

measure of our usefulness as members of the House to this community will not be measured by our destructive criticism as party partisans or party hacks, but by our constructive criticism and our constructive ability to help the State in its necessity. To ensure that the Government must have no more secret contracts—

Mr. Allen: We have been saying that for four years.

Mr. JAMES GARDINER: I am not responsible for that or for the errors of the past. If the Government enter into these contracts, the first people to be consulted are the members of this House. If the Government intend to start any State enterprise, they have a right to come to the House and get the capital authorisation and explain whether they can make it pay, or whether there is a prospect of making it pay.

Mr. Allen: If they do not what will you do?

Mr. JAMES GARDINER: Give them all the criticism I can. I am not afraid to do my own duty or anyone else's duty.

Mr. Male: If you do your own it will be enough.

Mr. JAMES GARDINER: This is the position. We all realise the times of stress through which we are passing, and that these times are not only trying for us in this House but for us in this community. Not only is there a shrinkage of State revenue, but there is a shrinkage of private revenues. Every man at this particular juncture is looking forward to trying to weather the storm. That is his ambition, and it should be the aim and ambition of this House. So far as I am concerned—and I believe I am speaking for the little coterie in this corner—it is our aim and ambition to give every assistance possible. But it is idle to give every assistance unless we are satisfied that the economies which are required to be practiced, are real, and unless we are satisfied that the loan works, particularly the new ones, are such that they have the sanction of this House before we are committed to them. Unless we are satisfied that every care is going to

be exercised, I say it is idle to come to this House and ask for sympathy or support. If the Government come to us, I say without the slightest restriction that any brains or ability which I possess, they are welcome to at this present juncture.

[The Speaker resumed the Chair.]

Progress reported.

House adjourned at 10.43 p.m.

Legislative Council,

Wednesday, 22nd September, 1915.

	PAGE
Questions: State teamship Service, Diesel steamer	984
Unionists and arrears of fees	985
Industries Assistance Act, Kalgoorlie and Boulder Firewood Co.	985
Select Committee: Retirement of C. F. Gale	986
Motion: Agricultural Settlement and Immigration	986
Bills: Roads Act Amendment and Continuation, report	989
Industries Assistance Act Amendment, 1a	989
Cottesloe Beach Rates Validation, 1a	989
Licensing Act Amendment Continuation, 1a, Weights and Measures, Com.	989
Government Electric Works Act Amendment, Com.	990
Health Act Amendment, 2a	995
Sale of Liquor Regulation, 2a	1011
Joint Select Committee: Horse-racing control, Interim Report, to adopt	990

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

QUESTION—STATE STEAMSHIP SERVICE, DIESEL STEAMER.

Hon. W. KINGSMILL asked the Colonial Secretary: 1, What circumstances occurring prior to 12th July, but not detailed on the file laid on the Table, led to a report being furnished on the Diesel steamer "Kangaroo" by Sir J. H. Biles? 2, Has he yet ascertained the

name of the insurance company, introduced by Sir J. H. Biles, who financed this operation? 3, What is the nature of the business carried on by Sir J. H. Biles & Co.? 4, In view of the exceptional nature of the financial method involved, and in order to give Parliament an untrammelled and clear-cut opportunity of expressing an opinion on this transaction, will the Government in their proposed Loan Bill deal with this matter only?

The COLONIAL SECRETARY replied: 1, When it was decided to endeavour to replace the "Western Australia" the desire was to obtain, if possible, either a Diesel-engined or oil-fired ship. Inquiries to this end elicited from Sir John Biles the information that the "Lalandia" (now "Kangaroo," as indicated on the file) was completing, and would probably be for sale; but Sir John Biles states he could not recommend her purchase for the purpose of replacing the "Western Australia." It then occurred to the acting manager of the Service that a favourable opportunity was presented of acquiring a suitable vessel, which would be necessary in connection with the Wyndham Freezing Works. This led up to the obtaining of the report on the vessel by Sir John Biles. 2, Yes; the Legal and General Life Assurance Company. 3, Naval architects. The principal, Sir John Biles, is Vice-President of the Institution of Naval Architects, a member of the Society of Naval Architects of U.S.A., an honorary member of the Japanese Society of Naval Architects; was in the Construction Department of the Admiralty from 1880 to 1890; Naval Architect to the Clyde Shipbuilding Yard; Professor of Naval Architecture at the Glasgow University since 1891; served on Admiralty Departmental Committees on Mercantile Auxiliaries, 1901; Torpedo Boat Destroyer Committee, 1902-3; Warship Designs, 1905; Board of Trade Departmental Committee on Tonnage, 1905-6; Chairman Boats and Davits Committee, 1912-13; Assessor on "Titanic" Inquiry, 1912; British Delegate on International Conference on Safety of Life at Sea, 1913; is Consulting Naval

Architect to His Majesty's India Office, and to the Commonwealth Government of Australia. 4, The Government sees no reason for departing from the procedure adopted by previous Governments in this respect; this will afford Parliament the fullest opportunity of expressing an opinion on the matter.

QUESTION—UNIONISTS AND ARREARS OF FEES.

Hon. A. G. JENKINS asked the Colonial Secretary: 1, Have any instructions been issued or has any minute been forwarded by the Minister controlling the Water and Sewerage Department to any workmen working under the department containing instructions that if unionists, who owed arrears of fees to their unions, did not make arrangements to pay up those arrears of fees, they would be treated as non-unionists, and be dismissed from their employment? 2, If so, the date of the instructions or minute, and the full terms of same?

The COLONIAL SECRETARY replied: 1, No such instructions have been issued. 2, Answered by No. 1.

QUESTION—INDUSTRIES ASSISTANCE ACT.

Loan to Kalgoorlie and Boulder Firewood Co., Ltd.

Hon. R. D. McKENZIE asked the Colonial Secretary: 1, On what date was the amount of the loan £4,000 (under the Industries Assistance Act, 1915) paid to the Kalgoorlie and Boulder Firewood Co., Ltd.? 2, When was the bill of sale over the two gas engines (taken as security) registered? 3, Have the Kalgoorlie and Boulder Firewood Co., Ltd. sold or parted with their interest in the Beria Consols Leases, and in machinery installed thereon? 4, If so, who are the present owners? 5, Were the two gas engines included in the sale? 6, Has the bill of sale been transferred? 7, In the event of default, are the Government satisfied that they can legally take pos-

session of the said engines? 8, Are the Government satisfied that the engines would realise the sum that they have advanced against them?

The COLONIAL SECRETARY replied: 1, 6th March, 1915. 2, 24th March, 1915. 3, The Company has only leased the mine. 4 and 5, Answered by No. 3. 6, No. 7, Yes. 8, The Government is satisfied that the engines will realise the balance of the loan now outstanding.

SELECT COMMITTEE, RETIREMENT OF C. F. GALE.

Extension of Time.

On motion by Hon. J. J. HOLMES, the time for bringing up the report of the Committee was extended to Thursday, 30th September.

MOTION — AGRICULTURAL SETTLEMENT AND IMMIGRATION.

Hon. J. F. CULLEN (South-East) [4.37]: I move—

1, That, in the opinion of this House, the Government should appoint an Honorary Commission of three experienced settlers to prepare for submission to Parliament a scheme for attracting and settling on suitable areas in this State a large number of immigrants from Europe after the close of the war. 2, That the foregoing resolution be communicated to His Excellency the Governor.

The Government, who are now, to my mind, stagnating the affairs of this State, came into office with loud claims as immigrationists. What have they done to substantiate those claims? They admitted the immigrants who had been contracted for by their predecessors; they admitted a number of persons nominated by people who were previously here. They could not well refuse to do that. But what else have they done? The Public Service Commissioner, with unconscious irony, has supplied the answer. In his apology for complicity in the re-

tirement of Mr. Gale from the office of Chief Protector of Aborigines, he explained in as clear terms as he could use that the work of the immigration officer had ceased; his occupation was gone; and in order to make room for this officer whose occupation had gone, he made a recommendation for the retirement of Mr. Gale, whose occupation continued. This is not the time nor the place to discuss the peculiar logic of the Public Service Commissioner. The point I make is that it has been officially stated that immigration has practically ended and Ministers who came into office with loud claims as immigrationists have settled down comfortably to look at this enormous country stagnating because of the smallness of its population. Three hundred and twenty thousand people for this enormous country of a million square miles! There is no mystery about the changed aspect of the Government. The union bosses, who, as a kind of side line, boss the Ministers, believe that the fewer people there are in the country the bigger the individual chance of work, and that the fewer the people the more money there will be for each one. That is their doctrine and so they have converted these Ministers into anti-immigrationists, or at all events they have led them to suspend their zeal on behalf of immigration. But these union bosses have gone further than that. Their idea is that of the boys born here only a percentage shall be allowed to train to earn a livelihood. They asked the Arbitration Court to order that there should be only one learner for every four trained men. That is their peculiar request, and the amazing part of it is that the Arbitration Court has fallen in with the idea and on a number of occasions it has endorsed this philosophy of the union bosses. In this way the union leaders are doubly paralysing and stagnating this State. They are, as far as they can effect it, shutting the doors against immigration and preventing our own boys from following their fathers in earning their livelihood. Now, of course, I will be answered that there are avocations outside those covered by the union bosses. If

there are it is not their fault, for they are trying to bring every avocation under their own control, and is it to be supposed that they will have a different rule for any other avocation than they have already asked the Arbitration Court to decide on, namely, that there shall be only one learner for every four trained men in a community? Every father is supposed to have two or three or even four sons. When I was at school in the healthy country, in which I had the happiness to live, I do not think I had a school fellow who had not three or four brothers. I had five. That is a healthy condition of life, but the union bosses say that it is destruction, for the fewer the workers the more money there will be for each one. "Keep out the immigrants and do not let more than a percentage of the boys learn how to earn their livelihood." That is the plain English of it, and the Ministers of the Crown today, as far as they can, are carrying out the behests of those union bosses. The work of the immigration officer has gone, and a place has been made for him by retiring someone whose work was going on. That is the position. Notwithstanding this, I have no doubt Ministers will still say they are immigrationists. I suppose the Colonial Secretary, representing the Government in this House, would say he is in favour of immigration. It would, perhaps, not be fair to say that his silence gives consent, but I know he professes to be an immigrationist. I ask him therefore to give the best attention to the proposal contained in my motion. Here is a proposal to meet the case. I will admit that the Government officers could produce a nice paper scheme of immigration that would look as well as one prepared in the way my motion suggests, but no one can move about amongst the people engaged in the primary industries of this country without coming to the conclusion that the men who have gained practical experience are the men to show how to do it. They are the men to guide others who desire to follow in their footsteps. My motion proposes that the Government appoint an honorary commission of three experi-

enced settlers. There will be no difficulty about getting them. I can suggest three or four sets of three capable men each. I could pick in this House a set of capable men who would be delighted to do it as an honorary work. I ask that the Government entrust the honorary commission with the duty of maturing a scheme for attracting and settling a large number of immigrants on suitable areas in this State. What are the difficulties in getting immigrants? There are the ties of home and kinship to be relinquished by the people who will migrate. This is the main difficulty. The people have ties of home and kinship and it is a great wrench to get them to come to a new country, but this awful war has riven the ties of home and kinship for numbers of people in Europe, in Belgium, in France, in Italy, and in Great Britain. Numbers of people in those countries have had these ties rudely riven asunder and, when the war is over, they will be looking for some peaceful territory wherein to make new homes. That is the time for a country like Australia to move. South Africa is moving. The Minister for Defence in the Union Government, speaking the other day, said, "We must prepare to attract immigrants. Immigrants are flocking now to the United States and Canada, and those countries will soon be filled, and South Africa will be the only place for overcrowded Europe to send their people to." Australia is a far better place than South Africa, and Western Australia has the best inducements of all to place before immigrants. We want to be ready; we are not ready now. The Minister will admit that. We have actually taken our one and only immigration officer and dispossessed an officer in another department to make room for him. That is the condition of our immigration office. We have closed our survey offices and we have scattered to the four winds the able band of surveyors that had been assembled in this State at great trouble and no little cost, and those surveyors who remain here holding on in the hope of a change in the policy of this State are struggling for a bare living.

