same Scottish race, and I have had handed down to me by my parents that good old tradition of the race I belong to, that there shall be no encouragement given to the form of gambling which the hon. member and his friends have been advocating to-night. Go up to the borderland of Queensland, and see the inroads which have been made into those North Coast towns by a set of promoters, coming from Queensland and running their art-unions and their lotteries in the name of "charity." Go to Murwillumbah, to Lismore, to Byron Bay, or to any other of those North

Coast towns, and see the "spinning jennies," the roulette wheels, and the games of "under and over seven," by which they obtain money from the women and children of the towns, and then go away. The bulk of that money goes into the pockets of the promoters, though they may give a little of it to the charity, a little of it to the Queensland Labour party, and perhaps a little of it to the New South Wales Labour party.

If the hon. member wants the facts straight out he will get them. That is the sort of stuff and those are the kind of people with which the Labour party has been allying itself. It is a pitiful and poor way of appealing to the charitable instincts of the people. I say the bulk of the money goes to individuals who put it in their own pockets, while a little of it reaches the charitable institutions concerned. In New South Wales, thank God, hitherto we have had a clearer atmosphere. We have been able here to maintain our public institutions, and to look after our sick, our maimed, and our suffering citizens without devices of that character, and without creating a gang of professional harpies and parasites, living on and exploiting the charitable instincts of the community. I say the Committee will be wise to reject every amendment which in any way attempts to whittle away the provisions of this clause.

The Hon. Dr. NASH: In view of what has been said in regard to this clause, and the invasion of one territory by another in regard to the collection of money for eleemosynary purposes, I would like to have on record what this State has done for itself during the year 1920-21. The amount expended from the consolidated revenue, for eleemosynary objects in New South Wales during the year 1920-21 was £4,062,825, or £1 18s. 11d. per head of the citizens of our State. They contributed, as follows, to the hospitals of the State, without going outside the State at all: First of all, the subscriptions and donations amounted to £355,870. The contributions by patients were £132,230, and in other ways they raised £62,054. When we add to that the State aid, which was included in the £4,062,825, and which amounted to £458,818, we find that there

was expended on the special hospitals to which my colleague refers no less a sum than £1,008,972.

I wish to make it clear that our hospitals rank amongst the best in the world, and I repeat what I said before, that the plans of the Royal Prince Alfred Hospital are in "Burdett's Hospitals," the best publication in the English language. There is no better publication in our language, and when the plan of a hospital, and information about it, are published there it means that the hospital concerned ranks with any in the world. We have other hospitals which are equal to it in their functioning. Whether you consider their surgical work, their medical work, or their X-ray or any other work, our hospitals rank worthily in their methods with the best hospitals in the world. Go next door, to Sydney Hospital, and you may see their X-ray equipment functioning every day. Go to their operating room, and see the work done. There is nothing better done anywhere. I am as competent a judge and know as much about it as most people, and I give them that certificate. In comparison with the money which we expend in this direction, I venture to say that the money spent in Queensland is only a trifle.

The Hon. Dr. WALL: I regret that the hon. member Sir Joseph Carruthers should for one instant consider that anything, I said reflected upon our hospitals. I did not say that at all; and I do not wish to give that impression to the Committee. What I did say, and what I will stand by, is that the money spent upon our hospitals, by the Government and private charity, is not sufficient to cope with the large number of cases that they get in during the year. I will undertake to say that to-day there are some hundreds of cases on the waiting list of the Royal Prince Alfred Hospital, the Sydney Hospital, St. Vincent's Hospital, the Lewisham Hospital, and our suburban hospitals. Our Public Health Department has been starved, and, no matter how much we may have spent upon our hospitals, it has not been sufficient. Any man who has held the portfolio of Public Health I am sure will agree with me in that statement. The public of this State does not realise that the health of the community is really,

[*The Hon. Dr. Nash.*]

the most outstanding and important subject with which we have to deal. I am sure the hon. member Dr. Nash will agree with me when I say that any medical practitioner who wishes to get a case into a hospital to-day will find that he will have to try a number of hospitals before he will be able to do so.

I am sorry to again take up the time of the Committee, but I want to explain my position, and I regret that the hon. member Sir Joseph Carruthers should for one instant have thought that I would say anything to the detriment of our hospitals. What is wrong is that the Government—not this Government alone, but the previous Governments as well—has not given sufficient money to carry on these great public utilities.

Amendment negatived.

Clause as amended agreed to.

Clause 11 agreed to.

Postponed clause 1 (Short title).

The Hon. Sir JOSEPH CARRUTHERS:

I move:

That the following subclause be added:—
"Sections 9 and 5 of this Act (in so far as the last mentioned section shall be omitted) enact that section 9 of the Principal Act shall not come into operation until the first day of January, 1923."

That means that the operation of the clauses relating to the selling and distributing of tickets will be postponed until the 1st January, 1923. That gives the opportunity for the Eight Hours Day Art-union to be held, and it gives two or three months breathing time before these proposed new sections are brought into operation. That is the compromise I offered last night. Instead of the Governor proclaiming a date, we fix the date now, and that makes it clear that there will be no interference this year with the Eight Hours Day Art-union. If during the next twelve months it is found that there should be some other amendment, to meet the circumstances of the case, such as hon. members have suggested, then there will be an opportunity to consider the matter. The arguments which have been used in regard to this matter, particularly those submitted by the hon. member Mr. Power, the hon. member Mr. Cruickshank, and the hon. member Mr. Kavanagh, are such that I have given very great attention to

them. There was considerable merit in the speeches of those hon. members, to which I am not oblivious. I think the suggestion I have made will get over the difficulty, and will provide a very fair compromise.

