Chapter 2

A charity or a right?

Repatriation of disabled ex-servicemen in Western Australia, post World War I

Sue Summers

It will be a great event in your lives. It is not in the time of difficulty and trouble, when obstacles have to be overcome, that we think most of such an experience. It is after the work is over that we look back with joy and pride on what we have done and where we have been. It is then that there comes home to us a great feeling of satisfaction that we have been able to go through these difficulties and overcome them all. I hope that you will come safely through all the dangers and that we shall have the satisfaction of welcoming you home and congratulating you on the work that you have done. … On behalf of the people of Western Australia I say to you all “God speed.”¹

When Sir John Forrest addressed the young recruits at the Blackboy Hill encampment in September 1914, he championed the British view that the Empire would come out of the conflict successfully, while assuring them the Australian government and people would honour its obligations to the expeditionary forces.² War had been declared one month earlier and in Western Australia alone, 4,444 men rushed to the recruitment halls just one day after they opened.³ War was seen as the ‘great adventure’ and as men left country areas in droves, they were farewelled with much enthusiasm and pathos by friends, relations and well-wishers along with “cheers, whistles, detonators, and cock-a-doodledooing” from every railway engine in the yard.⁴ At this point war was in its infancy and they were yet to know that 60,000 Australians would die, that two-thirds of those sent overseas would be injured through combat, and that 75,000 would return home as invalids.⁵
Relatively little has been written on the repatriation of those who were incapacitated, of their struggles and trials, of their dependency on family, community and government and of their individual stories of survival that have long been overshadowed by idealised projections of the “independent and masculinised hero of Anzac lore”. There are notable exceptions including Stephen Garton’s *The Cost of War* (1990), Clem Lloyd and Jacqui Rees’ *The Last Shilling* (2004), Kate Blackmore’s *The Dark Pocket of Time* (2008) and Marina Larsson’s *Shattered Anzacs: living with the scars of war* (2009), yet books examining ex-servicemen’s experience of repatriation remain “thin on the ground”, particularly in the Western Australian context. It is perhaps now, with the safe distancing of time that their stories are seen as worthy of inclusion in the national narrative and the subject of further exploration.

Early last century it was a different story as illustrated in the uneasy and protracted transition to peace as returned soldiers called upon State and Federal Governments for the “fulfilment of promises made in 1914”. Such promises, however, were few and far between, their minimalism beclouded by the “silver tongued oratory” of British and Australian leaders calling upon men to answer the call of their country. When John Forrest promised the young recruits that the nation would honour its obligations to the men, the only detail he provided in his lengthy speech was that the government and people “will see to those you leave behind”. The key promise made to men – largely in response to falling recruitment levels from 1915 – was that Commonwealth and State governments would ensure preference of government employment to returned soldiers, with a further guarantee that men’s positions would be available to them on their return from war. As detailed later in this chapter, this seminal pledge was not just poorly honoured, but was based on the assumption that the majority of men would return from war service in good health. This was not the case. There was little comprehension at the time that the Great War would be unlike all others: set against the unexpected size of the conflict and the extraordinary increase in the destructive power of weapons were medical advances in military medicine, antiseptics, new surgical techniques, greater control of infectious and epidemic diseases and thus soldiers who would have died in previous wars were now surviving. By the end of war in November 1918, disabled soldiers overwhelmingly outnumbered the war dead.

In exploring the complex circumstances that shaped the lives of disabled ex-servicemen, much of this research focuses upon a case study of Trooper Frank Leear Bolger, a miner in the WA goldfields who enlisted in the 10th Light Horse in 1914, served briefly at Gallipoli, and was hospitalised three times before his return to Australia as totally and permanently incapacitated (TPI). A case study is applied for two key reasons. First, Bolger’s ‘experience’ of repatriation is barely visible in the literature to date. He was among a class of war-disabled
men who were at a distinct disadvantage in the 1920s: he was a manual labourer, single, middle-aged, no home or close relatives in WA, and did not benefit from any vocational re-training schemes. The majority of ex-servicemen after being “repaired, rehabilitated and pensioned” were “cared for in their own homes by their own kin” with the family providing the “cornerstone” of their lives. Bolger, however, had never married and a number of family members living in Victoria were ill or had passed away. A case study approach also provides access to the specificity of Bolger’s extensive repatriation records and various archival documents that help illustrate – particularly when set against newspaper coverage of the time – the socio-economic conditions in the WA goldfields that helped drive recruitment levels, the unremitting pressure placed upon men to enlist, the resources and practices of the Repatriation Department and the subsequent plight of many disabled men following the war.

Born in Daylesford, Victoria, in 1878, Frank was one of 75,000 people who fled depressed conditions in the colony between 1895 and 1900 heading for the most part to Western Australia. One-third of these ‘othersiders’ were attracted by stories of quick and easy wealth and made their way – by camel, coach, train or foot – to the eastern goldfields. Frank, however, arrived towards the tail-end of the mining boom when opportunities to prosper were beginning to wane. By the early 1900s, gold-mining was changing, mines were steadily amalgamating or closing, and of the 50 towns in the region, few would survive the next decade. Frank was fortunate to secure employment at the Marmont Gold Mine just outside Meekatharra, but the mine lay idle in 1912 and again in 1913, with the economic outlook across the state increasingly bleak. The government had imposed a wage freeze, unemployment and trade union strikes mounted, drought devastated vast areas of inland, the wheat yield plummeted, basic commodity prices escalated, and store keepers were reluctant to give credit as they too were struggling to survive.

Film and cinema was still a novelty for Australian audiences and helped mediate the economic and political problems of the time. There was standing room only at Picture Land in Meekatharra as locals flocked to “some fine pictures of the troops” and the “dirty Germans” all to the accompaniment of “splendid music”. Nearby “A.W.A Photoplays under the stars” promoted “Kaiser Bill wants Europe” as “the most colossal film ever attempted”, while “War. War. War. War” was hailed as: “… the first genuine moving picture of the present war. The Great Battle at Antwerp. Inhabitants flying in all directions – batteries in action – German shells bursting – a thoroughly realistic picture of war in its present stage”. In tandem, newsreels and newspapers covered the stirring addresses and powerful speeches of the Prime Minister and other world leaders who focused on the heroism, glory, adventure and drama of war in place of its agony and suffering. Throughout Western Australia, recruiting committees set
up by the State War Council, the Perth City Council, various local authorities (including Municipal Councils and Roads Boards throughout the state) and the appointment of special recruiting sergeants set in motion “a thousand persons as recruiting agents”.

Young men were constantly told they had a “bounden duty” to enlist, that the future of the country, of Australian democracy, and of the Empire was hanging on the hopes of victory. As part of this unrelenting moral and coercive pressure to enlist, men in the Goldfield’s were told that the enemy would be easily “beaten into submission” or “worn down and worn out” and thus would be no match for the “magnificent material” from the WA bush:

… the Australian bush dweller is already half a soldier. He can shoot, he can ride, he can tend horses, endure privations, and live on the smell of an oil-rag. Give him three or four months’ training under a competent instructor, and he will be ready to take his place in the trenches or in a cavalry corps.

Frank seized the opportunity for what was being hailed as the “great adventure”. When he volunteered for the 10th Light Horse there was little time to waste as he was 36 years of age and deemed too old to enlist. The 10th Light Horse was primarily a Western Australian regiment and most of the recruitment took place in country areas from October to mid-November 1914 via the rail links to the
south, east and north of Perth. It appears he initially missed out, that he was among the deluge of volunteers who bypassed routine recruiting procedures by leaving their jobs and farms in country areas, paying their own fares to Perth, and turning up at the Military Barracks in Newcastle Street or at the Blackboy Hill Camp some 18 kilometres east of the city. While hundreds were turned down – their frustrations vented in the daily papers – Frank successfully enlisted on 28 November 1914 at the Blackboy Hill encampment and was placed under the command of Hugo Throssell.