We are not ready for immigration to-day, and we should get ready. An honorary commission of three experienced settlers—and I myself could nominate four sets if the Government desired; there would be no trouble to find them—a commission of men who have gone through the mill and made a success, men who know the country and who know how to develop it, these are the men who could make the plans and offer, not fantastic and imaginary attractions, but the solid and real attractions that the country possesses. They could put these in form for the people whom we desire to attract here to read.

Hon. J. W. Kirwan: Why send the motion to the Governor? It is rather unusual.

Hon. J. F. CULLEN: I will explain that presently. One of the most important items of their scheme will be a plan for the lads, many of whom have been left fatherless, many of them orphaned, lads who would make splendid settlers in a new country like this. The Allies, who will have to settle up affairs after the war, would be relieved to find an opening for boys, and such an asset to a country like this would be incalculable, boys of suitable physique who would be placed under practical training for agricultural and pastoral work—why! the union bosses would be amazed at the rapidity with which such boys would become employers of labour. I would like to turn aside to say that some of the union bosses in their anxiety to lessen and restrict ordinary immigration, have said that they would not mind if people came here with money to employ labour. They would even touch the accursed thing capital, and the accursed capitalist, that is, from their point of view. They would have him and his money in preference to having anyone whom they thought would share in the money that is going. These bosses would be amazed at the rapidity with which well trained young fellows—I mean well trained in farming pursuits—would in turn become employers of labour. The commission, out of their practical know-

ledge, would prepare a scheme. They would suggest what areas should be thrown open, how far they might be prepared in advance, and some scheme whereby boys of suitable physique could receive the necessary apprenticeship or training for work on the land. I am sure there would be no difficulty in getting suitable men, and that they would undertake the duty with all their hearts, and the country would be the richer for the results of such a scheme. I want to impress this House, and through it this country with this view of the situation: For a spacious country like this, the first want is men. Even more than capital, we want men. It is as easy to govern—and when I say govern, I mean all the ramifications of administration—three millions of people as three hundred thousand. It costs little more to provide roads and railways and schools and all the public utilities for three millions than for a population of 320,000. It is a costly process trying to administer this enormous country with 320,000 people, a most costly process, and the only way to cheapen it is to multiply our population. I commend the motion to the House. For the benefit of the hon. Mr. Kirwan, I wish to explain, as I explained last evening, that my reason for asking that this resolution be forwarded to His Excellency the Governor, is that it would not otherwise be certain to go to the Executive. I am sure hon. members will understand and appreciate my remarks when I say there is no other way of making certain. This is a matter the country is feeling—

Hon. J. W. Kirwan: Is this not a matter more for Cabinet than the Executive?

Hon. J. F. CULLEN: That is my meaning. Anything sent to His Excellency the Governor is sent to the Executive Council. This is the usual process in the oldest Parliament of Australia, namely, New South Wales; all the resolutions are forwarded to His Excellency the Governor and by address.

Hon. H. Millington: Just now we are sending men out of the country.

Hon. J. F. CULLEN: The union leaders think that if we have fewer men each will have more money. We are lending our best men—for the best are volunteering—to the Motherland for the time being, and we hope that most of them will come back, and I desire to see a great many more come and help to get full possession of this country and its latent wealth. I commend the motion to the House, and although at present Ministers are afraid of their lives to venture on immigration, I hope that when we impress them with the fact that the real people of the country—those who are carrying on the industries and making the country—desire more population, they will give heed to it. These people realise that it is bad for everyone to have such large vacant spaces in this country. Rather than carry a railway for 20 miles through sparsely populated areas to the next centre of settlement it would be far better if the lands were occupied all along and if all the country were developed, and this can be done only by securing population. I hope this House will carry the motion unanimously. There is no reason why we should not do so, for even Ministers say they are immigrationists. I am accepting their protestations, and I am saying to them, "We are all with you, the whole country is with you, if you will only get the right kind of people." When I say "the right kind" I do not mean wealthy people. If they are moneyed, so much the better; but if they have nothing except industry and thrift, the more of those people we can get the better. I will add only this word—if legislators will not rise to the occasion, then the country will have to force their hands.

On motion by the Colonial Secretary debate adjourned.

BILL—ROADS ACT AMENDMENT AND CONTINUANCE.

Report of Committee adopted.

BILLS—(3): FIRST READING.

- 1, Grain and Foodstuff.
- 2, Cottesloe Beach Rates Validation.
- 3, Licensing Act Amendment Continuance.

Received from the Assembly.

BILL—WEIGHTS AND MEASURES.

In Committee.

Resumed from the previous day; Hon. W. Kingsmill in the Chair, the Colonial Secretary in charge of the Bill.

Schedule "D"—Weights for bushel, Section 18:

[Hon. W. Patrick had moved an amendment, "That the word 'seed' be struck out after 'wheat.'"]

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: I support the amendment, concerning which I have consulted with the Crown Solicitor, Mr. Sayer, and the Commissioner for Wheat Belts, Mr. Sutton. Mr. Sayer writes as follows on the matter:—

I have conferred with Mr. Sutton, and he advises me that Clause 19, relating to the weight of "bushel," should apply to wheat generally, and not only to seed wheat; therefore the amendment required is to omit the word "seed" after "wheat" in the last line of Schedule D. This brings the law into accordance with the existing Weights and Measures Act, No. 11 of 1899 (see Section 32 of that Act and the Seventh Schedule) providing that wheat generally is 60lbs. to the bushel.

Mr. Sutton has also communicated with me as follows:—

A bushel is a measure of quantity, and the weight of a measured bushel of wheat varies according to its quality and condition. Neither seed nor milling wheat in Australia is sold by measurement or by the actual weight of a measured bushel of wheat, for, obviously, this will vary from year to year. To facilitate the sale of wheat, the term bushel is given an arbitrary meaning, and is understood in the industry to mean 60lbs. avoirdupois. All transactions connected with the pur-

chase and sale of wheat are conducted on this basis. Thus, though a measured bushel of F.A.Q. wheat might weigh 62lbs., a purchaser of 100 bushels of such wheat would not receive 6,200lbs.—that is, the weight of 100 measured bushels. He would receive 6,000lbs., the quality of which would be such that a measured bushel of it would weigh 62lbs.

Amendment put and passed.

Schedule, as amended, agreed to.

Preamble, title—agreed to.

Bill reported with amendments.

BILL — GOVERNMENT ELECTRIC WORKS ACT AMENDMENT.

In Committee.

Resumed from the previous day; Hon. W. Kingsmill in the Chair, the Colonial Secretary in charge of the Bill.

Clause 7—Effect of amendments:

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: I have consulted the Solicitor General on the point raised by Mr. Colebatch. It is proposed to amend Subsection 1 of Section 7 of the principal Act by adding a proviso. Subsection 1 of Section 7 reads—

Before the Commissioner proceeds to break up any street or to open or alter the position of any sewer, drain, or tunnel, or of any wires, he shall give to the person or local or other authority under whose control or management the same may be, notice in writing of his intention so to do not less than three clear days before beginning the work, except in cases of emergency arising from defects in any of the electric lines or works, in which cases the notice shall be given as soon as practicable: provided that when the interference with the street, sewer, drain, tunnel or wires is required for the purpose of connecting any branch electric line to a main which has been previously laid or provided, one clear day's notice shall be sufficient.

The Act is being amended in order to provide that in case of the owner being an absentee from the State a notice

posted up on the land will be all-sufficient, and this amendment will have a retrospective effect. Mr. Sayer writes as follows:—

An officer of the Railway Department has seen me with regard to Clause 7, whereby the amendments are made retrospective. The only portion of the Bill that necessarily should be made retrospective is the proviso in Clause 5. It is believed that in all cases notices have, in fact, been sent by post although many have been returned through the dead letter office; and I understand that the Commissioner has hitherto affixed a notice on the land where there was no known owner within Western Australia. It is desirable to give retrospective effect to this amendment to avoid the possibility—although probably somewhat remote—of vexatious proceedings being taken in case notices to absentee owners may not have been sent to their proper addresses. As far as I can see, the only effect of not complying with the requirements of the Act as to the service of notice would be, as I have said, to lay the Commission open to proceedings of a vexatious character.

Clause put and passed.

Preamble, title—agreed to.

Bill reported without amendment and the report adopted.

JOINT SELECT COMMITTEE, HORSE-RACING CONTROL.

Interim report, to adopt.

Hon. F. CONNOR (North) [5.14]: I move—

That in the opinion of this House effect should be given to the recommendations contained in the interim report of the Joint Select Committee on Horse-racing.

I wish hon. members to understand that the interim report which has been presented to the House does not comprise the full measure of the matter which has been considered by the joint select committee appointed to inquire into the subject of horse-racing. But as it is pro-

hable that the full deliberations of the joint select committee will not be available in time to permit of legislation being passed this session, it was considered by the select committee that it would be advisable to recommend Parliament in the meantime that certain restrictions should be placed upon gambling. The members of the committee have not spared themselves; in fact they imposed upon themselves the necessity of visiting the goldfields to see the local racing.

Hon. A. G. Jenkins: That was an inflection.