The Hon. Dr. NASH: I think that meets the position I took up last night. It also meets the position of my hon. friends in that it gives the right to run five art-unions. There are two art-unions in which I was especially interested last night. One was that for tubercular soldiers and the other for the Women's Hospital. I am informed that the art-unions have been granted the right to function, and that the drawings will take place on various dates between now and the end of the year 1923.

Amendment agreed to.

Postponed clause as amended agreed to.

Postponed clause 9. The Principal Act is further amended by adding the following new section:—

18. Whosoever—
- 5 (a) in a street, sells or offers for sale any ticket in a lottery; or
- (b) in a right-of-way, doorway, or on any private land adjoining a street, sells or offers for sale to
- 10 any person in such street, any ticket in a lottery,
- shall be liable to a penalty not exceeding ten pounds.

Amendment (by Hon. E. J. KAVANAGH) proposed:

That after the word "whosoever" the following words be inserted:—"Unless with the permission of the Attorney-General and the council of the city, municipality, or shire of the locality having control of the public roads and streets, and subject to the regulations of the city, municipality, or shire of such locality."

The Hon. Sir JOSEPH CARRUTHERS: There is a great deal of merit in what the hon. member proposes. I believe the matter is arguable. At the same time I shall vote against the amendment. I am not in the position to assent to it at the present moment.

The Hon. W. E. V. ROBSON: I intend to oppose this proposal. I think there ought to be some certainty about the law. The policy of the measure is to curtail the sale of art-union tickets in the streets. This clause is intended to prevent that sort of thing. If we have made up our minds that it is not good that the sale of

art-union tickets should be carried on in the streets of Sydney, then I think it is time Parliament said so. We should not give any Attorney-General the right, at his whim, to say yes or no in regard to the permission to sell tickets in the streets. I am not prepared to hand this power over to the Attorney-General, so that he can exercise his discretion in the matter according to his own whimsicalities. It is time Parliament made up its mind on the matter, and definitely stated what the position should be.

The Hon. J. ROBINSON: The amendment proposed by the hon. member Mr. Kavanagh has at first sight rather an innocent appearance, but on closer acquaintance it will be seen that it goes further than the amendment the Committee rejected yesterday evening. That was that permission be granted for a particular day. The amendment of the hon. member Mr. Kavanagh is quietly slipped in, and not only provides that on the day of the procession the tickets be sold, but it opens wide the door on both sides, and it leaves it open for this nuisance of ticket selling to exist for weeks and months before and after the day of the procession. I think there was a feeling amongst the Committee yesterday—even amongst those who were designated by the hon. member Mr. Waddell as being straight-laced, that, as far as possible, we should be prepared to allow the concession on the day of the procession of the Eight Hours Day Art-union and the Police and Firemen's Art-union.

The Hon. E. J. KAVANAGH: They kept it in their hearts. They did not show it by a vote!

The Hon. J. ROBINSON: That is because you did not ask them to show it. You forced hon. members into a division. Now they will be forced into a worse position. The hon. member's amendment goes beyond the Eight Hours Day Art-union and the Police and Firemen's Art-union. It opens the door to other art-unions. I do not know whether any hon. member here is as highly favoured as I am in the notice that some people take of me by sending me books of art-union tickets for me to sell. I think it must be done for a joke. At any rate, I look on it in that spirit. Those books of tickets are sent by people who know

perfectly well that I am not going to buy a ticket for their particular art-union. They have posted me books of tickets with a covering letter asking me to dispose of the tickets. I used to go to the expense of paying the postage on them to send them back, with a courteous note, but for some years I have not wasted stamps on returning them. This amendment if passed will open the door for the ticket-sellers to work at every street corner, and in every passage, year in and year out, just as they do now, vending these tickets—a practice which so many people are opposed to. I do not want to emphasise further what I said previously. I simply stand by my guns on behalf of, not a few, but 75 per cent. of our population. We are sick and tired of this street-selling of art-union tickets, not only on the day of the procession, but on other days. Although I am opposed to such a system of selling tickets, I will be generous and will give way on one point. I do not want to dictate to the Minister what he should do in the matter. I believe he has made a step in the right direction, and I hope it is a step to abolish, not only art-unions, but racecourses as well. I hope the amendment will not be pressed. If it is I hope the Committee will reject it, because it will make the bill absolutely valueless. It would be better to turn it down altogether than to open the door to the further sale of these tickets. I hope the Committee, if forced to a division, will show the hon. member Mr. Kavanagh that we are not going to be caught napping. If we did agree to the amendment it would be a case of our being caught napping. I trust the hon. member Mr. Kavanagh will see that he is asking too much, and that his amendment will destroy the utility of the bill.

I am not going to traverse the ground of other hon. members, and what has been said about the Government in power in a neighbouring State, or that we should be fleeced to keep their salaries and the business of their State going. All that should be outside this question. We have to deal with New South Wales and the people of New South Wales. Our people need protection, and we as legislators should protect them. Our

[*The Hon. J. Robinson.*]

duty is to protect the weak and the innocent. Some hon. member referred to the weaklings. I represent the weaklings, and those who cannot defend themselves. The weaklings need protection. There are weaklings in our State, and if we are not careful, owing to the lifelong tenure of our appointment here, some of us may reach that state of second childhood when we may become weaklings, too, and need protection, as others do. There are some of us who have been so long in the way of sin and error—

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I ask the hon. member to confine his remarks within the ambit of the amendment. I would remind hon. members that they have an opportunity of discussing the general principles of a bill on the second reading. The Committee is now dealing with a definite matter, and I must again ask the hon. member to confine himself to that.

The Hon. J. ROBINSON: I will content myself by pointing out the danger of the amendment. If the Committee accepts this amendment it will break down the very structure of the bill as it was approved of by the other branch of the Legislature. I hope the amendment will be lost.