Journalists invited to tour the camp described the young men who “answered the call” of their country as “fine specimens of active, virile manhood”, further praising them for their “fine athletic appearance”, “enthusiasm” and “earnestness”. A 1921 account written by Lieutenant-Colonel Arthur Olden described the assortment of commercial and professional men, farmers and labourers, university graduates and men of independent means brought together under the “wooden, hessian and iron shanties, lovingly called ‘Hay Street’” that had sprung into being at the Light Horse Camp:

No comic opera, no screaming farce, could have possibly cause more mirth and merriment to anyone possessing the slightest sense of humour than did the numberless incidents of the daily routine of that period.

Each man was expected to “supply his own horse gratuitiously” yet many lacked the skills required for a Light Horse contingent. Olden explained that the major task for those “taken on the strength” of their enthusiasm was the “work of licking this willing material into shape.”

Trooper Frank Bolger 708 was given ten weeks training before he embarked on A50 Itonus at Fremantle in February 1915 to commence active duty at Gallipoli in mid-May 1915. Against the odds he survived the Battle of the Nek in which 800 Australian servicemen were killed or wounded, recovered from a wound to the neck the following month, but then took a bullet to the chest on 7 October 1915. He was hospitalised for several months, firstly in Malta and later in Egypt, with medical reports indicating that he was in severe pain, coughing blood, and suffering ongoing palpitations. A decision was taken not to remove the bullet as it lay too close to the heart. He was “invalided home” in April 1916 and stationed at the No 8. Australian General Hospital (AGH) in Fremantle.

When examined by the Defence Department Medical Board, Frank's incapacity was assessed as “total” with a recommendation that he be discharged as permanently unfit on a full pension for 12 months – a decision approved by the AIF.
COMMONWEALTH OF AUSTRALIA.

OLD AGE PENSIONS OFFICE,
A.M.P. CHAMBERS, WILLIAM STREET,
PERTH.
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POSTMASTER,

[Signature]

I have to inform you that the rate of pension granted to the above-named pensioner has been increased to $4 for fortnightly increased
(decreased) amount due 1/3/17.

Subject to further notice in this matter

Please forward the identification card to this office as early as possible in order that the necessary alterations may be made.

[Signature]

Deputy Commissioner of Pensions.

---

Frank Boegger

Declarant.
Frank then applied for a war pension and left Perth for Meekatharra in the WA goldfields. His immediate departure may have been influenced by a number of newspaper articles focusing upon returned soldiers who had been treated and discharged as unfit for further service by base hospital doctors, but then instructed to undergo further medical examinations in relation to their application for a pension. Distance, however, did not protect Frank from bureaucracy. Just one day after he was formally discharged from the AIF, W.A. Cornish, the Deputy Registrar of Pensions in Perth, set aside the decision of the Defence Department Medical Board and called for an independent medical examination that required Frank to travel 770 kilometres from Meekatharra to Perth. In this instance, the AIF and independent medical reports were consistent: Frank Bolger’s incapacity was “total” but Cornish had the power to make the final decision and he awarded a full pension to be reviewed in six rather than 12 months.34 This did not bode well for Frank, or for other disabled servicemen repatriated from war, as it was a precursor of far more difficult times to come.

Prior to war, W.A. Cornish was the Deputy Commissioner for Old Age Pensions in Western Australia and when redeployed as the Deputy Registrar of War Pensions, he was empowered to determine the eligibility of the claims placed before him.35 As observed later in the chapter, his decisions were consistent with long-standing values and practices of the Australian Welfare System which, from the 19th century, distinguished between the ‘deserving’ and ‘undeserving’ poor and, in the post-war years, between the ‘deserving’ and ‘undeserving’ sick. The repatriation system was not immune to this world view with key officials like Cornish viewing the war pension more as a ‘charitable handout’ than as a ‘right’. This was further buttressed by an all pervasive belief that receiving assistance was shameful and that it was the moral character of an individual – as opposed to the wider environment – that was the cause of many difficulties.36

Commonwealth and State governments – including the WA War Pensions Office – were ill-prepared for the immensity of the repatriation task and the deluge of disabled servicemen.37 Initially, they had believed that the majority of survivors could and would recover from their injuries, be absorbed into civil life with a minimum of dislocation and, with time, be less reliant on government support.
Their belief, however, was at odds with the realities of the situation which were clearly apparent in 1915 when the first war-injured were repatriated to Australia. At this time, the WA State War Council explicitly informed the Premier that, “practically the whole of the men discharged are unfit for hard work, and a percentage of these, by reason of disablement, through loss of limbs or otherwise, will be unable, even when their general health has returned, to follow their former employment”. The War Council also acknowledged that the difficulties would be greatly accentuated when larger numbers of men returned, for they had neither the organisation nor the funds to deal with large numbers of men.\textsuperscript{38} Later, Australia would be credited with introducing one of the most extensive war pension schemes of any nation,\textsuperscript{39} but at this early point in time:

Policies and programs, and the principles that informed them, were developed on the run, revised, and revised again in the light of changed circumstances and perceptions. In 1914 and 1915 there were three pension Acts, in 1916 an act to regulate repatriation funds, and from 1917 to 1921, four repatriation Acts, each amending the former. More followed in the 1920s and 1930s, and again during the Second World War.\textsuperscript{40}

The first National Repatriation Conference convened in February 1916 focused upon returning ex-servicemen to civil life and assisting them to find employment and a permanent livelihood—but no specific programs were proposed for wounded or disabled veterans. Instead, the conference resolved for citizens to subscribe in cash or kind to a special fund raised from appeals made by the Federal Parliamentary War Committee, the State War Councils and their associated local organisations. The outcome was the Australian Soldiers’ Repatriation Fund in which the government was confident that it was in the will and capacity of the people to furnish the necessary moneys for the fund to achieve its objectives.\textsuperscript{41} Returned service organisations were far from impressed: the government was attempting to place much of the responsibility for the care of returned soldiers onto the Australian community and, in the process, was disengaging from pre-war promises and re-framing the repatriation and rehabilitation of ex-servicemen as a ‘charity’ rather than as a ‘right’.\textsuperscript{42} The Australian press would later pick up on the many injustices of the situation but initially it was quick to take up the cause:

Our soldiers are risking their all for us. Already many thousands have sacrificed their lives so that we may live, and more have suffered injury and hardship past description. We promised these gallant men we would care for them on their return and we extend the same assurance to those who are enlisting. ... Only by some sacrifice of this world’s goods can we demonstrate our gratitude to them and discharge our
special individual obligations … it is quite imperative that we do it both ungrudgingly and thoroughly, so as to discharge the debt of conscience of the citizens of the Commonwealth.43

Individuals, families, communities, businesses and charities responded generously by donating money, clothing, livestock, tools, land and property for the benefit of ex-servicemen, the majority of whom were working-class men who had returned to vastly changed communities and life circumstances.44 At Sandstone, where Frank lived for several years, there had been a floating population of 6–8000 people prior to war, but by 1919 just 200 remained.45 Goldfield townships were struggling to survive. The post-war wool boom continued to displace the gold producer and by 1923, in the 200 miles between Leonora and Wiluna, there was a “long line of abandoned shows” described by the West Australian as “one of the most depressing scenes that the imagination can conceive”. While this post-war slump in the economy affected the whole state, the WA government isolated much of the unemployment problem within regional areas by investing most of the State's revenue in metropolitan projects and by restricting government employment in Perth to those with homes established in the metropolitan area. Further, the goal of the State War Council – including other organisations that administered the 1916 Repatriation Fund – was to return ex-servicemen to the district from which they enlisted on the expectation there would be “many willing and strong hands” waiting to help them. By relying on the goodwill of resource-depleted regional communities to shoulder much of the problem, the government was not only exacerbating long-standing tensions between the city and the bush but was strengthening an ethos in which regional communities drew together to protect their own from the indifference, neglect, and discriminative practices of city-based officials.46 This community support would be of benefit to Frank and other ex-servicemen in years to come.