Hon. F. CONNOR: So far as their deliberations have gone, the members of the committee have arrived at the decision that there is undue gambling in connection with horse-racing in this State. If we have to wait for the final report of the committee, it will not be possible to legislate this session in connection with the matter. Therefore, the committee, having thus far arrived at the conclusion that there is undue gambling, and an undue amount of horse-racing in this State, desire to point out that it is necessary that two evils, namely street betting and shop betting, should be immediately suppressed. Undoubtedly they are a menace to the welfare of the people, and the members of the committee hold that it will be to the interests of the people generally if these two evils are at once suppressed. That is the reason why I am moving the motion. If it were possible for the final report of the committee to be placed before hon. members in time for the introduction of legislation this session, there would be no necessity for the motion, but it is probable that the full deliberations of the committee will not be concluded in time to admit of the introduction of that legislation. Therefore, this interim report has been brought down, so that Parliament may rule straightaway upon the questions of street and shop betting. Under existing conditions, the authorities have not the necessary power to prevent this street and shop betting. There is a municipal by-law, certainly, directed towards the suppression of these evils; but it prescribes that when a man is prosecuted for street

betting, it must be shown that he was there for the purpose of betting. As a matter of fact, any man can go down the street and make a bet, and it may be utterly impossible to prove that he was there for that purpose. Therefore, Parliament ought to accede to the proposition made by the joint committee, namely, that it is necessary that there should be placed in the hands of the Government—not of a municipality—power to suppress this street and shop betting, which exercises so evil an influence. I do not wish to labour the question, indeed I scarcely think it is necessary. Quite recently I, as a member of the committee, witnessed racing at Bieton, and I can assure hon. members that I never saw more palpable roping in my life than was there to be seen. It is quite certain that the public have no chance there. The horse-owners, the course-owners and the bookmakers get the lot.

Hon. Sir E. H. Wittenoom: Why do the public bet?

Hon. F. CONNOR: Why should we allow them to bet? The committee hold that Parliament should be asked to immediately pass legislation to abolish street betting, and that authority should be given to carry out the existing laws which, up to the present, have not been enforced. That alone would serve to abolish some of the greatest evils. There are other evils, which will be fully dealt with in the final report of the committee. But in the meantime it is of the utmost importance that street and shop betting should be immediately suppressed. At present they exist to an abnormal extent, to the grave detriment of the people of the State.

Hon. R. G. ARDAGH (North-East) [5.27]: As a member of the select committee, I rise to second the motion. From the evidence adduced before the committee on this particular phase of the question of horse-racing and gambling, we have come to the conclusion that it is absolutely necessary that some action should be taken at once to minimise this evil. On the evidence before us, street betting exists to a very large extent.

Those who carry on this pernicious system of soliciting bets on the main thoroughfares of our more important towns and cities, are, to a large degree, persons who do not bet on the racecourse. The man who bets on the racecourse usually has to pay a pretty stiff fee to the racing clubs for the privilege, and he finds he has quite sufficient to go on with by betting on the racecourse, and so does not require to bet in the streets. I sincerely hope that the recommendation sent forward by the joint select committee of both Houses will be adopted by both Houses, and that the Government will act upon the recommendation to immediately clothe the police with powers to arrest for street betting. The evidence given before the committee shows that the authorities have not power to arrest for this offence. I think it is very necessary that they should have those powers. The committee have not had time to go into the whole question, and in consequence I am of opinion that Mr. Connor was somewhat premature in making observations in regard to any particular class of racing which has been held since the appointment of the committee. The main question we were asked to bring forward is that of street and shop betting, and I think if the Government adopt our recommendations they will be doing a great deal of good to the community of Western Australia. I do not wish to further labour the question. In conclusion I would say that the minimum fine for this offence should be made a heavy one, while the minimum term of imprisonment should be a pretty long sentence. To my mind this is the only way of dealing with the matter if we are going to minimise the evil of gambling in this particular direction. I sincerely trust that some action will be taken.

Hon. Sir E. H. WITTENOOM (North) [5.31]: While I do not propose in any way to oppose the motion before the House, I think this is a proper and useful time to consider the question of betting and horse-racing generally. I think it will be found, to a large extent, that horse-racing in many instances exists for betting, and that once betting is sup-

pressed it will probably do away with a good deal of horse-racing.

Hon. R. G. ARDAGH: Confine them to the racecourses only.

Hon. Sir E. H. WITTENOOM: I am not at this stage venturing an opinion as to whether that would be beneficial or not. I am perfectly convinced that there are numbers of people who care nothing about horse-racing as an amusement, but who take the greatest interest in it as an avenue for betting. There are three ways of looking at the matter, namely, as to whether horse-racing is carried on entirely for amusement, whether it is carried on as an industry, or whether it is meant to provide an opportunity for betting. I am afraid the days when horse-racing was carried on as an amusement are gone. There are very few people now who look upon horse-racing entirely from the point of view of sport. I think we should quickly find out that this is so if horse-racing was abolished, because the number of people who earn their living in connection with it would be so great that many would be thrown out of employment. When we look at the magnitude of horse-racing, and its far-reaching effects, we must always look upon it as an industry. It has been argued, and it is well for the committee to take this into consideration, that horse-racing has been instituted in order to improve the breed of horses. What they must consider now is whether horse-racing can be carried on satisfactorily without betting. They are in the position to take all evidence on the subject and get much information, and upon that evidence and information to arrive at an understanding as to whether it can be carried on as an industry without the evils which we are told follow in the train of betting. I have pleasure in supporting the motion.

Hon. A. SANDERSON (Metropolitan-Suburban) [5.34]: I would be unwilling to do more than thank members of the select committee for the work which they declare they have done. The work in connection with a select committee very often takes up a great deal of time, and very often, too, members of

such a committee receive very little thanks for what they do. In this case, I think that hon. members might say that the interim report that we have received is somewhat lame and inconclusive. In fact, the drift of affairs right through the piece is certainly very astonishing to me. I regard it in this way: that the Government having put our financial affairs on a thoroughly sound basis, have now turned their attention to our morals. They have allowed a select committee to be appointed to deal with racing. They have taken into their hands the Health Act, and they propose to refer the drink question to the people. I shall have something to say on the drink question and on the Health Bill, but at the present moment I propose to confine my remarks to this particular question. I was under the impression, as one of the general public, that it was considered that there was too much racing, and that some steps ought to be taken to minimise this state of affairs. For several reasons these steps should be taken, for it is almost indecent at this juncture to see people congregated in large numbers for amusement and gambling at a time when we are really fighting for our existence in this war. That is one reason. One other reason is the amount of financial waste that is going on, and as the posters which have appeared in our own corridors have shown, one further reason is that young men attending these race meetings ought to be going to help their brothers in the trenches. We now come to this position: that we ought to pass a resolution to the effect that the law should be put into force. This is the conclusion that this select committee will ask the House to arrive at.

Hon. R. G. Ardagh: You are quite wrong.

Hon. A. SANDERSON: Am I wrong, or is the committee?

Hon. R. G. Ardagh: You are.

Hon. H. P. Colebatch: The existing Act needs amendment.

Hon. A. SANDERSON: Is it not most interesting? Here are two members of the committee talking to one another. Let them settle the matter before I go

on. One can only go by the statements of the members of the committee who evidently know—they ought to know for they were put there to find out. The hon. Mr. Connor tells us that the existing law should be put into force, and the hon. Sir Edward Wittenoom pertinently asks whether the suppression of betting would do away with these race meetings.

Hon. Sir E. H. Wittenoom: I think it will.

Hon. A. SANDERSON: If there is so much unanimity in the Chamber on this subject, how does it come about that the select committee, after many weeks, has not been able to arrive at a definite decision in the matter?

Hon. F. Connor: They had a lot more to consider than that.

Hon. A. SANDERSON: Than what?

Hon. F. Connor: Than merely the question of gambling.

The PRESIDENT: Order!

Hon. A. SANDERSON: This is the conclusion that we are told by the hon. Mr. Connor and his supporters on the committee has been arrived at. This is to be the sole conclusion. There is not the slightest chance of bringing in anything else this session.

Hon. F. Connor: That does not follow.

Hon. A. SANDERSON: The hon. member told us that himself. He knows perfectly well that there is very little chance of any Bill being introduced this session to deal with the question. If hon. members think this is a sound conclusion at which we have arrived I had better reserve the rest of my remarks, which are more or less on the same lines, when we come to the Health Bill, and the referendum on the drink question.

Hon. J. F. ALLEN (West) [5.39]: I move—

That the debate be adjourned.

Motion put and negatived.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES (North) [5.40]: I do not intend to oppose the motion, but would like some further information on the subject. To my mind this committee was appointed to make recommendations for the control of racing.

Hon. R. G. Ardagh: And so we will.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: The members of the committee now come along with a recommendation for the consideration of street betting. Unless the people patronise race meetings and race clubs they will cease to exist, and if we stop street betting it will have the effect of forcing people to the racecourses in order to make their bets. This is the only logical conclusion to come to upon that recommendation. If I choose to make a bet in the street and play golf for the rest of the day, and if I object to go to a racecourse at all, and while I am there be wheedled into making more bets in order to recover the money I have lost on my original bet, I object to be forced if I want to make a bet—and as a matter of fact, I do not bet—to a racecourse in order to do so. Consequently, I am not in accord with the motion before us, that we should put down street betting. My idea is rather to put down betting altogether, for by that means we would, I think, arrive at the stage which most of us desire to reach. How, in the name of commonsense, are we going to control racing by prohibiting street betting? I contend that the object is to control the number of race meetings. If we are going to make them more popular every day, however, by forcing people to attend them if they want to make a bet, by affording them an opportunity to bet on the racecourse and not on the streets, then we shall be defeating our object.

Hon. Sir E. H. Wittenoom: They always will bet.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: If people always will bet—and that is admitted—why not let them bet either on the street or on the racecourse? If the prohibition of street betting would minimise the danger, I would be in accord with the motion. To my way of thinking, however, we shall be forcing the people to the racecourses in order to make their bets. I agree with the mover of the motion that we have not a hope—at all events I doubt very much whether the general public have any hope—on the Bicton racecourse with our money if the horses are run by the bookmakers and are run to lose. I

read the other day in the newspaper the evidence of a witness who was being examined in the Bankruptcy Court who said he had owned horses, ridden them, and trained them, and that even then they beat him. If a man who owns, and trains, and rides horses is beaten, what hope is there for the general public? And yet, the recommendation of the committee is to force bookmakers out of the street and to drive them on to the racecourses where men on all sides are sure to get rooked. The hon. Mr. Connor tells us this afternoon of what happened at Bicton. I will tell the House what happened at Goodwood. The incident I am going to mention did not come under my personal observation. It was related to me by one of the most reputable citizens in Western Australia who attends race meetings regularly. He went to this particular racecourse on one occasion, but said he would never go again. He is the soul of honour, and, if this is an additional qualification, he is a justice of the peace. He said he saw a barefooted girl of 14 years of age making a bet at Goodwood. All she had to bet with was the sum of one shilling, and she got the odds of five shillings to one. He did not wait to see whether she got her five shillings or not. We presume that she did not do so, and that she lost her shilling. This is the sort of place to which we are going to force people to go to make their bets. I say that the way we should deal with race clubs is to put down betting entirely. Let us allow them to use the totalisator and stop all other betting. If we put down street betting and allow betting on racecourses we shall soon see what will happen, and we shall see how ineffectually we shall have attempted to get rid of the evil of betting.