The Hon. N. J. BUZACOTT: Apart from the principle underlying the amendment I do not like the way in which it has been drafted. I think it would be sufficient to say, "Whosoever without the permission of the Attorney-General." In that form the amendment would not be objectionable. As it is it requires the promoters of an art-union to get the permission not only of the Attorney-General but of the local council. Why should that be necessary? It seems to me absurd to take the power from the Attorney-General, who ought to be responsible, and confer it upon other authorities. When Mr. Trickett introduced the measure to extend the provisions of the Art-union Act to meet a want felt by the Trades Hall, which was unable to pay its debts, several people approached me, and said, "We are in the hands of the Jews, will you vote for the bill and help us"? I was somewhat dubious about voting for the bill, because I had always considered gambling an evil, and been taught that

it was a proper thing to give value for value. However, I voted for the bill on that occasion. Since then I have read a good deal of literature by men who built up the Labour movement, and if they have departed from those high teachings I have not. My own view is that we should reject this amendment. The Trades Hall is not in the parlous condition in which it was in those days. Surely after twenty-three years of annual art-unions they have got out of the hands of the Jews, and are a little bit ahead. If not, it is purely bad management. The need for selling tickets does not exist to-day. The amendment of the hon. member Mr. Kavanagh will open the door wide for the sale of tickets on any day. I think he only intended that it should apply to the day of the procession. As the hon. member Mr. Robinson pointed out, under the amendment permission can be given to sell tickets on any day, including the day of the procession.

The Hon. R. W. CRUICKSHANK: I am sorry to find hon. members showing such a complete lack of confidence in the Attorney-General. I think it should be left to his discretion when an application comes in from a laudable organisation such as the Policemen and Firemen's Art-union, which raises over £30,000 annually for our hospitals. In such a case the Attorney-General should be given discretion to say that tickets may be sold in the streets. Let me remind hon. members that even if this bill is passed tickets will still be sold in doorways and in public places, and it will be quite within the law.

An HON. MEMBER: What is your grievance?

The Hon. R. W. CRUICKSHANK: In the case of the big art-union organised by the policemen and firemen, practically all the tickets are sold in the streets. I do not suppose they get very much money in any other way. If they are prevented from selling tickets in the future then we must make up our minds that our hospitals will be deprived of something like £60,000, including the Government subsidy. As to the inconvenience caused by selling tickets in the streets, in my opinion it is humbug to say that people are molested. I have been up and down

George and Pitt streets half a dozen times a day, and I have never been pestered to buy a ticket. I have seen people offering tickets for sale, and passers-by are at liberty to buy if they feel inclined. The bill is a splendid piece of legislation in so far as it is intended to regulate the harpies and scoundrels who live on the various charities. But why should there be any interference with these other art-unions? If it is the desire of the Government to put a stop to the sale of tickets in the street, the responsibility might surely be left with the Attorney-General of deciding in favour of special cases where the objects are manifestly good. How would we have got on during the war if we had not been allowed to sell tickets in the streets? Hundreds of thousands of pounds were raised in that way. If a crisis occurs again, and it is necessary to raise money suddenly, as was the case during the war, we may have to again resort to art-unions and raffles, in which event this bill will have to be made inoperative. The feeling of the community is no doubt against the universal sale of tickets in the street by those who make a profession of it; but we have an army of self-sacrificing, devoted women who give their leisure to selling tickets in the streets for the benefit of our hospitals and other charitable purposes. There is no more laudable section or one more worthy of admiration than those self-sacrificing women, dressed in the garb of red-cross nurses, who collect money for our hospitals. I am surprised that hon. members should seek to disparage those who undertake this work. Do they say that of the women who collect on Hospital Day? The bill seems to me to be absurd, and particularly this clause. This House ought not to always echo what the other House does. We know that bills come up which are absolutely and manifestly stupid. We had an example in the case of the Police Appeals Bill. How it came to pass the other Chamber in its imperfect state I cannot understand. Here is another bill equally clumsy in parts. It has good points, and I am sorry to say it has bad points; but I regret that certain hon. members should take up the stand of supporting the Government no matter how foolish or inept a piece of legislation may be.

The Hon. E. J. KAVANAGH: Let me assure, the hon. member Mr. Robinson that I have been too long a member of this House to attempt to get anything through by a clever move. When I moved the amendment I believed I was doing it in a straightforward manner; though possibly the hon. member imagined that because I did not make a speech I was trying to sneak it through Committee. The hon. member said he was favourable to permission being given for the sale of tickets on one day. If I submit an amendment now to allow of tickets being sold on the day of the demonstration, will the hon. member support it?

The Hon. J. ROBINSON: Your amendment covers every day in the year!

The Hon. E. J. KAVANAGH: I moved it in that form because I felt that any other amendment would be taking the matter out of the hands of the Government. The bill is aimed at doing away with the irregularities and frauds which take place in connection with lotteries and art-unions. All I am seeking is to give a chance to a legitimate, well-conducted, properly-controlled, and *bona fide* art-union to sell tickets in the street on a day to be prescribed by the Attorney-General, because his permission would naturally carry that. You cannot put an amendment in the bill saying that its provisions shall not apply to the Eight Hours Day Art-union or to the Policemen and Firemen's carnival. As the Minister pointed out, it is difficult to open the door to allow one organisation through and to shut out others; but when the discretion rests with a responsible member of the Government you can exercise some control. Hon. members may not agree with my amendment because I am seeking to close the doors almost entirely. As it is framed the amendment differs materially from what was suggested on a previous occasion.

An Hon. MEMBER: It is far worse!