Frank did return to Meekatharra as expected but not without difficulty: a return to his former employment was not viable as he was incapable of sustained work, all facilities for disabled ex-servicemen had been set up in the metropolitan area, and there was no family unit to help care for and sustain him. His prospects of marriage throughout his life were negligible. In the early part of the century, men on the WA goldfields had outnumbered women two to one, and in the post-war years the claims of some journalists that the “warlike deeds” of wounded men would be “desirable to young women” mostly fell on deaf ears.47 The reality was far removed from earlier visions of the glory and heroism of war: Frank and others like him had been left with little to offer. His main resource proved to be the support of key community members who, it appears, helped shield him from the scrutiny and harsh practices of the Repatriation Department. Over the next two decades he lived at Meekatharra, Wiluna, Sandstone and
Norseman and one can only speculate whether he took shelter in a corrugated iron shed on the outskirts of town or in houses abandoned after the collapse of the mining boom. It would have been a solitary life. Archival records indicate that at various times he owned some horses, dogs, sheep, and an old truck, and sold sandalwood on occasions. He also fossicked for gold when his health allowed, no doubt searching for that elusive gold nugget that would enable him – as did William Beggs in September 1919 – to have his name “struck off the list of those receiving sustenance” and be free of the red tape that shaped the lives of many ex-servicemen.48

**LEFT:** Map of WA showing towns Bolger frequented or resided, some 730–950 kilometres east to north-east of Perth.

When Frank’s war pension was due for its first re-assessment in February 1917, W.A. Cornish from the Perth War Pensions Office contacted the Kalgoorlie police requesting they be “good enough” to enquire and to report on the activities of Frank Bolger. The Inspector of Police reported that Frank: had taken a “tribute” in the company of another man, that “no parcels had been crushed after two months”, that he “took periodical turns whilst at work”, was “receiving no wages” and that he was “unable to follow his present occupation”. Cornish immediately reduced his pension from £3 to £2:5:0 a fortnight and Frank travelled 950 kilometres from Wiluna to Perth at his own expense to successfully appeal the decision. At his next pension review – scheduled just three months later – Frank strategically sought the support of the AIF Permanent Medical Referee Board who advised Cornish, in detail, of his state of health, including the bullet lodged in his chest, recurrent attacks of asthma, retraction of the right lung, a dilated and markedly irregular heartbeat, dyspnoea, and precordial pain as the result of a bullet wound at Gallipoli. They added that “… The claimant has lost his earning power to the extent of the whole for twelve months”. When Cornish overruled their medical testimony to reduce the pension rate, Frank sought the advice of the Returned Soldiers and Sailors’ Association (RSSA) of WA which he had joined following his discharge from the AIF. He explained that those who enlisted in 1914 were guaranteed that “if a man was wounded and had lost his total capacity to earn his living in a common labour market, he was to receive a full pension.” Yet, in spite of these terms, in the space of just 18 months his pension had been subject to ongoing revision and reductions. “What I want to find out is there no way of us getting
what we are justly entitled too. What is the good of the board of doctors, if someone outside is to chop your pension about at their own sweet-will.” 49 The RSSA then forwarded Frank Bolger’s letter to the Pensions Office requesting “that it be treated in the nature of an appeal”.50

Chas O’Callaghan, the Secretary of the Local Repatriation Committee at Wiluna, also intervened on Frank’s behalf and the appeal was successful leaving Frank free from surveillance for some 18 months.51 The branch at Wiluna was one of some 21 Local Repatriation Committees throughout WA where secretaries/managers, typists and clerks worked in an honorary capacity utilising their offices and phones for the benefit of ex-servicemen. That they had little power or influence was evident at the first state-wide conference of local repatriation committees held in Perth in March 1919 in which they requested: that the duties and powers of local committees be clearly defined; that their recommendations be upheld, or valid reason be shown why not; and that local committees be supplied with the necessary information to be able to deal expeditiously and efficiently with the business referred to them. Their submission for Labour Bureaus, registering all returned men, to be opened in each country area was turned down on the grounds that every local committee was, in effect, already a labour bureau. Their recommendation that convalescent homes and workshops be opened at provincial centres was rejected given the Minister’s decision that one convalescent home in WA was sufficient and that it be established on the outskirts of the capital city of Perth. The Repatriation Department also dismissed a recommendation that it bear the cost of the salaries of secretaries/managers because of “the immense sum” this would entail, a decision endorsed by an executive member who asserted that “the carrying on of this work without cost to the Commonwealth was the least they could do”.52

The frustrations borne by local committees were illustrated in a seven-month standoff between W.A. Cornish, WA Registrar of Pensions, and Chas O’Callaghan, Secretary of the Wiluna Repatriation Committee over the reimbursement of travel costs for Frank Bolger and ex-sapper William J. Johnson’s medical examination as part of their ongoing pension reviews.53 The return fare of £9 was no small sum for ex-servicemen on a pension of £2–£4 per week, and the problems this additional expense created, particularly for those in country areas, were the subject of much concern. In 1918, the Geraldton RSSA had placed “the present unfair method of making country returned soldiers bear all expenses when called up for re-assessment of pension” and of “assessing a pension on the amount the man is earning, instead of on the amount of his incapacity” on the agenda for the forthcoming State Conference.54 Cornish’s refusal to provide travel warrants for Johnson and Bolger brought the wider issue to a head, requiring ongoing interventions from the Repatriation Department in Perth, the Repatriation Commission in Melbourne, the Commissioner of Pensions
in Melbourne, and the Pensions and Maternity Allowance Office, Melbourne before the matter was finally settled.

The impasse began in early November 1919 when Johnson, who had been out bush prospecting under the Repatriation Scheme, returned to town to collect his part-pension and found that it had been cancelled without notice along with a directive from the Pensions Office to travel to Leonora for a medical examination as part of a formal pension review. As Johnson had insufficient money to cover living expenses, O’Callaghan made up the shortfall and contacted the Pensions Office to let them know that Johnson, and others affected by similar decisions at the time, were “badly incapacitated and were trying hard to do something for themselves”. Unreceptive to O’Callaghan’s communication, Cornish called for a preliminary police report on Frank Bolger’s activities and directed him to travel to Leonora with Johnson for a medical review. O’Callaghan mediated once again, requesting travel warrants for the two men, even suggesting they borrow camels and cart from the Mines Department for the 600 km return journey. Receiving no response, O’Callaghan called for the intervention of L.E. Tilney, the Deputy Comptroller of the Repatriation Department (Perth) who advised the Pensions Office to pay the Coach Fares immediately in accordance with Regulation 81; further, he requested that Johnson’s pension be continued after the review and that his payments be made retrospective. At this point O’Callaghan, confident that travel warrants were forthcoming, paid the coach fares in advance knowing that if the men did not front up for the medical examination, their pensions would be cancelled. O’Callaghan was working in an honorary capacity and the £18 would have come from his own pocket. Shortly after Frank’s medical and police reports affirmed his 100 per cent incapacity, Cornish organised yet another police enquiry into his activities. They acted as directed, adding to their report that “this man is genuine”.

Two months later, in January 1920, O’Callaghan again sought Tilney’s intervention for the reimbursement of the fares:

… we took the action indicated to facilitate matters for the Pensions Office – your department – and particularly the soldiers concerned with the idea that we were helping all parties. I might mention that it is no small matter for those prospectors to come in many miles from the bush after making all arrangements regarding their turnouts to find that no Coach Warrants are available for them to travel to a Doctor as demanded and only we who are conversant with the circumstances and on the spot can sympathise with their discomfiture and we do our best to alleviate same.

