

# Legislative Assembly,

Tuesday, 7th October, 1924.

	PAGE
Assent to Bills ... ..	1151
Questions: Police—1, Transfers from Fremantle.	1151
2, Treatment of a child ... ..	1151
Fremantle Harbour Trust launch ... ..	1151
Milk producers, a circular ... ..	1151
Gaol Administration ... ..	1152
Wool sales, Albany ... ..	1152
Bills: Legal Practitioners Act Amendment, 3a.	1152
High School, 3a. passed ... ..	1152
Presbyterian Church Act Amendment, 3a., passed ... ..	1152
Trade Unions Act Amendment, 3a., passed	1152
State Lotteries, 2a., Com. ... ..	1152

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

## ASSENT TO BILLS.

Message received from the Lieutenant-Governor notifying assent to the undermentioned Bills:—

- 1, Road Districts Rates.
- 2, Unclaimed Moneys Act Amendment.

## QUESTIONS (2)—POLICE.

### Transfers from Fremantle.

Mr. SLEEMAN asked the Minister for Justice: 1, Is he aware that two valuable officers in the persons of Water Police Constables Clarke and Howard have been transferred from Fremantle? 2, If so, what provision has been made to fill their places, and what sea-faring and life-saving experience will be required of their successors?

The MINISTER FOR JUSTICE replied: 1, Yes; both constables were appointed to more responsible positions at their own request in response to applications published in the "Police Gazette," such applications having been inserted in the "Gazette" at the special request of the Police Association. 2, The necessary action is being taken. Sea-faring experience is not essential. What is required is that the member shall be capable of handling a boat, and a good swimmer. Water Police Constable Clarke has been replaced by a man with these qualifications, and a suitable man will be selected to replace Water Police Constable Howard.

### Treatment of a Child.

Mr. HUGHES asked the Minister for Justice: 1, Is it a fact that recently at Nedlands a police constable used threatening language towards a child thirteen years of age and actually used violence to induce the child to make a statement? 2, If so, will he have the constable suitably dealt with?

The MINISTER FOR JUSTICE replied: 1, The constable denies having used either violence or threatening language and in this he is supported by Detective-Sergeant Molloy, who was present at the time. The lad referred to was not taken to the police station by the police but went there of his own free will in company with two other boys who were requested to call there in connection with a case of alleged stealing from shops in which several boys were implicated. The constable received an urgent telephone message stating that an old man had fallen off the Nedlands jetty into the water, and in hurrying from the telephone accidentally collided with a lad then in the office, but did him no injury. This is what the alleged violence consists of. The lad's father wrote complaining of the constable's action, but inquiry shows that the complaint is without foundation. 2, Answered by No. 1.

## QUESTION—FREMANTLE HARBOUR TRUST LAUNCH.

Mr. SLEEMAN asked Hon. S. W. Munsie, Honorary Minister: 1, Is he aware that the Fremantle Harbour Trust motor launch "Victor" is still being used for the transport of workers and the public in general in the Fremantle harbour? 2, Seeing that the said launch is totally unsuitable, and a danger to persons who are obliged to use it, will he see that the launch is scrapped and a suitable motor boat made available for this work?

Hon. S. W. MUNSIE replied: 1, The ferry service between Victoria Quay and North Quay, Fremantle Harbour, is being maintained by the steam tender "Ivanhoe" and the motor launch "Victor." The "Ivanhoe" runs during the busy hours of morning and evening and conveys the great bulk of the workers across the harbour, and the "Victor" runs during the day when a few persons are travelling, business being then so small that the launch often runs empty. 2, The "Victor" is a perfectly staunch and safe steel oil launch, licensed to carry 45 persons, and compares favourably with the private launches that work in the harbour. The passage across the harbour occupies about five minutes. The service is a heavily losing one, owing to lack of traffic, the loss last year being about £2,500.

## QUESTION—MILK PRODUCERS, A CIRCULAR.

Mr. HUGHES asked the Minister for Works: 1, Is he aware that a group of milk producers by acting as their own distributors are retailing milk at 6d. per quart as against 9d. per quart charged by the Associated retailers? 2, Is he aware that a circular from an unknown source is being distributed (ostensibly in the interest of

maintaining the higher price) to the effect that those selling at a reduced price have been using sweated labour? 3, If so, will he have the matter investigated and institute prosecutions against any person guilty of a breach of the law respecting conditions of labour?

The MINISTER FOR WORKS replied: 1, No. 2, No. 3, Inquiries will be made.

#### QUESTION—GAOL ADMINISTRATION.

##### *Prisoners' interviews with Solicitors.*

Mr. HUGHES asked the Hon. S. W. Munsie, Honorary Minister: 1, Is it a fact that it has been the practice at the Fremantle gaol to allow prisoners to interview their solicitors in the hearing of a warder? 2, If so, is this privilege withheld from prisoner Callanan?

Mr. HUGHES: I should like to alter the conclusion of the first part of the question to read "in the presence but not in the hearing of a warder."