The Hon. E. J. KAVANAGH: Not from my point of view, because those who desire to sell tickets in the street must get the permission not only of the Attorney-General, but of the council of the municipality or shire of the locality which controls the public roads and streets in that locality. As they have to do all that I hardly see how there can

be any suggestion of an attempt to get something through easily. I feel so confident of the case that can be made on behalf of the Police and Firemen's Art-union that I am sure it can pass the test. I believe the present Attorney-General will act like a judge on the bench, who forgets all else, and considers only the facts put before him. If the case put before the Attorney-General has merit he can say that in certain circumstances and for a certain purpose tickets may be sold in the streets on a particular date. With regard to the remarks of the hon. member Mr. Buzacott I cannot see where the participation of the Jews in the matter comes in.

An Hon. MEMBER: That was a matter of twenty years ago!

The Hon. E. J. KAVANAGH: The Vice-President of the Executive Council has been good enough to come forward with what I regard as a fair and reasonable compromise under all the circumstances, namely, that the art-unions which have already received the sanction of the Attorney-General shall be carried to a conclusion, and clauses 5 and 9 will not apply to them on this occasion. In view of the fact that the hon. member will not accept my amendment I am prepared to let it go. I am always prepared to accept what I can get, and I am grateful for what the hon. member has done to meet me.

Amendment by leave withdrawn.

Postponed clause agreed to.

Bill reported with amendments; report adopted.

[The President left the chair at 6.30 p.m.
The House resumed at 7.37 p.m.]

WRIGHTVILLE MUNICIPALITY ABOLITION BILL.

SECOND READING.

The Hon. Sir JOSEPH CARRUTHERS moved:

That this bill be now read a second time. He said: Wrightville is a small mining centre. The town is in a dying condition, its mines are closed down, and the people are moving away. Very few people are left to pay the rates or to require municipal services. The town hall and municipal records have recently been destroyed by fire. There are not

sufficient aldermen in the town to form a quorum. It is not considered advisable to attempt to recreate the council. The Governor has therefore appointed the local clerk of petty sessions to be administrator of the municipality. The present position is that Cobar has asked for the amalgamation of Wrightville with it, but the residents are opposed to that. The position of the Wrightville municipality is practically hopeless. The rate income in 1920 from the exceedingly high rate of 1s. 4d. in the £ on the unimproved capital value was only £356. Only about half of that amount was collected, barely sufficient to pay administrative expenses. The expenditure on public works in 1919 and 1920 was £681 1s. 10d., towards which the Commonwealth and State Governments contributed £679 15s. 8d. The amount expended out of the council's own funds was only £1 6s. 2d. Apparently there is no good reason for the continued existence of the municipality. There was a previous occasion of the kind when the municipality of Silvertown was abolished by a special provision in the Local Government Act of 1906. These facts prove that no good purpose can be served by continuing the existence of a municipality such as Wrightville.

The Hon. JAMES WILSON: I do not think it fair to the House to agree to the motion as a matter of form without saying one kind word for the pioneers of Wrightville. I can remember when Cobar was struggling for existence, and men were endeavouring to get out a little mineral for the purpose of keeping the whole district alive. People in Wrightville then were heroes—Australians battling to earn their livelihood. There was not a Sinclair in the crowd. None were mean enough. They were great men. It is not fair that the bill should be passed without expressing gratitude to the pioneers who to-day are being disfranchised and lost because nature is poverty-stricken. It is only fair that I should say, on behalf of the men amongst whom I worked, with whom I battled, and in whose company I suffered, that to wipe them out without a tear and without a regret is absolutely unchristian and un-Australian.

Question resolved in the affirmative.

Bill read a second time and reported from Committee without amendment; report adopted.

COAL-MINES REGULATION (AMENDMENT) BILL.

SECOND READING.

The Hon. Sir JOSEPH CARRUTHERS moved:

That this bill be now read a second time.

He said: This bill amends section 54 of the Coal-mines Regulation Act, a portion of which reads as follows:—

Neither gunpowder nor any other explosive which is not on the list of permitted explosives in force for the time being shall be used in any mine which is not both naturally wet and free from inflammable gas.

It is now proposed to substitute for that the following paragraph:—

(m) Neither gunpowder nor any other explosive which is not on the list of permitted explosives in force for the time being shall be used in any part of a mine which is dry or dusty, or which is not free from inflammable gas.

It has been found that it is absurd to prohibit the use of explosives in all cases except where the mine is both naturally wet and free from inflammable gases. There are cases where the mine is dry, and where it is all the better for the miners to work and use explosives so long as the atmosphere is not dry or dusty. The amendment is in the interests both of the miners and of the mine-owners, and no objection is taken to it. It is recommended by the mining authorities.

Questioned resolved in the affirmative.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee:

Clause 1 agreed to.

Clause 2 (Amendment of of Coal-mines Regulation Act, 1912).

The CHAIRMAN: The question is that the clause stand part of the bill.

The Hon. JAMES WILSON: Wait a bit; give us a chance!

The CHAIRMAN: Clause 2.

The Hon. JAMES WILSON: That's better.

The CHAIRMAN: I will ask the hon. member not to interrupt.

The Hon. JAMES WILSON: Why should I not interrupt?

The CHAIRMAN: If the hon. member persists in interrupting I shall have to put the plenary powers of the Chairman into force.

The HON. JAMES WILSON: Put them into force!

The CHAIRMAN: I warn the hon. member that if he continually interrupts I will order that he be removed from the Chamber.

The HON. JAMES WILSON: I call attention to the state of the House

The CHAIRMAN: There is a quorum present. I draw the hon. member's attention to the fact that it is highly disorderly to call attention to the state of the House when there is a quorum present. I have power to deal with an hon. member so offending.

The HON. JAMES WILSON: Do it!