Tilney attempted to resolve the issue with the WA Pensions’ Office once more before escalating the matter to its Head Office in Melbourne.
I desire to bring before your notice the fact that considerable annoyance is being caused to several Local Repatriation Committees in this State in connection with soldiers having to travel for review of pension, with no railway facilities are available. At the present the Deputy Commissioner of Pensions for Western Australia has power to authorise the issue of Railway warrants, and where it is necessary that a soldier should travel by coach or motor car to attend Medical officer in respect of the review of pension, no provision is made. I am enclosing copies of the correspondence which has eventuated through an instance of this nature, and from which you will see that the matter is deserving of attention.59

There are 30 separate communications on this matter in Frank Bolger’s file, which indicate Cornish’ refusal to back down. Under fire from his own Department, he passed blame, manipulated facts, cited missing records, and claimed that it was “most unusual to request pensioners to travel long distances for a medical examination”. He then called upon the Wiluna Local Repatriation Committee to provide evidence of such cases. O’Callaghan responded: “I cannot give you the particulars about all of them [in WA], but the following are some of them whom I am conversant with”. He duly provided particulars of three other men from Wiluna who not been provided travel warrants for medical examinations, whose pensions had either been stopped or reduced without notification, one as the “Result of Medical Review” although “he had not been within 200 miles of a doctor”. The interventions from Head Offices in Melbourne and their local branches in Perth continued for several months until the matter was finally settled on 30 June 1920.60

While O’Callaghan was sympathetic to the plight and rights of ex-servicemen, Cornish brought to the administration of repatriation 19th century attitudes of ‘deserving’ and ‘undeserving’ with the underlying view that repatriation – like the invalid pension that preceded it – was a charitable handout or a gift to the indigent sick.61 While Cornish was far from alone, his attitude provides an example of bureaucrats whose attitudes incensed returned services organisations. They railed against “unsympathetic, unjust, and inexplicable decisions” and called upon executive positions to be filled by “active service soldiers who went, remained, and saw the fighting on active service conditions”.62 Cornish was eventually pulled into line by his superiors, yet the problem was to continue when the Repatriation Department took responsibility for war pensions in July 1920 – the same year as the introduction of the 1920 Repatriation Act.63

An important item in the new [1920 Repatriation] Bill now before the Federal Legislature is that, while those with definite and lasting injuries, as for instance a man who has lost a limb, have their pensions
fixed for life, a very large proportion of the beneficiaries under the Act comprise men whose pensions are subject to periodical review and reduction as their Incapacity is surmounted and as they gradually recover physical fitness and earning capacity.64

Frank and hundreds of others who were placed in the second category were inexplicably expected to overcome serious and lasting injuries. Critically for men in country areas, the 1920 Act did not address the issue of travel warrants for medical examinations; instead provision for travel was rescinded given a “liberal increase in the pensions of all incapacitated soldiers”. The one exception was travel for medical ‘treatment’,65 yet archival documentation strongly suggests that this did not include travel for a medical ‘examination’. Accordingly, Frank’s pension was increased from £3:0:0 in September 1919 to £4:4:0 in July 1920 – an increase of £1:4:0 per fortnight to cover significant travel and sustenance costs for medical examinations every three, six or 12 months.66

In late 1920 Frank moved to Norseman where a medical practitioner was available for his next pension review and travel was not an issue. This particular medical report, however, was problematic for Frank. It acknowledged that there had been no improvement in his health, yet suggested his earning power had been reduced to “three fourths” rather than “the whole” and within a week his pension was reduced to 75 per cent.67 The 1920 increase in the pension had been effectively taken off him. Frank appealed the decision:

As a totally disabled man, I don’t understand this review … According to the terms I enlisted under in 1914 I don’t see why it should be liable to suspension as it is not charity, but a right. Is it not possible, seeing that I can only get worse instead of better to go before a board of responsible doctors to get this thing sorted one way or the other. I can’t very well explain by letter, but being called in every now and then to report to a doctor, is a hardship. As for instance in Nov 1919, I had to go from Wiluna to Leonora and was away for a week. I had to pay someone to look after my dogs and leave my horses in the bush. In consequence losing some of my horses valued easy at £30. Knowing that the department does not wish to put unnecessary trouble in a man’s way. I hope you could manage to fix things. Yours etc Frank Bolger, Norseman.68

Frank was a member of the Kalgoorlie Branch of the RSL, the nearest branch to Norseman. While there is no record in his file that the organisation ever intervened on his behalf, Frank had adopted a different tone in this communication suggesting that he understood the language of the returned-services organisations, sharing their insistence that repatriation was not a charity but a right.69 However, the Department ignored his letter, refusing to
accept the testimony of an ex-serviceman as an appeal. So Frank contacted two
doctors at Kalgoorlie for an independent medical assessment. An informal note
written by Vere Arkle – a doctor with knowledge and experience of war service
at a base hospital in France\textsuperscript{70} – is retained in Frank’s records:

Dear Watch,

This man has had his pension docked. Both Stacy and I have examined
him. He has a bullet in his chest. His heart is rotten and I think his
story about getting giddy on any exertion is true.

Yours

Vere Arkle

Dr Watch then submitted a formal report to the Repatriation Department:

Pensioner to look at is a fine physical type but his heart is in such a
condition as renders him unfit for anything but a negligible amount of
work. Action is markedly rapid & irregular – too much so to count the
pulse rate. There is also marked arrythmia, some retraction of rt. lung.

He added that improvement during the previous six months was “nil”, the
likelihood of further improvement “improbable”, that earning power had been
lost to the extent of “the whole”, and that the proportion due to war service was
“100 %”. The Department accepted Watch’s report as an appeal, and Frank’s full
pension was reinstated.\textsuperscript{71}

For the first time, a medical report reached a core issue: “Pensioner to look
at is a fine physical type”. Those bureaucrats not conversant with frontline
conditions were said to dismiss men’s claims and make arbitrary decisions
based upon their own understandings and experience. It was so common that
in 1922 a deputation of ex-servicemen and service organisations headed by
Major General Sir Talbot Hobbs confronted the WA Premier: “Unless a man
bears scars, or is minus a limb, neither the Government nor the public seem to
imagine the digger – sick though he may be – is entitled to help or sympathy”.\textsuperscript{72}

Particularly vulnerable were those whose conditions were deemed to be ‘pre-
war existent’. This arose in part from the 1915–1916 fall in recruitment levels
when the AIF could no longer afford to be particular about perfect health,
allowing for some medical conditions to be overlooked on enlistment. This
was to pose a considerable problem for those claiming a war pension, as they
had to prove the claim was a direct result of war service and not a pre-existing
medical complaint. Disputes were frequent, often made more complex given
that the symptoms of many conditions – notably shell-shock, tuberculosis and
blindness – could take several years to emerge.\textsuperscript{73} Very often ex-servicemen
were depicted as malingers, drifters, or layabouts yet newspaper coverage was variable and could also be exceptionally sympathetic and supportive. “There is many an apparently healthy digger in this state so full of gas,” stated the *Sunday Times*, “that he is in a far more pitiful condition, and a great deal closer to the grave than the men whose visible war wounds win them so much public consideration and sympathy.”

This was the subject of heated debate between the Australian government which viewed its Repatriation Scheme as the most liberal, complete and generous in the world and the RSL which argued that it did “not function according to the spirit of the Act”:

“The repatriation slogan, pre-war existent, by which so many unfortunates are deprived of their rights, is as great a wash-out as are some of the decisions of the officials sitting in judgment on the stricken digger and dependants, and the time is long overdue for vital changes to be effected in the interpretation of the Pensions Act which provides the most generous terms for the incapacitated men and their dependants. This, in my opinion, can never be done by officials hundreds of miles from the man and who apparently diagnose his complaint from written documents, and in many instances reverse the recommendations of local medical men.”