Hon. Sir E. H. Wittenoom: There will be no horse-racing then.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: Would that cause very much harm? Horse-racing was all right when we ran our horses to win, and when racing was conducted in order to encourage the better breeding of horses. Will anyone tell me to-day

that the main principle of horse-racing is the uplifting of the horse-breeding business of the State? Any man who tells me that surely does not expect me to believe him. If he did I would not do so. Nowadays it is a matter, not of the best horse winning, but of which horse a man can make the most money out of. I will not be a party, much as I desire to put down betting altogether, to forcing people to the racecourses in order to make their bets, for, by going to the racecourses for this purpose they are generally obliged to make two or three bets to recover their losses where they will only make one bet in the street.

Hon. J. F. ALLEN (West) [5.45]: My object in moving the adjournment of the debate was to enable me to place before the House certain information which I had derived from the evidence given before the committee of which I happen to be a member, but as the House has decided that the question shall be debated now I will endeavour as far as I am able to deal with the question from my memory and notes which I have on this question. I have elicited from the various witnesses who have been examined that there are two objects in view in connection with racing: first, that of the promotion of the breed of utility horses and secondly the element of sport, which is to my mind pre-eminent in this State. If we are to look on the question purely as one of improving the breed of horses then a great number of abuses have crept into the sport as it exists to-day. On the other hand if we are to consider the question purely on the point of view of sport, then a great number of arguments advanced by witnesses would naturally have to be considered. Personally I am of opinion that nothing which exists in any community for the purpose purely of sport, which has not for its ultimate object some beneficial result to the community, is an evil which should be suppressed, and if the element of sport is to be taken into consideration in a larger sense than that of the production of a better class of animal, then I am opposed to that position. The question before us to-day is not that which

the committee has been empowered to inquire into on the wider scale, it is a question purely of the suppression of street and shop betting, and if the House will only consider it from that point of view they will see the committee in introducing this interim report have been actuated by a desire to do something for the benefit of the people as a whole. We are at present faced with a position which is unparalleled in the history of the world and it is necessary for the nation at this time—and by that I mean the English-speaking dominions—to conserve its resources to the uttermost, and if this committee in introducing this report have done something to direct the attention of the House to a phase of the question which is at the present time leading to the dissipation of national resources, we are doing something of importance to the community. The question of street betting is one which this House might seriously take into consideration. The question of betting as a whole is one that is open to a great deal of debate. If the question of betting is one purely of sport then it is something which we may very well leave alone. The question of sport is one which, to my mind, leads only to absolute loss to the community, but if it is a question of something that is of interest to the community and will lead to an economic benefit to the community it is something which we should support. The great evil, to my mind, of street betting is that people are enabled under the present condition of things to invest moneys on possible events which may never eventuate. They may be able at the present time to invest money they can ill afford on races that do not take place, they are able to invest money on horses that may be scratched, and they may have to save the situation by means of taking other bets; and we have evidence to show that a number of people from time to time have been induced to bet on races in advance of the occurrence to such an extent that to save themselves from disaster they have to bet and bet again, and the result is that these people to save themselves from that disaster

have to increase their liabilities to such an extent that they have ended in the disaster which they desired to steer clear of. The question of street betting at present can only be dealt with by means of the by-laws that give the police no power beyond that of taking the names of people and prosecuting them. The evidence taken before the select committee has shown us that it is necessary that not merely should this procedure take place but it should be absolutely necessary for the police to have the power to arrest. I have only to mention to members that the police can only take the name of a person whom they have reason to believe is betting in the streets but they have no means of proving in a court of law that the person has betted, whereas if the power was given to arrest a person, the police have the proof on the person arrested to show that the person has been betting in the streets. This is an important point and it is the crux of the whole situation. If the police have the power of arrest and have the power to produce the proof in the court that a person has been indulging in something which is in contravention to the law some benefit may ensue, but if the police have no power to arrest they can produce no proof that the law has been transgressed. I think if members only take that into consideration they will see the necessity of doing something in connection with the interim report of the committee. Naturally the committee are desirous of doing some good work for the community. It has been shown by the evidence collected to date that an enormous waste takes place in the community, that a large amount of money is expended in this direction without even the least advantage to the community, and it seems to me that if we are in earnest in endeavouring to see that the community are practising that economy which we desire to see at the present moment, an effort should be made to stem the trend of waste which is taking place amongst us. The House will be wise to consider the advisability of taking into serious consideration the recommendation of the committee in this direction.

Hon. H. P. COLEBATCH (East) [5.54]: As a member of the committee I should like to endeavour to remove any misapprehension in the minds of members which may have been created by the remarks of Mr. Holmes. This committee is making exhaustive enquiry and will furnish a complete and comprehensive report dealing with the question submitted to them, but I think Mr. Holmes and other members will recognise that the question is a difficult one. There are many points which have been raised and it would be unreasonable to suppose that a committee consisting of ten members taken from both Houses, selected from all parties, could easily agree on the whole of the issues placed before them. But the committee were unanimous on this, that if possible something should be done and done quickly to decrease to some extent what I at all events think is one of the greatest evils under which we are labouring at the present time, the evil of over-racing and consequently over-gambling. Whether or not the whole matter of racing referred to the committee and which will be reported on at an early date, will be dealt with by legislation this session depends, not on the committee, but on the Government. The committee feeling that there is some risk that the whole questions may not be dealt with, and that some little time may be occupied in reconciling the views of the committee on the number of issues, they say that this is one point on which they are unanimous, let us try and get Parliament to do something. Mr. Holmes smiles, he apparently is a supporter of street and shop betting.

Mr. Holmes: I am not a supporter of betting at all.

Hon. H. P. COLEBATCH: There is not in this community any greater abomination than street betting. There is nothing so offensive to me, particularly at this juncture, than to walk along St. George's terrace on a Wednesday afternoon and see the number of men indulging in street betting. If the Government are not willing to devote sufficient time to deal comprehensively with this question of racing in this session—and I say

that if we have work of this character to do we should do it—but if the Government will not introduce a comprehensive Bill we should appeal to the Government to suppress this abominable street betting. It is easily suppressed, a slight amendment of existing legislation will do it, if that legislation is strongly enforced.

Hon. J. J. Holmes: And you will force people to attend race meetings.

Hon. H. P. COLEBATCH: I do not think it will. These people congregate in the streets betting at a time when there are no race meetings being held in the metropolitan area or even in Western Australia. If the Government are able to restrict the racing dates in Western Australia and still allow the street betting to continue it will not benefit the position. The crowds will still congregate in the streets and they bet on races which are being conducted in the Eastern States. Our Standing Orders prohibit the disclosing of evidence or documents collected by the select committee until they report to the House. For that reason it was impossible for Mr. Connor or myself to submit to the House the evidence on which the committee came to their conclusion, but when I say it is the unanimous conclusion of a committee drawn from both Houses and from all parties, I think the House will be slow to ignore the recommendation.

Hon. A. G. JENKINS (Metropolitan-Suburban) [6.0]: I desire to congratulate the select committee on the interim report which they have brought in. The House and the community are indebted to that committee for the manner in which they have tackled this problem in the limited time they have had at their disposal, and I can appreciate the fact that it was impossible for them in the limited time at their disposal to bring in a full report on the whole question of racing. In their wisdom the select committee detected the two evils which want suppressing, and they undoubtedly do want suppressing. Anyone has only to walk down the street to see to what an enormous extent these two evils have grown in the last

few years. This is the only State in Australia, and I am pretty safe in saying it is the only place in any English speaking community, where street betting is allowed to be carried on with impunity. In every other State, and in England, there are most drastic laws for the suppression of this evil. In some cases imprisonment without a fine is the penalty which is inflicted. That only shows how gravely people who have had experience of it consider the evil. Unfortunately, the law as regards shop and street betting has not been applied as strictly as it might have been. So far as street betting is concerned, there is a municipal law to prevent it but it provides only for a paltry fine, and delinquents have been fined £2. £5, and in some cases £10. The police magistrate, in imposing the penalties, has referred to the fact that it only amounts to a license fee which the bookmakers can well afford to pay. It comes from the money which they make from the people who can ill afford to lose it. As a rule the street bettor is a man who is not in the position to indulge in that kind of thing and invariably, too, he is a man who cannot afford to pay his fare and his entrance money to a racecourse. That man would never think of a race meeting if street betting were prohibited.

Hon. J. J. Holmes: Why not?

Hon. A. G. JENKINS: Because he could not afford to pay his entrance fee. The select committee want to try and stop that man from betting in the streets and in shops.

Hon. W. Kingsmill: Stop him betting everywhere.

Hon. A. G. JENKINS: That is not the question at the present time. Our attention is just now being drawn to two evils and the House is asked to remove them. The police have power to arrest in regard to betting in public places, but, as it has been pointed out, it is very difficult to get convictions. As regards shop betting, there is a section in the Criminal Code which provides for a severe penalty, but again it is very difficult to catch these shop bettors. Something more drastic is required. I know, and every hon. member

knows, that throughout the metropolitan area there are numerous shops conducted solely for the purpose of betting. On the goldfields also there are many shops which are entirely devoted to the same purpose. That is not the state of things that should be allowed to exist in the community. Year after year we have had reports from the Commissioner of Police calling attention to the evil of betting and asking that legislation might be introduced, but nothing has ever been done. I do not know why. Successive Governments have been asked by the Commissioner of Police to bring in a drastic law to suppress it. Here is the opportunity for the Government and I have no doubt that the House will unanimously agree to the suggestion of the select committee, that the two obnoxious evils to which they have referred should be legislated against. The Government should now show that they are in earnest on the question. There is ample time in the present session to put through a short Bill which will utterly crush the evils. There can be clauses in that measure which will make it absolutely impossible for people to carry on these practices. Anyone can go down St. George's-terrace in the months of October and November, when the big meetings are being held in the Eastern States, and they will see for themselves to what extent the gambling evil manifests itself. The Terrace looks more like a racecourse than an ordinary business thoroughfare. Such a thing is not tolerated anywhere else in the world. Why should we tolerate it here? There may be one or two reputable bookmakers who do a certain amount of street betting, but as a rule it is the hanger-on who becomes very objectionable.

Hon. J. Duffell: He is a parasite.

Hon. A. G. JENKINS: Exactly, and he is the man we want to wipe out. We can see for ourselves daily the loafers who hang around the Terrace doing nothing but living on the unfortunate working man, because it is the working man's money that they accept in wagers. These loafers will allow more useful men to go to the front and fight for them, while they

themselves stay behind to live in idleness, or practically speaking on the misfortunes of others.

Hon. J. J. Holmes: You see the same thing on a racecourse.

Hon. A. G. JENKINS: You do not. A man who goes to a racecourse invariably is able to put some money on a horse. At any rate we do not see gambling in the same form at a racecourse as we see it in our business thoroughfares. It will be time to discuss the question more fully when the complete report of the committee is presented to the House. I hope the House will agree to the motion. I cannot for the life of me imagine that any hon. member can have the slightest sympathy with the two evils referred to.