The CHAIRMAN: Usher, remove the hon. member Mr. Wilson from the Chamber.

[The hon. member Mr. Wilson left the Chamber, accompanied by the Usher of the Black Rod.]

Clause agreed to.

Bill reported from Committee without amendment; report adopted.

BOORABIL COMMISSION (AMENDMENT) BILL.

SECOND READING.

The Hon. Sir JOSEPH CARRUTHERS moved:

That this bill be now read a second time.

He said: Hon. members will remember that section 8 of the Boorabil Commission Amending Act provided that:

A witness before the commissioner shall not be excused from answering any question put to him on the ground of any privilege, or on the ground that the answer thereto may criminate or tend to criminate him, or upon any other ground.

Then there is the proviso:

That no evidence taken before the commissioner shall be admissible against any person in any civil or criminal proceeding except in the case of a person accused of having given false evidence before the commissioner, or of having procured or caused or attempted or conspired to procure or cause the giving of such evidence.

Recently some persons were charged with conspiracy in connection with the supply of twine to the Wheat Board, and they

were discharged, on the ground that none of the evidence given before the commission could be used in the criminal proceedings. It was presumed that the intention of the Boorabil Commission Act was to protect only the person who gave the evidence, and not any other person who might be involved in the matter. If so, the words "any person," in the proviso to section 8 of the Boorabil Commission Act, should perhaps read "any such person." The amendment now proposed will provide that the protection is only to apply to the person who actually gave the evidence, and not other persons.

The Hon. E. J. KAVANAGH: We quite appreciate the position taken up by the Government in the endeavour, while protecting the person who gives the evidence, to limit the extension of that protection as regards those who might be incriminated by such evidence. As I understand the Boorabil Commission Act, it provides that a person who goes before a commissioner may give all the information he desires to give and he is protected. If there is to be any use in a royal commission it is that it may obtain all the information possible. Hon. members who were in Parliament when the Boorabil Commission Act was passed know that its main object was that all the information possible should be obtained by that royal commission, whether it reflected upon the person who was giving the evidence, or whether it affected any other person. It was afterwards ruled, I understand, that evidence or information given before the royal commission, or documents produced there, could not be afterwards used in a proceeding for conspiracy, or in regard to any criminal charge, against the person who gave the evidence. But I understand the decision of the court went further than that, and it was held to apply to any person who might be implicated by the evidence given by the witness. The question arises as to whether, in curtailing any of the privileges or the rights of a person giving evidence, we are going to interfere in any way with the effectiveness of a royal commission. A man possessing information may give it in respect of something to which, perhaps, he himself has not been a party. It may affect other persons, and it may be that

he would not give the information he possessed if he knew that the person whom he was implicating could be chagrined, as would be possible on the passing of this bill, with any offence arising out of the inquiry. At the first glance I was inclined to think the bill was going a little further than is now made clear by the Minister's explanation. I think the public generally has been astounded at some of the situations created in regard to royal commissions in recent times, when men have been allowed to go before royal commissions, and to give evidence regarding other persons, and then it has been found that no proceedings followed. The public naturally said, "If these people are guilty of this sort of thing, why are they not before the courts?" I understand that the Boorabil Commission Act protects them from being taken before the court. The endeavour is now being made to provide that we can prosecute, not the person directly giving the evidence, but the person implicated or referred to by the witness. To what extent are you helping things as far as the royal commissioner's inquiry is concerned? I simply raise the question. I raise this point, because it is not the first time that the matter has been before me. I believe the Government has gone a long way towards grappling with the difficulty, but the particular point I want to refer to is that the information given in regard to other persons may be suppressed by the individual giving the information, when he knows that those in regard to whom he gives the information may be prosecuted in the criminal court.

The Hon. B. B. O'CONNOR: I take it that the object of the bill is to remove any legal grounds for not answering questions of whatever kind or character before a commission. Proposed new section 8 of clause 2 of the bill states that the following is to be substituted for section 8 of the Boorabil Commission Act:

A person who is called before the commissioner either as a witness or to produce books, documents, or writings, shall not be excused from answering any question, or from the production of any book, document, or writing, upon the ground that the answer thereto, or the

production thereof, may criminate or tend to criminate him, or on the ground of privilege, or on any other ground.

Then in the next part it says that whatever answer you make, or whatever documents or books you produce, you will be immune from any action, civil or criminal. The explanatory note attached to the bill says—

The Hon. Sir JOSEPH CARRUTHERS: The second part of the section is the important part!

The Hon. B. B. O'CONNOR: Yes, I take it that the second part exempts a man from being prosecuted criminally or civilly. But I cannot see any difference between that and what is in the Act. Section 8 of the Boorabil Commission Act contains a proviso which states:

Provided that no evidence taken before the commissioner shall be admissible against any person in any civil or criminal proceeding except in the case of a person accused of having given false evidence before the commissioner

That is quite at variance with the whole principle of British jurisprudence. You are dragged to the court under plenary power. The Act compels you to go there, and you cannot escape going. It compels you to answer, but, having forced you, under the majesty of the law, with all its attendant penalties, to do that, it states it is not going to use that against you. The explanatory note says:

In a prosecution for conspiracy the Chief Justice ruled that a document which had been compulsorily produced before the royal commissioner was not admissibly any evidence against those accused with conspiracy.

Seeing that the evidence or document was obtained under plenary power, it was the bounden duty of the judge to say that that evidence or document could not be used in a criminal charge. With all due respect. I do not think I would alter the law as it stands. The object of the bill is to remove any ground of defence, legal or otherwise, against answering a question. A set of circumstances might arise under which you would have to compel a man to answer a question. I cannot see the exact relation between the explanatory note and the words in the bill. I think the bill

is very simple, and, in the absence of the explanatory note, I would have less difficulty in regard to it.