“The central criterion for entitlement to a war disability pension”, according to historian Stephen Garton, “was incapacity arising out of, or aggravated by, ‘active service’”. The difficulty, he explained, was that words *arising* and *aggravated* were never clearly defined, which led to “complex debates over the ‘onus of proof’ and the ‘benefit of the doubt’ in determining pension entitlements”. To complicate the matter further, the clinical records of the AIF, which had been stored in the British Museum after the war, were destroyed without notice by the British Government which was in need of additional storage space. The destruction of such vital and strategic information was a terrible loss, especially as much of the onus of proof for a war claim was then shifted to ex-servicemen. No steps were taken to ensure that surviving records be available for Australian purposes, and, further, obstacles could be placed in the path of those attempting to access war-related medical records held within Australia. In Geraldton, for example, Frank Mitchelmoore Issell, formerly of the 2nd Battalion, requested a copy of his medical records to be sent to the Swan Military Barracks in Perth. The Officer in Charge of Base Records, Victoria Barracks, Melbourne responded: “I have to advise you that my instructions preclude the supply to you of any documents in connection with your medical history whilst a member of the AIF. If you require medical assistance you should apply to the Repatriation Department.” Issell then applied to the Repatriation Department as directed, but was informed that his “full service and medical documents” were required to “enable a decision to be reached.” It was an impossible situation. It is possible that Issell was among
a multitude of ex-servicemen who had made it a point of honour during the war
and post-war years to defer medical evaluation until the last minute. In Gallipoli,
“‘sticking it out’ against disease was virtually official policy”. 82 While this code
of masculinity was honourable in war, the delay in seeking medical attention
would later prove counterproductive when applying for a war pension. Even
those successful in their claims would find it difficult to subsist on a meagre
pension, and many sought an advance by turning to money lenders, a practice
open to abuse and declared illegal and punishable under the Australian Soldiers’
Repatriation Act.83

In early 1924 Frank Bolger had returned to Sandstone and was directed to
undertake a medical review in Mt Magnet. On the strength of his victory with
the Pensions Office, he responded assertively: “I would like to advise that it is
rather inconvenient for me to visit Mt Magnet owing to the awkward running
of trains. By leaving Sandstone on Sunday night it would be twelve days before
I could return, however, if it is necessary for me to go up for review will you
kindly send me a Railway Warrant together with sustenance fees”. 84 The Deputy
Commissioner of Repatriation (WA) couched his response carefully:

I have to advise that it is not desired to involve the inconvenience
to you and the expense to the Department indicated in your letter.
It may be pointed out that you have not been medically examined
since August, 1921, as generous consideration has been given to your
remoteness from a medical officer and I shall be glad to learn when
you may expect to be visiting the metropolis or any other centre where
your medical examination can be effected.85

This was a perfect bureaucratic letter. Under the 1920 Repatriation Act, the
Department had to provide travel warrants for ‘medical treatment’ but this was
a ‘medical examination’. It was a grey area, one that posed more problems for
men in country areas, and after the earlier debacle the Department could not
openly refuse Frank’s request. Instead, the onus was placed upon Frank to make
his own way to Mt Magnet for examination, the implications of failure to do
so evident within the tone of the letter. Frank duly complied, with the medical
report re-affirming a key dilemma: “Patient appears a fine healthy stamp until
he removes his singlet”.86 His pension was continued in full and, from that point
in time, the Department placed less pressure on him, his formal medical reviews
delayed on several occasions over the next eight years until 1932.

Rehabilitation training and employment

Neither the Pensions Office nor the Repatriation Department offered Frank
occupational re-training. This would have entailed travel and sustenance
fees which the Department had proved reluctant to cover and impossible for
Frank to pay, as the costs would have exceeded his pension. The Department and ex-servicemen were also aware that re-training did not necessarily lead to employment. Various classes were offered including bookkeeping and general education subjects by the Perth and Fremantle Technical Schools and poultry breeding and rearing at the West Subiaco Government poultry grounds, but attendances were reported as disappointing. It was public knowledge that ex-servicemen who had re-trained as clerks could remain jobless given lack of experience in the area and an inability to provide testimonials from previous employers. In 1922, the Returned Maimed and Limbless Men's Association made an appeal to the public: “Is there one firm in Perth that can find room for an incapacitated soldier?” The Association had made special efforts to secure employment for members, but without any appreciable result:

To-day over 60 men who sacrificed all in their country’s service are parading the city streets looking vainly for suitable employment, the right to work and earn an honest living, and the fulfilment of promises given in 1914. Unless the Government come to the aid of these men immediately, their chances of early employment are very remote. … in every large business firm in this State, and in Government departments mainly, there is at least one position, a maimed or limbless man can fill, and fill, too, to his employer’s entire satisfaction.

Popularly known as the Wingies and Stumpies Association, they lobbied hard to increase pensions and work opportunities for permanently or partially incapacitated men, even awarding certificates to those who employed WA’s “next-to-helpless heroes”. They suggested that maimed men could work as lift-operators, caretakers, telephone switchboard operators, night watchmen, responsible messengers, tallymen, timekeepers, and clerical workers. “A chance of showing their capabilities is all that is asked.”

The field was fraught with problems. A key recruitment promise at State and Federal levels was preference of government employment to returned soldiers, yet there was relatively little coverage of this seminal promise in WA newspapers of the time. In February 1916, State Premier John Scaddan affirmed that his government had given “an undertaking to all State servants who had enlisted that their positions would be available to them on their return”. For more than a year, the WA Employers Federation and the Fremantle Chamber of Commerce had urged Scaddan to “widely announce” his government’s promise, but the Premier’s standard response was to deflect the question with counter-debate, only being drawn at his public address at Hay Street to say that “publicity from time to time will be given to this phase of the matter”. The Employers Federation was aware, as were returned service organisations, that the relevant legislation had been passed in New South Wales, that State Public Service Regulations had
been amended in Victoria, and that the Scaddan government had refused to create a similar Act in Western Australia. As early as mid-1916, the press was decrying the “scurvy” and “callous treatment meted out to the soldiers by the deplorable Scaddan Government” and was joining with service organisations to demand that “every returned hero” be “be properly cared for as a right and not as a charity dole”.

The perceived “Judas-like betrayal” of the Commonwealth and State governments and their various departments was replicated in the private sector, which also proved reluctant to provide preferential treatment to ex-servicemen and to keep men’s pre-war jobs open to them. This led to bitter parliamentary and public debate, in which the firm ‘guarantee’ of preference of employment steadily lost ground to the ‘principle’ of preference of employment and then, by late 1920, “preference in employment to returned men … where practicable.” Complaints were rife as ex-servicemen and returned service organisations continued to dispute the interpretation and implementation of the policy. In 1920, the *Sunday Times* reported that returned servicemen mainly from the Postal Department:

… brought forward cases of injustice and unfair treatment whereby stay-at-homes were able to collar the better positions, while the now-returned individuals were away at the front. Then there was that howl from the returned men retrenched from the Pensions Department because, they said, stay-at-homes were allowed to continue in their positions unmolested while the ex-soldier was given the order of the boot.