On motion by the Colonial Secretary debate adjourned.

Sitting suspended from 6.6 to 7.30 p.m.

BILL—HEALTH ACT AMENDMENT.

Second Reading.

Debate resumed from the 16th September.

Hon. A. J. H. SAW (Metropolitan-Suburban) [7.30]: I desire to thank the hon. Mr. Sommers for according me the privilege of speaking on this subject immediately after the Colonial Secretary. I welcome the appearance of this Bill firstly because I approve of the principle of safeguarding the health of the people from venereal disease, and, secondly, I welcome it because if any Bill ever justified the existence of this Chamber it is this one. As the measure comes to us it is so full of flaws and so greatly imperils the liberty of an innocent person that I really wonder how it could have been passed in its present form by another place. For the person suffering from venereal disease, it practically suspends the Habens Corpus Act. A person might quite innocently contract venereal disease and yet, under the measure as it is presented to us, he might, at the whim of the Commissioner and Governor-in-Council acting on the advice of the Commissioner,

be detained for years and no power on earth could get him out so long as he remained infected with this complaint. There is in the Bill as it comes to us a so-called right of appeal, but that right of appeal does not protect the person so long as he is suffering from this disease in an infective condition. Therefore a person might quite innocently contract this disease, and there are many such, and yet at the whim of the Commissioner and the Governor-in-Council acting on the advice of the Commissioner he might be detained in hospital or other place for years. We all well know that one of these diseases does last for years and very often we cannot positively say when it is perfectly cured. No power on earth, no order of the judge and no right of appeal could possibly get a person so infected out. The only thing that could get him out would be a revolution and the storming of the modern Bastille. Perhaps this is a considerable condemnation of the Bill; yet I welcome it because I approve of the principles underlying it. I welcome the Bill, because like the road to a certain place, it is paved with good intentions. I fully intend to support the second reading, but whilst doing that I shall have very many amendments to move in Committee, amendments which I think are vital to the success of the Bill if it is not to inflict great hardships on the community, and I trust that the House, instead of referring the matter to a select committee—as I believe if that course is pursued it may mean that the Bill will be shelved—will carefully consider the various amendments which will be proposed, and if possible get this Bill into such a shape that it may be of benefit to the community. This is a Health Bill and I do not believe for a moment that it is likely to injuriously affect the morals of the community. This is a most difficult subject because, whilst it is a health matter, it is also mixed up with the question of public morality, but, I do not believe this Bill as it stands, although it has great drawbacks in regard to the liberty of the subject, can possibly injuriously affect the morals of the community. It is a

Health Bill and not a Bill to regulate vice. Before we can justly appreciate the measure as proposed, it is necessary that we should have some understanding of the diseases for which this Bill is intended to legislate. It is rather an unsavoury subject and I may quote the words of Don Quixote to Sancho Panza—“It is not made any better by stirring.” But I trust any remarks I have to make, whilst they may be plain, because I think plain speaking on this measure is necessary, will not cause any offence to the most delicate mind. It is necessary that we should know something of the diseases for which this Bill is designed to legislate and I will first take the subject of syphilis. Syphilis apparently became prevalent in Europe somewhere about the close of the fifteenth century. It was supposed to have been introduced by the sailors of Columbus on their return from the first voyage to America. That is somewhat in dispute, and it appears probable that the disease was known to the Chinese as long ago as two thousand years before Christ, and it is also probable that the disease had appeared in Europe before Columbus and his sailors returned from their voyage to the West Indies in 1493. Be that as it may, somewhere about that time this disease assumed gigantic proportions. It first appeared in Naples, so far as we know, and it rapidly spread over Europe. It was of a most virulent type and assumed epidemic proportions, so much so that it is said in a very short time 20 per cent. of the inhabitants of those countries became infected with the disease. The origin of the disease was obscure, but it was at first attributed, like everything else is, to the unseasonable weather in view of the fact that its real mode of conveyance was not known, and naturally people did not want it to be known. It was certainly prevalent in the time of Shakespeare for Shakespeare in “Timon of Athens” gives us a most vivid and graphic description of some of the ravages of this disease and he was undoubtedly alluding, as any medical man knows from the symptoms.

diverse as they appear, to the latent ravages of syphilis, when he said—

Consumptions sow

*In hollow bones of men, strike their sharp
shins*

*And mar their spurring. Crack the lawyer's
voice*

*That he may never more false title plead
Nor sound his quillets shrilly; hear the
flamen*

*That scolds against the quality of flesh
And not believes himself; down with the
nose,*

*Down with it flat, take the bridge right away
Of him that his particular to see
Smells from the general weal. Make curled
pate ruffians bald.*

All those symptoms, diverse as they appear, do undoubtedly allude to the ravages of syphilis, and it is a most extraordinary thing that Shakespeare, with that universal knowledge which he seems to have possessed, undoubtedly knew a great deal about disease, and apparently from the sequence of these sentences connected them up with the later manifestations of syphilis. Syphilis is a disease which is sometimes severe and sometimes mild. Under the ordinary methods of treatment which prevailed until the last few years, we usually considered that the person was infective to others under certain conditions for a period of about two years. Under more modern methods of treatment which are now coming into vogue, we imagine that the infective period can be cut considerably shorter but that yet remains to be proved. I am alluding to the treatment of 606. If the patient is untreated, or if he is insufficiently treated, it is probable that he remains infective for about five years. Of course I give those as general terms. The disease is usually contracted in one way, that is by sexual intercourse. It may however be contracted in other ways and these have certainly come under my cognisance, so I can speak definitely. It may be contracted by kissing a person infected with the disease. If he has secondary lesions he may undoubtedly convey this disease by kissing. It may also be spread by suckling a syphilitic infant and so a wet nurse may get infected, or, on the other hand a syphilitic wet nurse may infect a clean baby. And many surgeons have

fallen victims to this disease during their professional career by the fact of their inoculating a finger during the course of their work and many of them have suffered very terrible consequences later on. I have said that the patient may be infective for this period but he may remain a sufferer and present manifestations of this disease for a very much longer period than he remains infective, and he may also transfer the disease to his offspring for a longer period. The disease is, unfortunately, widespread. I have no desire to alarm the public, but I think if I gave the House some absolutely reliable statistics concerning the disease hon. members would be astounded. I was present at the Interstate Medical Congress held in Melbourne during 1908, at which a paper on this subject was read by the president, Sir William Allen, pathologist of the Melbourne Hospital and the Melbourne University, one of the most distinguished men in medicine in Australia, and certainly the greatest authority in Australia on syphilis. In that paper he said that during the course of 100 post mortems which he had made at the Melbourne Hospital on patients dying from diverse diseases for which they are admitted to the Melbourne Hospital—100 consecutive post mortem examinations taken at random—he found evidence of syphilis in more than 30. He concluded his paper in the following words:—

I am compelled to hold that in the hospital population—

Of course, these statistics apply only to hospital patients; but I presume the patients of the Melbourne Hospital would be drawn from at least one-half the population of the city—

syphilis is widespread, a frequent cause of death, a potent factor of physical deterioration rendering patients much more susceptible to other noxæ, and adding largely to the mortality from many other diseases.

I heard Professor Allen, as he then was, make that statement; and it made me think. At first I was inclined to consider his statistics exaggerated, but ever since I heard that paper read in 1908 I have been keeping my eyes and my mind

open. As the result of my observations and of various mental impressions which have been borne in on me since them—because when this sort of thing is forced on one's notice it makes one think—I have come to the conclusion that Professor Allen's statistics were not exaggerated. As the result of my clinical observation I affirm my belief that syphilis is widespread in the community. During the course of a professional career extending over 25 years, I can recall hundreds of victims of syphilis. They include men and women of the highest character, and of all grades of society—men and women whose lives have been ruined by this disease. Many of them found an early grave; many of them still linger on in suffering and misery; many of them have found a final shelter in the lunatic asylum. Undoubtedly, many of these patients become cured. The great majority, indeed, become cured, especially if medical advice is sought early and treatment is continued for a sufficiently long period. There is another disease included in the scope of this Bill, and that is gonorrhoea. Many people believe, and I have seen it stated by some critics, that gonorrhoea is a trifling disease. It is not so. It is a most serious disease. It has many complications, all of them painful and many of them fatal. I have heard eminent London surgeons maintain that gonorrhoea is really a more serious disease to the community than is syphilis. The unfortunate feature of gonorrhoea is that many people, whilst apparently cured, and while believing themselves cured, may continue to infect others. That, I think, is one of the most serious features about the disease, and a feature which has frequently given rise to terrible consequences. The trouble with regard to these diseases, and especially the first of them, syphilis, is that the incidence of the disease is not confined to the offender against morality. If that were so, I could quite understand that a section of the people would say of the sufferer, "Well, he deserves it." If such people were students of Shakespeare they might repeat the lines from "King Lear"—

The Gods are just, and of our pleasant vices
Make instruments to plague us—

though the reference in Shakespeare is not to syphilis, but to the rebellious conduct of a bastard son. I, of course, do not agree with those stern moralists, because the punishment is out of all proportion to the fault. At any rate, those of us who have medical knowledge will, I think, hold that opinion. If there are in the community any who would be inclined to advocate the view to which I have alluded, I would say to them in the words of the Master, "He that is without sin among you, let him cast the first stone." I think I have said enough to convince this House that there is urgent necessity for legislation on this subject. If any one does not think so, I would like to ask him is he satisfied with the present condition of affairs? There are some, I believe, who consider that legislation on these diseases will tend to promote vice. I ask those who hold that opinion, what value has a morality that is only based on a fear of infection? Turning from these general considerations to the provisions of the Bill, I understand that the Honorary Minister (Hon. R. H. Underwood) rather takes pride in the fact that the measure is not the outcome of the labours of the Commissioner of Public Health, Dr. Hope. That is the impression I have gathered from remarks I have read. If my impression is correct, all I can say is, more's the pity; for Dr. Hope, as we all know, has laboured incessantly in the cause, and in his reports he has year after year drawn attention to the prevalence of these diseases, and to the necessity for taking preventive measures. I make bold to say that if the Commissioner of Public Health had drafted this Bill, we would have had a very much better measure brought before us—one free from the crude provisions contained in this Bill. If the Honorary Minister drafted it, I should say that he selected the most stringent of the clauses which he could find in any corresponding measure existing in any part of the world. Further, I should say that he set himself to exact the most severe penalties

for the infringement of these clauses, no matter how innocent such infringement may be. I should say that the Honorary Minister had drawn the measure with a view of creating an autocracy, making the Commissioner of Public Health an autocrat. No doubt there are certain advantages in an autocracy. I believe that at the present time it would probably be a very good thing if there were an autocrat in another part of the world, to get the war finished a little more quickly. However, in any case, I do not believe in making an autocrat of either the Commissioner of Public Health or the Governor-in-Council for the purposes of this measure. I do not wish to anticipate the various amendments which I propose to move, but one matter is so important that I desire to refer to it here. A clause of this Bill gives to the Commissioner power to order compulsory examination, and the evidence on which he is to order that compulsory examination is not to be disclosed. In this connection I have suggested a certain amendment which, I understand from this morning's newspaper, the Honorary Minister is not prepared to accept. I do not know whether the Government are prepared to accept it. The amendment is to the effect that the Commissioner shall act only on a sworn declaration, and that the person accused shall have the right of seeing that declaration and of obtaining a verified copy of it. That, of course, will to a certain extent safeguard people against false witness. I should like to ask the Colonial Secretary whether the Government are prepared to accept that amendment. The hon. gentleman does not reply. As I say, from this morning's newspaper I gather that the Honorary Minister is not prepared to accept the amendment. At all events, it is stated that the Honorary Minister does not agree with the amendment. On that point, all I can say is that we imagine the Labour party as intended to represent liberty.