The Hon. E. J. KAVANAGH: The last words in the explanatory note seem to give the gist of the bill!

The Hon. B. B. O'CONNOR: They state:

The present bill will protect a person giving the answer or producing the document, but does not protect other persons. That might be worked to great disadvantage, and I will tell hon. members why. Supposing two men, A and B, are concerned in a matter, and you only bring B before the royal commission. You may force a document in against A, and then in a criminal prosecution you may drag that document out, and use it against B.

The Hon. J. M. POWER: Would not that deter B from giving all the information in his possession?

The Hon. B. B. O'CONNOR: They would put him in gaol if he did not give all the information in his possession.

The Hon. J. M. POWER: He might suffer from loss of memory!

The Hon. B. B. O'CONNOR: Yes, he might. The Boorabil Commission Act cuts across the grain of our procedure in civil and criminal jurisdiction, and I do not want to see any extension of it. Once evidence is brought out one does not know what the result will be, when you do this under force of law. You are going a long way to make our criminal jurisdiction very nearly approach an inquisition. It will not be far off an inquisition. I know that the leader of the Government hesitated a long time before he gave effect to the Boorabil Commission Act. With this extension of power, I would be slow to agree to the second reading of the bill.

The Hon. J. B. PEDEN: I would suggest to the leader of the Government that he should reconsider the whole frame of the bill. As far as I understand the matter, the Boorabil Commission Act of 1914 was a special Act, passed for a special purpose, with, of course, only a limited life. It was essentially an Act for one commission—a commission held by the late Mr. Justice Pring. There had before been some legislation of this kind. In this special Act, which was passed for one special purpose, there was a section

[The Hon. B. B. O'Connor.

which amended the general Act, namely, the Royal Commissioners Evidence Act of 1901. The gist of the permanent provision was that where, after the passing of the Act, any commission was issued, it should be permissible in the case of a commission issued to a Supreme Court judge for the Governor to say that any specified section of the Boorabil Act should apply to the commission which had been issued and which was being carried out in accordance with the Royal Commissioners Evidence Act, 1901. That is provided for in section 12 of the Boorabil Commission Act. The amendment, in that section, of the Royal Commissioners Evidence Act was temporary. It was only to operate within two years after the passing of the Boorabil Commission Act. The next step was in connection with the inquiry made by Mr. Justice Street when he investigated the I.W.W. cases. An Act passed in 1918 called the Police Inquiry Act was again a special measure passed to confer special powers on one special commissioner. Advantage was taken of the passing of that Act to eliminate the two-year limit from the clause in the Boorabil Commission Act, which amended the Royal Commissioners Evidence Act. So that you have now one section only of the Police Inquiry Act alive. Section 4 of the Police Inquiry Act, 1918, says:

Section eleven of the Royal Commissioners Evidence Act, 1901, as inserted by section twelve of the Boorabil Commission Act, 1914, is amended by omitting the words "within two years after the passing of this Act."

Now is it not undesirable to have what is intended to be permanent legislation mixed up with two temporary Acts? I have a recollection that when either the Police Inquiry Bill or some other bill affecting royal commissions was before this House a suggestion was put to Mr. Garland, who was then the leader of the House, that the proper thing to do was not to ask the House in a temporary measure to pass some amendment of the Royal Commissioners Evidence Act; and I think he gave a definite undertaking that his Government would, at the first convenient opportunity, bring down a measure for the amendment generally of the Royal Commissioners Evidence Act. Is not that what ought to be done now?

Under section 12 of the Boorabil Commission Act, to which I referred:

In any letters patent issued under the great seal within two years after the passing of this Act—

That has been cut out:

appointing any judge of the Supreme Court a commissioner to make any inquiry, it shall be lawful for the Governor to declare that all or any specified sections of the Boorabil Commission Act, 1914, shall be applicable for the purposes of such inquiry, and the same shall therefore be applied in the holding of the said inquiry.

There are some sections, at any rate, in the Boorabil Commission Act which could have no possible application. For instance, the one providing that Mr. Justice Pring should be the royal commissioner. I can quite understand that, when you are faced with some serious and urgent matter for investigation and you want to pass a special measure of the type of the Boorabil Commission Act, that is not the time to amend the Royal Commissioners Evidence Act. You have to do the best you can at the time. You passed an Act to meet the special emergency, and, incidentally, you took advantage of the opportunity to amend the Royal Commissioners Evidence Act. Now you are not dealing with a measure to meet any particular emergency. You are laying down a set of provisions to which recourse may be had in any royal commission issued to a Supreme Court judge when some important matter for inquiry arises. Now ought not all the sections you have in mind to go into an amendment of the Royal Commissioners Evidence Act of 1901? Scrap these temporary measures—the Boorabil Commission Act and this Police Inquiry Act; pick out the provisions you want, and make them a group of sections in the Royal Commissioners Evidence Act, or a separate part of that Act, with the provision, of course, that the royal commissioner is not to have the powers unless the Government of the day so decide. It seems to me that it is thoroughly undesirable to have our statute-book in the position that we have some permanent provisions embodied in temporary measures which involve keeping them alive for all time. The Boorabil Commission Act and the Police Inquiry Act are really done with. They ought to be

swept off the statute-book, and instead of having three Acts—the Royal Commissioners Evidence Act, the Boorabil Commission Act, and the Police Inquiry Act, why cannot we get down to one? There is no simplification by the method adopted in the present bill. This is a matter of form; but it is such an important matter of form that I make no apology for bringing it before the notice of the House and of the Government.