Those who returned from active service were re-entering communities, work practices and financial resources undergoing considerable change. There was a post-war slump in the economy; massive growth in primary and secondary industries; new technologies that demanded greater skills and knowledge; machines replacing unskilled labourers; competition from younger workers who could be paid lower wages; and women introduced to the workforce in the war years publicly acknowledged as “capable, earnest and conscientious officers well fitted by character and education to discharge the duties entrusted to them.” War had also brought Australia into prominence as a destination for British immigration, placing strain on already scarce prospects for employment. In sum, there was a vast pool of available workers, and employers preferred those who were young, skilled and able-bodied. Even the trades unions showed a remarkable reluctance when it came to employing or re-training disabled men, including their own members, after the war.
Health and repatriation

In Frank Bolger’s extensive repatriation records spanning from 1914 to 1937, there were just two communications suggesting he access medical treatment for his war injuries with no indication that associated travel expenses would be covered by the Department. As Frank had a right to treatment, just as he did to vocational training, it is useful to explore the facilities and services that were available to ex-servicemen to help understand why he was reluctant – or unable – to use them. The various goldfields towns in which Frank lived were 730–950 kilometres north-east of Perth, yet medical facilities offered to ex-servicemen were all city-based including the Kalamunda Convalescent Home, the Wooroloo Sanitorium for Consumptives, Stromness Military Hospital, Whitby Inebriates Home, Claremont Hospital for the Insane, ‘Lemnos’, the Soldiers’ Mental Hospital at West Subiaco, and the Anzac Hostel at Keane’s Point on the Swan River.

A review of medical facilities, and when they were established, is consistent with Oliver’s assertion that the government was slow to respond to the challenges of repatriation. In April 1919, four years after men were first repatriated from war, the Chief Medical Officer of the Repatriation Department, Dr Agnew, outlined a complete system for incapacitated soldiers in the West Australian newspaper. He espoused “the best conditions and the best experts for the care of mental cases” with the promise that they would be kept apart from civil cases in a facility to be placed “somewhere” between the city and Fremantle. He was optimistic about the outcomes of their care with the goal that, as their condition permitted, ex-servicemen would be sent to a farm colony in the hills among the “normal men”, set at tasks suited to their capabilities, gradually recovering a state of normal health. Accordingly, Kalamunda Convalescent Home when opened in April 1919 at a cost of £45,000, was viewed by Agnew as a facility where soldiers could overcome self-defeating attitudes and brought back to “normal”:

Men, who through long periods of idleness in hospitals and convalescent homes, have lost both the physical ability and the mental attitude for useful employment, who have in fact developed what is often known as ‘hospitalism’ will be given healthy mental and physical recreation, be re-taught the value of work and gradually restored to a normal and useful condition both of body and mind. These men were workers in their pre-war days, and the department has made up its mind to stop the wastage of their lives and to rehabilitate them as useful self-respecting members of the community.

Agnew’s words reflect a moral evaluation of ex-servicemen, over and above the circumstances that re-shaped their lives, in an era when Post Traumatic Stress Disorder (PTSD) was unknown and its symptoms misunderstood. Arising
out of the Vietnam War, the classification of PTSD brought to public attention understandings of “victimhood” and a “language of entitlement” but fifty years earlier the characteristically British response to war was the non-language of stoicism, fortitude, endurance, a stiff upper lip, all encouraging, directly and indirectly, a culture of silence on the part of the men involved. Family and community were also advised to avoid sympathy, with expressions of “pity” described as the “greatest threat” to “manhood and rehabilitation”. With public and departmental attention focussed on the mindset of ex-servicemen, rather than on the specifics of their medical conditions, those whose injuries outweighed their capacity to cope were typically characterised as inherently weak and treated as hypochondriacs or malingerers who were undeserving of assistance. This standpoint was consistent with the Repatriation Department’s belief that men could be cured of their war injuries yet it was also reinforced by the pragmatic concern that the men be “independent and self-reliant rather than a drain on the state”.

Another of Agnew’s key concerns was alcoholism, which was widely perceived as a problem among ex-servicemen. In the idiomatic language of the day inebriates were described as “shickered”, “layabouts”, “public nuisances” and the “deadbeats” of the city whose drink habit drew much ridicule and merriment in theatre, literature and the press. Agnew was emphatic that:

It is a question to what extent, if at all, the department is responsible for the treatment of any man who, by his own folly has become alcoholic, who may have been a hard drinker before he enlisted. Although we are responsible for medical and surgical treatment for disabilities due to or aggravated by war service there may be no responsibility for the treatment of alcoholics.

His goal was for men to “recover their self-respect and usefulness”, to become “normal useful citizens” and return to civil life. He called upon the WA Red Cross to establish, maintain and conduct a clearing house for alcoholics, and for the Returned Soldiers Associations to “save” members known to be “drifting” from “the disgrace of appearing in the Police Courts”. For Agnew the situation was clear: if men did not “play the game”, the Department would wash its hands of further responsibility. However, those who did place themselves in the hands of the Department may have been apprehensive about the outcome. They could have been admitted to the 40 bed Stromness Hospital which was equipped by the Lunacy Department, funded by the Repatriation Department, and admitted 20–38 patients a year including ex-servicemen. Known as a home for neurotic cases, it attracted much public concern in the press – particularly the need to protect ex-servicemen admitted to the hospital from the absolute power of the Inspector General of the Insane. Among them was
Alexander Forbes who had been blinded in war and confined as an inebriate for a term understood to be “six months at the outside”. Eight months later, family members were fighting for his discharge into their care, demanding to know on whose authority he was being “detained and persecuted” with other mental patients.\textsuperscript{112} It appears they were unaware that under the \textit{1912 Inebriate Act} a person could be committed to an Inebriate home for any period up to 12 months on the premise that he would then receive permanent benefit from his treatment in the institution.\textsuperscript{113}

Many ex-servicemen were admitted to the Whitby Inebriate’s home where detention for drunkards could be ordered from three to twelve months, with provision for the utilisation of labour of the inmates, and for mutinous inmates to be sent to the Fremantle Prison. Whitby’s “inmates”, however, “resented their detention”, made “absolutely no effort to help themselves” and the Home was closed in mid-1918, reverting to the property of the Claremont Hospital for the Insane where patients overflowed from a capacity of 750 to 1,110.\textsuperscript{114} Conditions at the hospital drew considerable public disapproval, particularly as ex-servicemen were being housed with “criminals” or the “insane”.\textsuperscript{115} The headlines were striking: ‘\textsc{Death Follows Fractured Skull}’; ‘\textsc{Public Hospital Sensation. Mental Patients Escapade. Escape From Padded Cell}’; ‘\textsc{An Enquiry Needed}’; ‘\textsc{Hospital for Insane. Questions in Parliament}’.\textsuperscript{116} There were repeated calls for a Royal Commission of Inquiry and, in August 1918, a deputation from the Metropolitan Council of the Australian Labor Federation (ALF) appointed a committee to look into the control and workings of the Hospital. Among their findings were disgraceful conditions including serious overcrowding, obsolete methods of restraint, inadequate numbers of nursing and medical personnel, insufficient supervision of dangerous patients, and subsequent serious injuries to inmates and staff. In place of a Royal Commission, the government responded by appointing a Select Committee of the Legislative Assembly which – in their report of 11 November 1919 – made minor recommendations while denying or dismissing the majority of the charges of the ALF as gross exaggeration.\textsuperscript{117}

The sensational headlines continued: ‘\textsc{Claremont Hospital Seriously Overcrowded}’; ‘\textsc{Pity The Poor Patients}!’; ‘\textsc{One Lunatic Kills Another}’.\textsuperscript{118} In 1924, returned soldier inmates were placed in a special ward at the hospital with “various indoor games”, “sweets”, and a “special gramophone provided for their amusement”. According to the Geraldton RSL, they were “dragging out a miserable existence”.\textsuperscript{119} The response to the changes demanded by the community was remarkably slow and this was due, in part, to the wrangling of the state and commonwealth governments over financial responsibility for ex-servicemen.\textsuperscript{120} The claims of the WA State War Council were backed up by the National Council of Women in that it was “the duty of the Federal Government
to undertake its rightful responsibilities with regard to all mental returned
soldier patients … as military service is a Commonwealth matter.” 121 It took 11
years from the time men were first repatriated from war for a dedicated facility
for shell-shocked and traumatised ex-servicemen to be established in Western
Australia. ‘Lemnos’, the ‘Soldiers’ Mental Hospital’ at West Subiaco was officially
opened on 12 July 1926. 122