Hon. W. Kingsmill: You have not been in the House long.

Hon. A. J. H. SAW: I always understood that that was the claim of the Labour party—that they stood for the

liberty of the subject. That remark seems to occasion laughter in this House. I will proceed to state a little experience which I gained some 15 months ago, when I had the privilege of being in Venice. I went to the Doge's Palace, and in one of the ante-chambers of that palace I was shown a slit in the wall which at one time had been known as "The Lion's Mouth." Through that slit the inhabitants of medieval Venice were accustomed to thrust secret denunciations of citizens, and those denunciations were acted upon by the Doge and the Council of Ten. Is that the condition of affairs which the Honorary Minister and the Labour party seek to create by this Bill? Do they intend to have a "Lion's Mouth" through the wall of the office of the Commissioner of Health to lodge secret denunciations? It is said that there is no more bigoted and no more intolerant person than the religious convert; and it seems to me that no sooner does the man who poses as an advocate of freedom assume Ministerial responsibility, than he wishes to become an autocrat. One critic has said that this measure will afford the medical profession opportunities to blackmail their patients. I never in my life heard a more astounding statement. This Bill gives the person afflicted with venereal disease the right of going to a medical practitioner for treatment and then, if the sufferer is dissatisfied, of leaving that medical practitioner and going to another without first paying the bill incurred with the former practitioner. The sufferer can also go to a hospital and demand free treatment. Under those conditions I think the opportunity for blackmail on the part of the medical profession must be extremely small. So far from there being any blackmail, the victim of venereal disease becomes the pampered protégé of the State. It was proposed, and I believe the Colonial Secretary intends to alter this, that the Bill should be administered by the police. To that I have very strong objections. This should be treated as a health matter, and not as a criminal matter, and in this respect the more we keep away from the police the better for the smooth working of the Bill.

I have nothing whatever to say against the police. In my happily short experience of them I have always found them an extremely reasonable body of men. But there are certain people who, just as they get nervous when entering a doctor's consulting room or a dentist's chair, so in the same way, when they see a man in blue coming to their door, they think that he comes on some dire mission. Consequently, I think the further the Bill is kept away from the police the better for its smooth working. In far distant towns, perhaps, there will be necessity for invoking the aid of the police, but in the larger towns it should be a health matter administered under the control of the Commissioner of Public Health. I desire to warn the Honorary Minister that if any good is to result from the Bill the bacteriological staff of the Public Health Department must be kept at a high level. The day of naked eye diagnosis of the disease and the handing of a bottle of medicine to the patient, has gone by. In the treatment of this disease particularly, we shall require the aid of the bacteriologist and if the Bill is to do any good we must demand a far larger staff of bacteriologists in the Public Health Department than we have at present. This is a matter which I do not believe those who are responsible for the administration of this department sufficiently realise. In my humble way I have been trying to insist on it to, I think, almost every Administration that has been in power here during the last 20 years. I know I made the first representation on the subject to Sir John Forrest in 1896, and in my small way I have been openly advocating it ever since. We must have a sufficient number of bacteriologists if we are to do any good. One reason why all similar measures have failed in other countries has been because of the lack of scientific knowledge. The result has been that numerous people infected with this disease, but apparently cured, were able to get clean bills of health and allowed to go about among the public spreading this disease wholesale. That has been the flaw in the administration of similar Acts in other countries. Now, owing to the

advance of science, we have potent weapons for the diagnosis and cure of this disease, but we must have a well-equipped Public Health Department or the disease will remain. Another weak spot in the Bill is in the bacteriological examination to be made by the Public Health Department. This can be done for a hospital free of charge, but when a medical practitioner invokes such aid—and I may say it is absolutely necessary for us to do so, because an ordinary surgeon or physician has not that knowledge of bacteriology necessary to enable him to carry out his investigations—when we have to go to the Public Health Department to get this done for us, we are charged fees ranging from 7s. 6d. to two guineas. I admit that the investigation required for two guineas is an extremely laborious one. But we are required under the Bill to make certain investigations and we shall require this help from the Public Health Department, and I claim that inasmuch as they do it free for the public hospitals, they should also do it free for the medical practitioner. Of course it may be said that we hand the fee on to our patients. That is not so. In many of these cases the patient pays nothing, and not only do we treat the patient free, but we have also to pay the Public Health Department for these investigations. I intend to move an amendment that these investigations shall be carried out free of charge by the Public Health Department when requested to do so. Then there is, so far as I can gather from various discussions that have taken place on the Bill, and from certain letters I have read, a spirit of hostility to the medical profession. There is noticeable in the Bill an attempt to treat the medical profession unjustly. All kinds of requirements are exacted from a medical practitioner. For instance, there are notifications to be made, and one of these notifications, I shall have to point out in Committee, is almost absurd. For instance, a patient being treated is supposed to come back within four weeks, but if he fails to come back within six weeks the practitioner must notify the authorities of the omission,

or suffer a penalty. Now, the practitioner has not all his mind centred on this patient. He does not notice that the patient has not come back for six weeks; yet if the practitioner fails to notify the Commissioner that the patient has not come back within six weeks, he is to be subjected to a penalty of £50. I think that is perfectly ridiculous. It is the same penalty as is to be exacted from the man who wilfully inflicts venereal disease on his fellow. Can anything be more absurd? And then, not only are these penalties to be exacted from the medical profession—it must not be thought that I regard myself as being a representative here of the medical profession; rather do I regard myself as a representative of all the people; but I am justified, I think, in pointing out that under the Bill these hardships are to be inflicted on the medical profession—but they are to receive no fees for notification. These penalties are to be exacted from them, and in the case of a man who is attached to a subsidised hospital, a sort of part-time officer, who receives a fee for the discharge of certain duties at this hospital, he is to be compelled to attend all these cases there, no matter what the social status of those cases may be, and is to receive apparently nothing for it. And not only that, but if he fails to attend them, very severe penalties are to be exacted from him, inasmuch as he is to lose the salary due to him. I intend to draw attention to that also in Committee. It will be absolutely necessary, if the Bill is to work smoothly, that the Public Health Department should also work smoothly with the medical practitioner; and if any injustice is done to the medical practitioner this Bill will be a failure. This is a measure of socialism. The trend of legislation appears to be socialistic; but if there is to be socialistic legislation, for goodness sake let it turn in the right direction, let it turn towards the promotion of the health and welfare of the people. I believe the Bill is an effort in that direction, imperfect as it is. I have many objections to it. Among other things it will impair the confidence that has hitherto existed between the medical man and the

patient, and which the patient could always be quite sure would be respected. But on the whole the principle of the Bill is a good one, and if it will do anything towards stamping out these terrible diseases which prevail in our midst, and of which the public have no knowledge, I will readily support it, claiming the right to amend it to the best of my ability.

Hon. C. SOMMERS (Metropolitan) [8.11]: The thanks of the Chamber are due to Dr. Saw for the excellent speech he has delivered. I welcome the measure. I think it is an honest attempt on the part of the Government to grapple with this great evil. After listening to the able speech of the hon. member, one realises how imperfect the Bill is. It shows how necessary it is that a second Chamber should exist. The passing of this Bill in another place has pointed to that necessity. I congratulate the Government and I congratulate the Honorary Minister on his public utterances in introducing the Bill. Evidently he has given a great deal of time to the study of its provisions, and his utterances teemed with interesting statistics showing the terrible effect this disease has on the community. I regret very much the haste with which the Bill was passed in another Chamber. A measure of such far-reaching importance to the community should not have been hurried in the way it was.

The PRESIDENT: The hon. member is not in order in reflecting on the vote of another Chamber.

Hon. C. SOMMERS: Generally I think measures of such importance as this, when first introduced, before the second reading is proceeded with, should be circulated as far as possible in order to allow the Press reports of the contents of the Bill to be thoroughly digested by the public. Hon. members living in country districts will agree with me when I say it is most difficult indeed for the ordinary outback man to follow what is happening in Parliament simply by reading the extracts, good as they are, which appear in the daily Press. Some-

times a clause which a man living out-back regards as of great importance, is only briefly referred to in the public Press, and even before the news reaches some parts of the State the Bill has passed both Houses, and the opportunity for discussion and for suggesting amendments is lost by the people most interested. For that reason I deplore the haste with which many Bills become Acts before the public have a proper opportunity for discussing them. I think it would be wise if Bills of such importance as this were sent to all recognised bodies of workers in social reform, who are doing so much good for the country. It would give them that opportunity which they have been denied in this case. The Women's Service Guild has drawn attention to the undue haste with which this measure has been dealt with, and I think rightly so. Members have a copy of the Guild's circular and will note the feelings of the Guild on the matter. I endorse that portion of the protest, but I regret that I cannot endorse the resolution which opposes the compulsory clauses of the Bill, because without the compulsory clauses the Bill would be useless. I am afraid that the members of many of these organisations which are protesting against this Bill have no idea what it really aims at, and have only a vague idea of the strides which this terrible disease has made in our midst. I had intended to submit quite a number of amendments with a view to improving the measure, but I am glad to see that the Government have already intimated through the notice paper certain amendments which certainly meet with my approval. The Hon. A. Saw has also dealt exhaustively with it, and with his vast knowledge of this dread subject. I have not the slightest doubt that the Bill when it leaves this Chamber will be greatly improved. With regard to the objections which are raised by many of the organisations I have referred to, it is strange that these very people who object to the compulsory clauses raise no objection whatever to isolation in the event of an outbreak of small-pox or bubonic plague.