I want now to deal with the question of matter. There is a somewhat similar provision to this in the Bankruptcy Act. When he wants to ascertain things the official assignee can take out a summons and get the bankrupt or a third party and cross-examine him with a view to discovering assets to be made available for the benefit of the creditors. In that compulsory examination the bankrupt or a third party can be forced to answer anything, but the answers he gives cannot be used against him in any other court.

Let me illustrate the sort of thing that could happen, which I think will suggest that this clause goes a little bit too far. I remember a case where a bankrupt was being cross-examined in the Bankruptcy Court under section 30 and he produced a certain document. He said, "I repaid £300 to a certain woman and thereupon she signed this document." That was a complete answer to the particular matter being investigated. Now the woman, when she got to know about this, said, "That document is a forgery, I never signed it." That document, let it be remembered, was produced by the person being examined, and you cannot possibly use any evidence given by a witness in that court under that section. Would it not be a monstrous thing that you could not use that document, that you could not get hold of it, that you could not put that man up on a charge of forgery, to say nothing, of course, about what took place in the Bankruptcy Court? Just get hold of the document, as if, so far as the jury were concerned, it dropped from the sky, and then put it to the jury, "There is a document which purports to be signed by A." Prove that A never signed the document, and that B, the accused, did. Where is the unfairness in a case like that of prosecuting

the man for forgery of a document which he himself produced in the course of a compulsory examination in the Bankruptcy Court? Let hon. members look at the proviso to clause 2 of this bill:

Provided that no answer given by any person to or before the commissioner, and no book, document, or writing produced to the commissioner by any person, shall be admissible in evidence against such person.

It is quite fair not to use against him the evidence he gave before the commissioner. The hon. member Mr. Kavanagh said that in order to induce a man to open his mouth, and to prevent him from losing his memory, you have to hold out to him the strong inducement of the Boorabil Commission Act. But having done that, and having said to him, "We are not going to take anything you have said, we are not going to convict you out of your own mouth in any shape or form," is there any reason why you should not get hold of that document and without saying to the jury that that man produced the document, of using any of the evidence given before the commission, connect him up with the document? For instance if it is a forged document and you can connect him up with the document.

The Hon. E. J. KAVANAGH: It might be a stolen document—

The Hon. J. B. PEDEN: As the hon. member says it might be a stolen document. If he has put it forward as a genuine document, and as a matter of fact it is a forged document, you cannot prosecute him under this provision for the forgery. Is not that going too far?

The Hon. R. W. CRUICKSHANK: If a false document were produced before a royal commission, would not that be giving false evidence?

The Hon. J. B. PEDEN: It is a very shrewd question, if I may say so. I think the answer is that it might or might not be false evidence. Very often it might easily involve the point the hon. member puts—that is that the witness, in effect, says, "this is a genuine document," and then you prosecute him for perjury, for having sworn that something is a genuine document when it is not a genuine document. Very often that would be the case. At the same time one can imagine cases where it would not necessarily

[*The Hon. J. B. Peden.*

amount to that. But whether it does or does not you cannot charge him with forgery; the only thing you can do is to charge him with perjury—that is giving false evidence.

The Hon. Sir JOSEPH CARRUTHERS: Do you say this bill will prevent him from being prosecuted for forgery?

The Hon. J. B. PEDEN: Yes.

The Hon. Sir JOSEPH CARRUTHERS: Why?

The Hon. J. B. PEDEN: Because you cannot produce any document against him.

The Hon. Sir JOSEPH CARRUTHERS: That is a different thing. You can prosecute him for forgery!

The Hon. J. B. PEDEN: You cannot use that document.

The Hon. Sir JOSEPH CARRUTHERS: That is only a question of evidence!

The Hon. J. B. PEDEN: How can you possibly charge a man with forging a document if you cannot produce the document to the court? There would be no evidence to go to the jury.

The Hon. Sir JOSEPH CARRUTHERS: I do not admit that!

The Hon. J. B. PEDEN: The case to go to the jury would be: A forged a document. You have either to produce the document or to account for its absence. Ordinarily you can account for its absence only by its having been destroyed or lost, and when you have an Act of Parliament which says that the document cannot be used against him, I fail to see how you could possibly prosecute him for forgery.

The Hon. R. W. CRUICKSHANK: If you can prosecute him for giving false evidence and you succeed, he will be sent to gaol, and no one wants more than that!

The Hon. J. B. PEDEN: If you prosecute him for perjury it may be that the offence is just as serious as the offence of forgery. But the rules with regard to conviction for forgery differ from the rules with regard to conviction for perjury. You cannot convict a man for perjury except on the evidence of two witnesses. So that it would be no good putting a man up for perjury unless you have two witnesses. It may be no good putting him up for forgery unless you have the evidence of more than one witness, but as a matter of law you would have sufficient

evidence, in a charge of forgery, if you had one witness. I suggest to the leader of the Government that this is such an important matter that he might well consider whether the best course would not be to have a systematic revision and amendment of the Royal Commissioners Evidence Act so as to make it perfectly clear what the position is and incidentally to consider the exact terms of the vital clause.