The opening of this 69-bed facility was widely covered in the West Australian:

Lemnos Mental Home
Official Opening
‘Nothing Like a Prison’
The official opening yesterday of ‘Lemnos,’ the new home for mentally
afflicted soldiers, begins a more pleasing chapter of a transaction
the earlier part of which was not creditable either to our humanity
or sense of gratitude. The revelation of the conditions under which
these unfortunate soldiers were existing at the Claremont Hospital for
the Insane, came as a shock to the community. Some alleviation of
their unhappy lot followed the publicity, but it has taken more than
two years, including months of vigorous and sustained agitation by
patriotically-minded citizens, to ensure their being housed and cared
for as befits their state, and the sacrifices they made for the common
good. 123

The opening ceremony was organised to coincide with the visit to WA of Colonel
Semmens, the Chairman of the Repatriation Commission. It is possible that
the timing of the ceremony helped deflect attention from events that were to
take place one month later on 16 August 1926 when the facility first opened its
doors to ex-servicemen. Effective from this date, Lemnos Hospital – celebrated
as a dedicated facility for “mentally incapacitated soldiers” – was gazetted as a
“Hospital for the Criminal Insane” under the Lunacy Act 1903–20. 124

There is nothing in Frank Bolger’s Repatriation file to suggest that he was an
inebriate, suffered from shell-shock or was mentally affected by war, but if he
was affected to any degree, it is possible that the negative newspaper coverage of
key facilities for ex-servicemen would have prompted him to keep his distance
and to stay out of harm’s way in the Goldfields. On the strength of his assessment
by a number of doctors, including the AIF Medical Board, Frank might, in
theory, have been eligible for a place at the Anzac Hostel at Keane’s Point on
the banks of the Swan River. Situated on seven acres at Peppermint Grove, the
property had been donated to the State and then leased to the Repatriation
Department: 126
Keane’s Point will not be a hospital or convalescent home but it will be these men’s own home as long as they require it, and they will not lack any home comfort. It is a magnificent site – the best on your fine river – and the people could not put it to a better use than by giving it as a home for these permanently injured men thereby showing true gratitude for the sacrifice they have made in the cause of liberty. We are going to spend a good deal of money there – the necessary structural alterations will cost some thousands of wounds [sic].

The words of Dr Agnew, Principal Medical Officer, Repatriation Department were constructive and optimistic, yet it took another four years for Departmental plans to come to fruition. What happened to the men until this point is unknown, but when the Anzac Hostel finally opened in 1923 it was described in the *Western Mail* as an “agreeable surprise” and an “inspiration”. Here was a “home in the true meaning of the word for permanently disabled and incurable members of the A.I.F” who were “compelled to pass the remainder of their lives in a comparatively helpless physical condition caused by injuries received in fighting for their country”. Reports in the *Sunday Mail* were similar. Keane’s Point provided a “haven of rest” for those diggers whose lives had been darkened through their part in the Great War. The nurses were described as “the personification of kindness”, the orderlies as “considerate and untiring in their endeavours to make to make the lives of their charges as enjoyable and attractive as possible”, the dormitories and cubicles imbied with “the breath of cleanliness and sweetness” and each “inmate” given an “unrestricted liberty … to decorate his little ‘dugout’ in the manner he so pleases”. They were given the opportunity to paint or create caneware, access to a launch, a yacht and a couple of rowing boats as the “most delightful means of idling away many hours on the river, besides giving them that opportunity of having ‘go-as-you-please’ excursions that are enjoyed by other members of the community”.

The newspaper articles honoured ex-servicemen for the part they played in war, yet they also made known that this much celebrated and highly expensive facility was home to just “a dozen diggers”. This was a remarkably low figure, given that 8,373 incapacitated men had been repatriated to Western Australia. This low intake, however, was the rule rather than the exception for across Australia the Commission was tough on assessing eligibility for the nation’s Anzac Hostels, convalescent homes and mental institutions. In Western Australia, the Edward Millen Home had seven patients in mid-1933 and 22 in August 1935; the 40 bed Stromness Hospital took 18–24 admissions a year between 1918 and 1923, and the Kalamunda Convalescent Home which had a capacity for 50 patients averaged just 33 daily.
As Frank presented initially as a “fine healthy stamp”, he had little hope of being admitted for long-term stay at a dedicated facility for ex-servicemen, even on a respite basis. It was not until 1932, during a medical crisis, that he was admitted to the special Repatriation Wing of the Perth Hospital where three wards had been set up for ex-servicemen in January 1922 at a cost of £45,000. It was built to accommodate 90 patients, yet admissions – which required the authorisation of the Department – averaged just 40 at any one time. The opening of this facility also marked the closure of the No 8 A.G.H. (Base) Hospital in Fremantle. By the early 1930s just Ward 11 remained, which was described in the Sunday Times as a “clearing station” for all patients “be they operation, medical or merely for review as a guide to the assessment, or cancellation, of pension”. Their choice of words help reflect the modus operandi of the Department where men could be admitted, processed and, where feasible, quickly returned to the world around them without the need for long-term accommodation. Yet this is just what was needed as the health of ex-servicemen deteriorated further with age and as the Great Depression took its toll. Recent research indicates that ex-servicemen can experience delayed-onset PTSD or, alternatively, the symptoms can heighten in later years, a notable example being Frank Bolger’s Commander Officer, Captain Hugo Throssell, who committed suicide in 1933.

In the late 1920s and the 1930s, widespread economic instability hindered the capacity of voluntary organisations such as the Red Cross and the Salvation Army to run their hostels, welfare programs and services. Soldier preferences and war pensions were targeted as a cost-cutting measure and the RSL and other service organisations ran a prolonged and ultimately successful campaign for the government to honour the promises of the people by preserving existing conditions. Their success was a godsend given that men’s admission to medical facilities had doubled during the 1930s, an estimate that would have been greater had it included those unable to prove their injuries were related to war service and thus had to pay their own way or find there was nowhere to go.

On his visits to Perth in 1928 and 1935, Repatriation Commission Chairman, Colonel Semmens, was “quite satisfied with what was being done for ex-soldiers locally” and “pleased to find things running smoothly and happily in the department of this State”. On his second visit, however, he did disclose the “depressing fact” that there had been a great increase in the number of patients with war-related disabilities:

Some years ago it might have been thought that the peak had been passed and that the figures were well down on a steady continuous decline. That assumption has already turned out to be wrong … Of course, the general depression had something to do with it. Men when they are in work and doing fairly well are apt to let their ailments look...
after themselves, but naturally enough when out of work they have
time to go into hospital; they are forced to see what chances they have
got of having their troubles, big or little, declared due to war service.
Besides this there is the age factor. Men are getting older and feeling
their disabilities more.¹⁴²

There was undoubtedly a degree of truth in Semmens’ words, yet the tone
was cynical and patronising suggesting a detachment far removed from
circumstances and possibilities that shaped the life choices of disabled ex-
servicemen. He also made no reference to the lack of facilities outside the
metropolitan area.