In regard to these particular diseases, the patients are taken away at once from the midst of their families, and their families are not allowed to see them, and even at death are not permitted to perform the last funeral rites. But when we attempt to deal here with this dread disease, which not only concerns the individual but the unborn child, we have these protests. These people are wrong. They do not realise the frightful importance to the community of this grave matter and the necessity for it to be dealt with and grappled with fearlessly so as to prevent a further spread of the disease. The figures quoted by Doctor Saw give one an idea of the alarming nature of the disease. Even if we take grave risks I think that the results we hope to achieve will warrant us in making a few mistakes. We all know that leprosy was only stamped out in England by means of isolation, and in the same way we should take steps here with this venereal disease. I do not believe in shutting my eyes to the ravages of the disease which is making such inroads in our midst. I am afraid that, bad and all as it is now, after the war the suffering that is engendered by it will be worse. It is not very pleasant reading to read the paragraph which appeared in the paper recently dealing with a ship which is returning from Egypt carrying two hundred military patients who will be landed in Port Melbourne to-morrow, and the significant words in the paragraph I have mentioned are "suffering from a certain disease." Perhaps we shall get varied phases of the disease presented to us in Committee. Dr. Saw will probably enlighten us on the point. It is probable that coming from that country the disease will be found to be even more dreadful than it is here. Two hundred of these returned soldiers will be arriving apparently tainted with the disease, and probably there are no means of isolating them. Perhaps there is no law to enforce, which can make it compulsory for these people to be isolated. If these cases are allowed to go about they will naturally cause a spreading of the disease, and these men

will become more deadly than even a German shell. When in Committee I shall be glad to do all I can to safeguard the interests of everybody. It is not possible to deal as one would like in the second reading debate with all the various clauses of the Bill and the amendments which will become necessary. I, therefore, content myself by saying that I do hope, as suggested by Doctor Saw, that it will not be allowed to go to a Select Committee, and that members themselves will create a Select Committee and go into this most carefully, and so turn out a measure which will be for the good of all humanity.

Hon. A. SANDERSON (Metropolitan-Suburban) [8.20]: It is not permitted, I clearly understand, to impute motives but certainly we want some explanation as to why at this particular juncture in the history of Western Australia the Government have brought down this Bill.

Hon. R. G. Ardagh: They thought it was necessary, I suppose?

Hon. A. SANDERSON: What is the explanation for bringing this about? We all know the position of affairs which this State, as part of the Empire, finds itself as a result of this great war. We all know how serious a matter it is. What is the explanation why at this particular juncture after the Government have been in office for four years and this disease has been, as we have just heard, in existence for four hundred years, the Government should bring down this Bill at the present moment and rush it through practically without discussion? I have two explanations—one is in connection with the matter to which the hon. Mr. Sommers has referred. If this is the explanation of this sudden determination to deal with the matter I will repeat here what I have said in connection with so many other questions. Do hon. members realise that we are living under a Federal as well as under a State Government, and that the Federal Constitution, Clause 55, specially reserves to the Federal Government any exclusive dealings with quarantine? Let hon. members mark this, that the Federal Parlia-

ment have received a clearer and fuller grant of power relating to quarantine than the American Constitution on which our Constitution is based. Let me put a concrete case in connection with military camps. Assume for a moment that we have a military camp in Western Australia in which are some of those unfortunate fellows affected by the disease.

Hon. R. G. Ardagh: There is no disguising the fact that we have them there.

Hon. A. SANDERSON: I am trying to deal with the explanation for bringing down this Bill at the present moment. If that is the explanation it may be a very good reason for doing it. Surely there should be some reference to the Federal Government. I ask the leader of the House what power his officer has when he approaches the Federal military camp of the Defence Department? That is a question I would like hon. members to consider if this is the explanation for bringing down this measure. Furthermore, the second possible explanation of this is that we all know here and the public know outside the position of affairs in connection with our finances. It is quite reasonable, I think, that by any means the Government should wish to divert public attention from the amazing position that they have got us into. Having as I have said this afternoon, established our finances on a sound basis, they are now going to deal with our morals and this is one of the methods of dealing with the morality of the community if the first explanation that I have given is incorrect. Before passing from that Federal aspect let me ask hon. members to look the matter up for themselves. If this has been brought in for that specific purpose or mainly on that account, surely there should be some reference to the Federal Government and some consideration given to that aspect, or we shall find ourselves in an impossible position. I do not think it is necessary, especially after what my colleague has stated, to emphasise the dreadful results of this disease. I would only point out as has already been shown, that we are, I think, indebted to him. Of

course he speaks with very special authority, an authority that no others of us can claim. If anyone wishes to realise in this country the full horrors of this disease let him go to Roebourne and look at the native camp there. I believe this has been shifted down to some of the islands since I visited the place. At all events when I was there I was taken over the place by the resident magistrate who was also the resident medical officer. I do not think it is necessary for us to emphasise the dreadful results of this disease in discussing this measure. The figures which have been given seem to me to be contradictory, that is to say, the figures which the leader of the House gave us he did not attempt to reconcile when quoting from the different medical authorities. I should imagine myself that it is very difficult indeed to get any accurate statement as to the percentage of infection throughout the country. We notice that the Government claim to have the support of the medical profession. I do not know what kind of support they have had from the medical profession to-night in this House. When my colleague stated that the principle of the Bill was a good one I felt inclined by interjection to get from him what the principle of the Bill was, but realised how careful you are, Sir, in preventing us from interrupting each other. I will, however, now ask him what the principle of the Bill really is? I can answer that question from the speech that was made in the introduction of this measure. I am referring of course to these compulsory clauses, round which probably the whole debate will centre. I ask hon. members to recollect that my colleague stated that he approved of the principle of the Bill. The leader of the House in introducing the Bill said—

They are absolutely essential if this Bill is not to become so much waste paper.

And yet the leader of the House tells us that he has the support of the medical profession. I do not believe he has got it either inside or outside the House.

Hon. A. J. H. Saw: With amendments.

Hon. A. SANDERSON: My hon. friend tells us that he approves of the principle of the Bill. I now ask him what the principle of the Bill is?

Hon. A. J. H. Saw: The prevention of venereal diseases.

Hon. A. SANDERSON: That is not what the leader of the House who introduced the Bill says. He says if he cannot get these compulsory clauses the Bill is so much waste paper. I am inclined to believe that. How are we to reconcile with this the statement that the medical profession supports him? I am at a loss to understand.

Hon. Sir E. H. Wittenoom: He will explain later on.

Hon. A. SANDERSON: "Nothing so drastic has even been proposed in any country in the world." This is a statement of another medical man outside this House. I ask once more why at this particular juncture in the history of Western Australia the Government have decided to bring down a Bill of this nature and practically run it through without any discussion. The Colonial Secretary further remarks—

It has the support of a large section of the women of Western Australia irrespective of political opinion, and not only has it their support but it has their whole-souled advocacy.

What is his authority for making a statement of that kind? Surely in this country of all others the women are able to speak for themselves. From my correspondence and my reading of the newspapers I say that the statement is on a par with the statement in regard to the Government having the support of the medical profession. Mr. Sommers has referred to bubonic plague as being analagous to this, but can he tell me where the morality of bubonic plague comes in? Surely whatever our opinions on the moral aspect of this question may be, it will be admitted that it has moral aspects, bubonic plague has not. Are we not bound to consult what I perhaps should call the guardians of morality, or the disciples of the school of morality? Are we not bound to consult

the clergy on a matter of this kind? We need not consult them on bubonic plague.

Hon. R. G. Ardagh: This is not a question of health.

Hon. A. SANDERSON: Whatever one's opinion on this question may be, if anyone will have the temerity to tell me that it is a question of health only, I say let them tell that outside the Chamber as well as inside. Surely it is obvious to every school of thought on this question, I care not what the ideas of morality may be, that this question has a moral aspect which the bubonic plague has not. That must be admitted by every hon. member. If we had the opinions of the medical profession quoted, and I admit they have full right to speak on this subject with the clergy, will anybody tell me that the clergy have not an equal right to speak on this subject with the doctors? Is it a question of health entirely? The clergy, so far as I have been able to ascertain, have not been consulted. I do not know whether the Government have consulted the women, but if they have, a totally wrong impression has been formed when they tell us the Bill has the support of a large section of them. I do not know whether that means a majority, but if it does not mean that it means a large minority, and it is highly questionable whether they can find a large minority. to say nothing of a majority, who are in favour of this Bill as it stands. I think we may safely leave the medical profession in this Chamber to look after its own affairs.

Hon. C. Sommers: And ours too.

Hon. A. SANDERSON: I am referring to the financial aspect which Dr. Saw touched upon. I certainly endorse what he says, because it seems to me a monstrous thing to throw these duties on to the medical profession without giving them adequate pecuniary compensation. I do not suppose there is any profession that does so much without getting paid for it, and the Government now attempt to deprive the medical profession of the fees to which they are fairly entitled. I suppose one may be permitted to outline one's own views on this question from the positive, rather than the negative point

of view. If we criticise a measure of this kind in the way I have had no hesitation in criticising it, I think one is fairly bound to answer the question if you are asked it, what are you going to do, what is your line of policy in connection with a matter like this? Judging from the reports and experiences of other countries, and judging from one's own knowledge of how these questions should be approached, I would suggest that the treatment be free, and the unfortunate patients have every inducement held out to be cured. If they can pay let them pay, if not let it be done at the expense of the general taxpayer.

Hon. A. G. Jenkins: And if they refuse to be cured?

Hon. A. SANDERSON: Can the hon. member or anyone else in this Chamber tell me that any member of the community, having the opportunity of being cured, would not take advantage of it?

Hon. A. J. H. Saw: Yes, I do.

Hon. A. SANDERSON: I know hundreds of people in this country who will not and cannot take advantage of the opportunity, if we make it optional or if we make it compulsory, and they are the natives on the goldfields and in the North.

Hon. C. Sommers: Leave them out.

The PRESIDENT: There is too much conversation taking place, and I would remind hon. members also that this is not question time. All questions must be asked at the beginning of the sitting.

Hon. A. SANDERSON: I admit having asked one or two questions, but I think I have answered them myself.

Hon. J. F. Cullen: To your own satisfaction.

Hon. A. SANDERSON: Exactly. I do not think it is necessary to go further because, as pointed out, there are many clauses which can be dealt with in Committee, but I may be permitted to end up by emphasising the point in regard to the compulsory clauses. I suppose the Minister will stand by them if the Bill is not to become so much waste-paper. The Federal aspect of the question seems to be of importance, and possibly of pressing importance, and I hope the Minister when he replies will make some reference to it.