The Hon. Sir JOSEPH CARRUTHERS, in reply: There may be very good grounds for going thoroughly into the question of amending the Boorabil Commission Act in other directions but I suppose that argument can be used in regard to other amending bills, and if it were to succeed we should find ourselves stopped at every stage when we were making an amendment about which there could be any doubt. What the hon. member contends is, that we should go further and not put ourselves in the position of having no power to prosecute a man for forging a document which he produces. That may be all very well, but the question of using evidence against a person or producing a document against a person who gives that evidence or produces that document is very debatable. The question here is the using of that evidence or that document against somebody else. It was never intended to protect that other person when the Boorabil Commission Act was passed and the judge could give protection to an individual in order to elicit facts in the public interest. You say to the person concerned, "We shall not use what you say against you, nor shall we use against you a document which you produce." By using in the Act the words, "any person" instead of "any such person" you mean that the world at large will be given the benefit of that immunity. You cannot produce against any person evidence given by another person who is not charged and who has had the benefit of the immunity granted to him under the Boorabil Commission Act. This is not dealing with the question of whether we shall allow a man who gives evidence or produces a document to have more or less immunity, but whether other persons shall be able to come in and say, "Oh, you got that evidence by giving that man

an immunity; having got that evidence you cannot now use it against us." We believe that we ought to be able to use it against other persons. If a document is produced, coming though it does from a tainted source, which will enable the public to have justice against some other person, we think it is a right thing that we should have that justice. In the wheat prosecution I understand a document was obtained from a witness who had the benefit held out to him by the judge or commissioner in a previous inquiry that he would not be liable to prosecution for saying anything which might incriminate himself, or by producing a document which might incriminate him. Other persons were implicated, not perhaps by that document alone but by a mass of other evidence also and when it came to producing against them that document that had come to the hands of the Crown through that channel it was held that it could not be produced. This bill provides only that the evidence or the document shall not be used against the person who gave the evidence or produced the document.

The draft of the bill was prepared by Mr. A. B. Shand, who, I believe, is leader of the bar, and Mr. Manning who occupies a high position. Mr. McTiernan the ex-Attorney-General submitted this matter to his Cabinet, and Cabinet after discussion of the matter commissioned the Attorney-General to have an amending bill which would stop justice from being defeated, as it was in the case to which I have referred, through the Chief Justice finding himself bound to rule that the document, through which perhaps justice could have been obtained against this man, was inadmissible because some other person produced it under an immunity given to that person. The opinion given by Mr. Shand and Mr. Manning is as follows:—

In our opinion the suggested amendment to the Boorabil Commission Act will get over the difficulty raised by the Chief Justice in the recent wheat conspiracy cases. It may be well, however, to point out the position of documents, &c., which may be called for by the commissioner. By section 2 of the Boorabil Commission Act, 1914, the commissioner has all the powers, &c., of the Supreme Court or judge thereof in respect of the compelling the production of books, documents, and writings. Section 8 takes away all privilege from a witness so far

as refusal to answer any question is concerned. This section does not deal with privilege regarding refusal to produce documents, &c. It would appear therefore that if a witness summoned to produce documents refuses to produce on the ground of privilege he could not be compelled so to do, as the judge merely has the powers of the Supreme Court, which clearly exclude power to compel a person to incriminate himself. . . . If a witness objects to produce on the above grounds, and the judge insists upon production and the witness complies, then the document cannot be used in evidence. See *R. v. Cooke*, L.R., 4 p.c., 599. We think if the Attorney-General wishes to bring the production of documents into line with the obligation to answer questions the draft marked "A" would be an appropriate one. If on the other hand it is desired merely to remove the difficulties raised by the aforesaid ruling of the Chief Justice then draft "B" is more appropriate than the one sent for our consideration.

(On that the Attorney-General of the late Government approved of the draft which was submitted. I maintain that it is perfectly justifiable, in the interests of the public, that where a person who is not the actual party who gave evidence is prosecuted that person shall not have the privilege of the immunity granted to the other. The whole policy of the Boorabil law may be bad, but there were extraordinary circumstances existing when it was passed. I recollect the keen debate which preceded it and which was repeated time after time as to whether we should have the novel procedure provided in the Boorabil case. It was said that practically it was encouraging an informer and using as an informer the chief criminal and giving to that chief criminal an immunity without which the court could not get possession of the facts. The object of all these bills was not so much to get at one individual and punish him as to expose a whole series of transactions, and to assist in the recovery by the Crown either of land or property or rights which had been taken away from it by conspirators or by some individuals. While this amendment may be really regarded as a bit of patchwork, it is essentially requisite in view of what happened in that case in which perhaps no justice has yet been done. I agree with the hon. member Professor Peden that it would be much better that this statute and many others should be carefully remodelled and that a sifting process should go on whereby the best of each may be retained and the

[*The Hon. Sir Joseph Carruthers.*

worst of each may be done away with. But I do not think that stage has been arrived at. In this country more than in the Old Land the temptation is so great and the watchdogs of the public so few that conspiracies will be continually recurring which will have to be guarded against. We have to pay the price and have to adopt some very novel procedure in order to get at conspirators.

Question resolved in the affirmative.

Bill read a second time and reported from Committee without amendment; report adopted.

SPECIAL ADJOURNMENT.

Motion (by the Hon. Sir JOSEPH CARRUTHERS) agreed to :

That the House at its rising to-day do adjourn until Wednesday next.

House adjourned at 8.44 p.m.

Legislative Assembly.

Thursday, 14 September, 1922.

Printed Questions and Answers—Member Deceased—
 Questions without Notice—Public Accounts Committee Election Enabling Bill—Amendment of Standing Orders—The Budget (First Night's Debate)—Amendment of Standing Orders—Local Government (Validation and Amendment) Bill (second reading)—Police Regulation Appeals Bill—Bread Bill—Encroachment of Buildings Bill—Mining (Amendment) Bill (No. 2) (second reading).

Mr. SPEAKER took the chair.

PRINTED QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS.

LAND BOARD CHAIRMEN.

Mr. PERKINS asked the SECRETARY FOR LANDS,—(1) When is it intended to make an appointment to the vacant position of land board chairman at Goulburn? (2) How many vacancies in similar positions exist at present in New South Wales? (3) Is it his intention to fill all such vacancies? (4) What amount would be saved annually by chairmen working two districts each throughout the whole State? (5) Where the reduced system has been tried is it a fact that inconvenience has been caused by delay in dealing with cases?