In August 1932, Frank was 54 years of age and had his first medical examination
in eight years. It had taken several days travel to the surgery at Mt Magnet, and
on arrival he was shaking, face twitching, heart rapid and irregular and his pulse
rate 172. The examining doctor recommended immediate admission to Perth
Hospital for observation and investigation and was insistent that the Department
provide a travel allowance inclusive of two night’s sleeper accommodation to
and from Perth. In filling in the necessary ‘Record of Evidence’ form, Frank
reiterated the fact that he had not worked for an employer since discharge,
that he could only do some fossicking when his health permitted, and that his
only income for the year had been his war pension. Subsequent tests taken
during his three-week stay at Perth Hospital’s Ward 11 revealed a long list of
symptoms including cardiac enlargement and a foreign body lying on the right
side of the heart. He was diagnosed with myocarditis and the examining doctor
suggested entitlement at T & P.I. rate in place of D.A.H. (disordered action of
the heart). His ‘100% pension’ was duly reconsidered and adjusted to ‘Special
Rate Pension, T & P.I. under Second Schedule’ of £8 per fortnight. It had taken
16 years since his discharge from the AIF for his health status to be recognised
by the Repatriation Department. Victory, however, was short lived, for the
decision was then rejected by head office in Melbourne and for the first time
its Department in Perth fought on Frank’s behalf. In doing so, they impressed
upon him the conditions under which the Special Rate was paid – that he notify
them should he be admitted to hospital or undertake any employment – and the
new pension came though several months later when payments were £53:4:0 in
arrears.¹⁴³

Four months after his return to Sandstone, the Department requested the local
Postmaster to make confidential enquiries in respect to Frank Bolger’s activities.
On 4 July 1933, Postmaster Connor responded:

I beg to state from my own knowledge and enquiries the pensioner is
in very bad health having a bullet in some part of his heart. He works
out about 40 miles in some place of his own where he has some few
sheep, but last year the few pounds he had in this bank he got it out to buy the sheep, at present he receives £4 weekly pension.\textsuperscript{144} With this testimony, his special rate pension continued. Frank Bolger died on 18 December 1936, age 58. He died intestate, his medical and funeral expenses paid by the Department, and the £5:2:10 due to the date of death paid to the Curator of Intestate Estates. There was no record of kin other than the name and address of his mother detailed at the time of enlistment.\textsuperscript{145} She had died in 1919 and the records had not been updated. Either friends or the RSL placed a notice in the local paper:

\textbf{OLD War Wound Causes Death.} — A wound in the heart from a piece of shrapnel, which he received in the war over twenty years ago, is said to have been the cause of the death of Frank Bolger, aged 56 years [sic], who died in the hospital at Youanmi on December 18th last. The deceased, who had been an inmate of the hospital for five weeks, was the owner of ‘Bo-Peep’ Station, situated about sixty miles north of Sandstone. An ex-service man, the deceased was formerly a member of the Kalgoorlie Sub-Branch of the Returned Soldiers’ League. He is believed to have had no relatives living, and that he died intestate.\textsuperscript{146}

Frank, the owner of ‘Bo-Peep’ Station! This was totally unexpected – a twist in the tale that came from left-field. An historical records search at Landgate WA revealed that “Frank Bolger of Sandstone Pastoralist” had been granted two Pastoral Leases, the first in January 1927 and the second in January 1934 for a land area of 47,133 acres (190 square kilometres).\textsuperscript{147} It is hard to conceive he had the physical capability to run a large station, unless able to employ men to work for him, but all available records show is that Frank sold 15 bales of wool at auction between September 1934 and March 1936 for just over £11 and that he did not make a profit from this enterprise.\textsuperscript{148}

There are so many strands to weave together in making sense of Frank Bolger’s life. On one hand, it appears that he may well have subverted the system when there was less focus on his activities from the mid-to-late 1920s. At the same time, his actions were consistent with the pledge of the government to those who had enlisted in 1914: he had lost his total capacity to earn his living in a “common labour market” and thus was entitled to a full pension. He clearly had the support and goodwill of those around him including Chas O’Callaghan from the Wiluna Local Repatriation Committee, the Inspector of Police at Kalgoorlie, the local police at Wiluna and Meekatharra, the Postmaster at Sandstone, by far the majority of examining doctors and a number of key individuals who sent affidavits to the Department attesting his integrity. While they may genuinely have wanted to help him “make a go of it”, their support
could also have been tempered by ongoing tensions between the city and the country, the centralisation of resources in the city at the expense of the bush, and the dismissive attitudes of city-based bureaucrats towards ex-servicemen and the local repatriation committees.

Unfortunately Frank never found the elusive gold nugget that could liberate him from the system, but at the same time he was not reduced to “demoralising idleness” as were many of the so-called “malingers”, “drifters”, “bludgers” or “layabouts” said to proliferate after war. He presents as a dogged, resilient and self-reliant man who recognised and acted upon the ethos embedded within the post-WWI repatriation discourse: the importance of self-help and manly independence, the dignity of work and the horror of dependency. Given lack of family, and the varying and at times begrudging support of the repatriation system, it is likely that he interpreted ‘manliness’ through the possibilities and constraints that defined him. As Larssen points out, “for wounded men manliness lay in the transcendence of suffering through an inner code of dignity, courage and determination”. It appears that a solitary and arduous life in the bush was preferable to admission to one of the city-based medical facilities for ex-servicemen or re-training in work that did not suit his temperament. There is nothing in available records to suggest he was a prosperous miner or pastoralist; instead, it appears that his additional activities helped supplement a meagre pension and perhaps more importantly helped him to participate, to some degree, in civil life.

In 1935, the Western Australian press marked the 21st anniversary of the outbreak of war. Their commentary contrasted with the earlier pro-establishment stance of the West Australian which, in 1923, had commended the government for “the magnificent way in which it has treated its ex-service men” drawing attention to nearly £7,000,000 a year spent on war pensions. By 1928, the Western Argus was acknowledging the ongoing costs of war while praising the Commonwealth Government for spending “no less sum than £171,546,920 in making provision for soldiers”:

How many of us ever stop to think what the Great War has cost us – what it is still costing us! … what a stupendous business that [Repatriation] department represents. … For a country whose entire population only amounts to slightly over 6,000,000, we are certainly standing up to our obligations to the returned soldiers.

By 1935, however, the focus was on the accumulative losses of ex-servicemen, family and community—marking some change in the tone of commentary. In “Twenty-One Years Ago To-day. The War That Did Not End War,” the Sunday Times reported that Western Australia’s percentage (9.9) of enlistments
to population was the greatest of all the States of the Commonwealth. Of 32,231 enlistments from WA, 6000 died in war, a further 200 had died after the cease of hostilities, 7031 war pensions had been drawn in respect of war injuries and disabilities, and a further 15,071 pensions for their dependents:

Then there are hundreds, probably thousands, who are unable to convince the Repatriation Commission that their ill-health is the result of the war – what are known as unaccepted cases. The figures are a revelation and bring home the horrors of the great holocaust.153

A week later, the *Sunday Times* again drew community attention to:

… those many men who are still suffering from the legacies of gas, shell-shock and exposure … who have not sought refuge in hospitals and other institutions. For these the war has never ended, little is heard of their cases, who are still suffering though the conflict has long passed and the guns and the cheering are silent.154

There is no doubt that John Forrest was correct when he addressed the young recruits at Black Boy Hill in 1914 – war did prove to be a “great event” in their lives. Yet did every man “look back with pride and joy” as he predicted? Did they truly have a “great feeling of satisfaction” that they had gone through all the difficulties and been able to overcome them all?155 Would they affirm the country had fulfilled its “obligations” and honoured each man for the part he played in war? In raising these questions, this chapter helps to give voice to those disabled in the Great War—those left at the mercy of a repatriation system that all too often adopted a ‘charity rather than a right’ approach through a focus on the perceived failings of the individual rather than the broader issues of war and economic decline. If alive today, one wonders what Frank Bolger and the other 75,000 Anzac veterans permanently disabled in war might have to say.
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