Hon. Sir E. H. WITTENOOM (North) [8.40]: I listened with considerable interest to the introduction of this measure by the Colonial Secretary and I congratulate him on the very clear and logical manner in which he explained it. I also was exceedingly pleased to hear the well chosen words in which he dealt with such an unsavoury and indelicate subject. I desire to congratulate the Honorary Minister on his bravery, I might almost say his extreme pluck, on having introduced a measure of this kind so early in his Ministerial career. I may safely say he is the latest addition to Ministerial rank. His experience must be something under six months, and yet he has introduced to us a Bill of a most drastic character, and one which apparently no Minister has had the temerity to grapple with hitherto. The Minister has claimed the Bill as his own. Someone has said that it is Dr. Hope's. I can only trust that good results will accrue from it. I would like also to express my appreciation of the admirable speech which fell to-night from Dr. Saw. Here, at least, we have evidence of facts from an expert. We have not got the statements of a fanatic. We have not got statements made from books and from papers, and from hearsay evidence, but we have the experience of an expert, who has not only read and heard all that is connected with this subject for years, but who has had practical dealings with it. It gave me great pleasure to find that we had one amongst us with such sound and practical knowledge, and I think, not only this Chamber, but the whole of the community, should be congratulated upon that fact. In spite of the remarks which fell just now from Mr. Sanderson, I consider this Bill is a reasonable attempt to deal with a most serious evil. It seems to me a very simple matter. Either this widespread evil is a menace or it is not. All the evidence goes to show, from the experience of the Health Department, and from every source which ought to know, that the disease is rife and widespread in our midst. Therefore it is the duty of the Government and of Parliament to stamp it out. Personally,

I had no idea that it was so extremely prevalent. I thought there were a few cases here and there, but I was astounded to learn the tremendous extent of it as told to-night by Dr. Saw, and as the Colonial Secretary told us in his introductory speech. Coming to the Bill itself some of the clauses are undoubtedly drastic, although it is necessary that there should be some compulsion in connection with it. It has been argued at public meetings and at other places that the Bill, if carried, will be an interference with the liberty of the subject. For years past the subject has had every liberty.

Hon. A. J. H. Saw: License.

Hon. Sir E. H. WITTENOOM: License, perhaps, is better. Every person who has become afflicted with the disease has been at liberty to do what he liked, to be cured or not. What has been the result? The appalling descriptions which have been given to us by the Colonial Secretary and by Dr. Saw. If that is the result of liberty, surely some reasonable compulsion is excusable. It has been said that if this particular provision were carried into effect we would be putting too much power in the hands of one person, the Commissioner of Public Health. But someone must bear the responsibility. There must be responsibility somewhere and it could not be in any better hands than those of a responsible man in a high position which, if he abused it, he would soon lose by force of public opinion. A certain amount of compulsion is necessary. It has been free and optional long enough for people to choose whether they would be cured or not. It is not as if this were an ordinary disease like smallpox, though that is bad enough, but apparently it can be conveyed all over the country in the most insidious manner and often without people knowing what they are doing. This particular clause provides that when the Commissioner has reason to believe or suspect that any person is suffering, he may take certain action. That is said to be too much power to give to anyone, but an amendment will be submitted which provides that when the Commis-

sioner has before him a written statement made on oath and verified by declaration, he may take action. That will safeguard the whole clause. In the first place very few men or women would give information of that nature about anyone else. I do not believe the Commissioner would be approached half a dozen times in the course of a year. The danger would be that no information whatever would be given. Therefore, I think the public need not have much fear on that score. The great argument against the clause, I believe, is that there might be a danger of some female being singled out and having a notification of this kind sent to her. Surely no man who calls himself a man would do anything of the kind and, if he did, it would be only on the very best grounds and under circumstances in which the individual's mode of life or surroundings must have been of a very suspicious character indeed. Therefore, I do not think there is much danger to be feared from this particular clause. If the amendment which hedges it round by requiring the person giving the information to make an oath and sign his name and for that be submitted to the person complained of, is passed, I do not think there will be any danger. We must have some compulsion and we must have somebody responsible, and under the circumstances I cannot think of anyone better than the Commissioner of Public Health. I hope that, in dealing with this awful question, there will be no maudlin sympathy about it. It is purely a matter of health. It is not a matter of morality or immorality; it is a question of a certain number of people in the community suffering from a dangerous and contagious disease and it is the duty of those in authority to endeavour to cure them of the disease. Therefore, I hope there will be no maudlin sympathy about it but that the whole matter will be carried out thoroughly without consideration for individuals. It is far better to be dealt with by experts and by doctors compulsorily than to leave these matters to the liberty of the subject, because, while hundreds might avail themselves of the opportunity, half a dozen might ne-

glect or refuse to do so, and so spread disease all over the country. Many people might argue that measures of this kind are too severe, but all great evils require stringent and extreme measures. We have only to look around at some other matters that concern the public to realise how severe are some of the measures which have been taken. Consider the question of the Chinese and opium. Asiatics and foreigners, persons who are generally looked down upon by the white race, are hedged around with every precaution, not only that they shall not consume opium but that they shall not smoke it. I read a while back of a Chinaman who had been prosecuted for smoking a pipe of opium. Just think of this precaution to prevent any harm to an alien race, and yet it is feared that a little compulsion exercised among our own people to save them from a dreadful disease is too terrible to contemplate. Some years ago there was a disease very rife among sheep, namely, scab. Scab in sheep is a most contagious disease. It is due to bacteria, and where any of the infected animals stayed or camped and the wool containing any of the eggs fell off, that spot was infected for 12 months afterwards. For years and years attempts were made to eradicate the disease by treating the spots with certain specifics, until at last the Government introduced a measure and made it compulsory to cure every sheep affected, under penalty of having them destroyed. The Government selected to administer the measure a man in a good position who had the courage of his convictions and the ability and energy to give effect to it; and that contagious disease which was decimating our sheep and killing them in thousands was eventually exterminated. That achievement was due to a West Australian whom many hon. members know, namely, Mr. Morton Craig. The disease was very rife at the time, and to-day there is not only no trace of it in this State but the whole of the Commonwealth is free from it. But drastic measures were necessary to stamp it out. I know of a case in which the officer said—"Unless these sheep are cured within six

months they will be destroyed." They were not cured and they were destroyed. Only by such stringent measures, enforced with discretion, were such satisfactory results ever achieved. In reading some of the letters and the reports of meetings held in connection with this question, a good deal of inconsistency is noticeable among those taking different sides. We find that a great deal of sympathy is expressed for those suffering from this disease by the very people who are using their greatest efforts to stamp out what is known as the social evil. Some say that this disease is the result of the social evil, and when we find these people expressing sympathy on behalf of those diseased, and contending that the patient should not be subject to compulsion in the matter of cure, it seems like inconsistency. No doubt these people have the best interests of the community at heart and the country is to be congratulated that so many take an interest in these matters, and although they regard them from different standpoints it would be wise for some of them to approach this great question from a practical point of view and base their conclusions on the opinions of experts. There is one proposed new section in the Bill which I hope will be enforced with the utmost stringency and that is 242 J, which provides a penalty for infecting others. This, I understand, is often and not always unknowingly done, and any penalty would not be too severe for such cases. In addition to the admirable testimony from Dr. Saw I have read a very excellent report which was tendered to the City Council by Dr. Seed. In this report the doctor raised many objections to the Bill, but concluded by saying that if it were put into operation as drafted, it would do away with these diseases, though he was still of opinion that the conditions were very stringent. I understand that Dr. Seed is particularly qualified to speak on this subject, as he has had a great deal of experience and therefore his report, like the opinion of Dr. Saw, is of the very highest value. I intend to support the second reading of the Bill. There will be many alterations required,

amongst others one dealing with the penalties. The penalties are fixed instead of being specified as the maximum so as to enable the magistrate to use his discretion as to the fine he might inflict for any offence. I also think the services required of medical officers should be well paid for, as a great deal will rest with the medical officers and it would be most unfair to ask these services of them, services which demand the highest skill and a great deal of experience besides thorough knowledge and much tact, for nothing. I have much pleasure in supporting the second reading of the Bill.

On motion by Hon. W. Patrick debate adjourned.

BILL.—SALE OF LIQUOR REGULATION.

Second Reading.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY (Hon. J. M. Drew—Central) [8.58] in moving the second reading said: Last year a Bill was introduced and passed giving the Government power to restrict the sale of liquor in war time. That power was unlimited and enabled the Government, if they chose, to close hotels either partially or wholly anywhere and everywhere, but this mighty instrument was placed in the hands of the Ministry only after the assurance had been given by the Minister introducing the Bill that it would not be used except in circumstances of great emergency, when disturbances, occasioned by feelings engendered by the war, threatened to seriously imperil the peace of any section of the State. Some months ago a deputation waited upon the Attorney General and pointed out the benefits which it was claimed would accrue to Western Australia by the enforcement of the Act. It was not alleged by those who waited on the Attorney General that the public peace was in danger. It was not contended that any one of the conditions had arisen which were in contemplation when the Bill was enacted. It was simply indicated that in a crisis such as that through which we are passing a check on the wastage of wealth involved in the

consumption of alcohol would be attended by the most desirable results. The Attorney-General agreed with the conclusions arrived at by the deputationists, but explained to them that he did not feel justified in putting into operation a law which was never intended by Parliament to be applied for the purpose of bringing about the end they had in view. The agitation then begun has continued, and there is no doubt it is the feeling of a large number of people in the State that the question should be grappled with as speedily as possible. It is indisputable that this is a time when economy should be practised, and when the conservation of wealth should be the aim of all. No one will deny that, either from the standpoint of economy or from that of the necessity which exists of preserving, and indeed increasing, the physical fitness of our male population, a diminution of indulgence in intoxicants must have consequences of a beneficial character. But, after all, this is a question which the people should be called upon to decide. The Government trust the people, and propose by this Bill to give them a chance of saying exactly what they desire. Where a drastic alteration of the law is contemplated, and where the question has never been before the electors, the people should certainly be consulted before anything is done. They will be consulted if this Bill be accepted, and they will be consulted on lines which will preserve the principle of local option as far as practicable—a principle which they have already endorsed. A referendum will be taken on the question. The State will be divided into four districts representing four interests—the metropolitan, mining, pastoral, and agricultural. By this means community of interests will be preserved, and the most satisfactory results should be obtained.

Hon. W. Patrick: Has a plan been prepared showing the boundaries?

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: No; but it will be easy to follow the boundaries from the Bill. All licenses will be affected by the vote given, and the measure is made to expire on the 31st December, 1916; but a resolution of both

Houses can give it further vitality. If at any time during the operation of the Act it is deemed advisable to again consult the people, there is provision in the Bill to enable this to be done. The Bill may be open to criticism. No Bill of this nature which the brain of man could devise would be immune from attack on some point or other. But any amendment which could be suggested would be equally vulnerable, equally open to attack, and equally open to objection from some quarter. What the House has to consider, and what I believe members will consider, is not whether the measure is in every respect a perfect human document—that would be impossible—but whether, on the whole, it deals with a difficult problem in such a manner as to give the best all-round results; whether in striving for too much, there may not be a danger of losing all. Every member of the House is acquainted with the clauses of the Bill, so I will not at this late hour take up time with their explanation, especially as I consider such explanation quite unnecessary in view of the fact that the principles of the Bill have been enunciated in the Press, and that not only members of this Chamber but also the general public are fully acquainted with the provisions of the measure. I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

On motion by Hon. J. F. Cullen debate adjourned.

House adjourned at 9.7 p.m.