Hon. S. W. MUNSIE replied: 1, In regard to convicted prisoners the reply is "No," but there are occasions on record upon which a warder has, without authority and in breach of regulations, allowed a solicitor to privately interview a prisoner. Regulation 125 under the Prisons Act provides:—"All visits (to a convicted prisoner) shall be received and carried out in the presence of a warder." Prisoners awaiting trial or under remand are allowed visits at all reasonable times, subject to the instructions of the Comptroller General of Prisons or the Crown Law authorities, and it is customary to allow such persons private interviews with their solicitors. 2, Yes. The privilege is withheld from all convicted prisoners in accordance with the regulations.

#### QUESTION—WOOL SALES, ALBANY.

Mr. THOMSON (without notice) asked the Premier: 1, Has his attention been called to a paragraph in last Saturday's "West Australian" stating that the Wool Buyers' Association had decided to attend no sale outside Perth? 2, If so, having regard to the fact that a large expenditure has been incurred in anticipation of wool sales being held at Albany, is there any means by which he can take action to influence the Wool Buyers' Association to alter their decision?

The PREMIER replied: 1, Yes. 2, I am not aware of any power possessed by the Government that might induce those concerned to alter their decision, and I can only say that I will make inquiry into the matter. However, I have no knowledge of any power that would enable the Government to intervene.

#### BILL—LEGAL PRACTITIONERS' ACT AMENDMENT.

##### *Third Reading.*

Mr. HUGHES (East Perth) [4.44]: I move—

*That the Bill be now read a third time.*

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

Ayes	..	..	..	..	21
Noes	..	..	..	..	17

Majority for .. .. 4

##### AYES.

Mr. Angwin	Mr. Marshall
Mr. Chesson	Mr. McCallum
Mr. Collier	Mr. Millington
Mr. Corboy	Mr. Munsie
Mr. Coverley	Mr. Panton
Mr. Cunningham	Mr. Sleeman
Mr. Heron	Mr. Troy
Mr. Hughes	Mr. Willcock
Mr. Kennedy	Mr. Withers
Mr. Lamond	Mr. Wilson
Mr. Lutey	

(Teller.)

##### NOES.

Mr. Angelo	Mr. Sampson
Mr. Barnard	Mr. J. H. Smith
Mr. Davy	Mr. Stubbs
Mr. George	Mr. Taylor
Mr. E. B. Johnston	Mr. Teesdale
Mr. Maley	Mr. Thomson
Mr. Mann	Mr. C. P. Wansbrough
Sir James Mitchell	Mr. Richardson
Mr. North	

(Teller.)

##### PAIRS.

AYES.	NOES.
Mr. A. Wansbrough	Mr. Lindsay
Mr. W. D. Johnson	Mr. Latham

Question thus passed.

Bill read a third time and transmitted to the Council.

#### BILLS (3)—THIRD READING.

- 1, High School.
- 2, Presbyterian Church Act Amendment.
- 3, Trade Unions Act Amendment.

*Passed.*

#### BILL—STATE LOTTERIES.

##### *Second Reading.*

Debate resumed from 2nd October.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL (Northam) [4.50]: This is the first Bill the Minister in charge of the Health Department has had the privilege of introducing in the House. I must say it is a Bill I cannot altogether approve. One mistake the Minister made was in attacking the proposal

that came from the late Government 12 months ago.

Hon. S. W. Munsie: I wanted the public to be certain where the money was going.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: I am not sure that the public, when they read the Bill, will know where the money is to go. The Minister did not say whether a State lottery was a trading concern, a public utility or an ordinary function of government.

Hon. S. W. Munsie: This will be a public utility.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: Then it will be classified with railways and harbours and works of that sort. The Bill is badly drafted. It contains no definition of "lottery." Of course "lottery" means any game of chance from two-up to a church raffle. In all good faith I suggest to the Minister that a definition of "lottery" is essential to the Bill. Nor is there any definition of "charitable institutions." They may not all be State-owned. A definition ought to be supplied by the Minister as soon as possible in order that members may be the better able to deal with the proposal. Then there is no reference to funds. There must be expenditure under the measure before there can be any revenue. That is another omission the Minister should rectify. Agents must be appointed, commission paid and printing done before the Minister can get in any money. Nor is anything said about the percentage to be paid as prize money. I do not know what they do in Queensland, nor am I quite clear as to what is done in Hobart. I understand that Tattersalls deduct five per cent. for the cost of running the lottery. My friend the member for Murray-Wellington (Mr. George), who has had more experience of these things than have I, says they take 10 per cent. I have had one or two tickets in Tattersall's myself, but I know I did not take very much out of it.

Hon. S. W. Munsie: If you have had one or two tickets in Tattersall's lotteries, you will have many in mine.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: The House should be informed as to the deductions. Many lotteries have been held in this State, and I am afraid that but a very small percentage of the money subscribed has been paid out in prizes. Of course that is not honest or fair or right, and I know the Minister does not intend that that shall obtain in respect of Government lotteries. However, he will not always be the Minister, and I think he should say in the Bill what it will be necessary to deduct in order to cover the cost of running the lotteries and furnishing the profits for the maintenance of hospitals. I advise the Minister to state in the Bill the maximum amount that can be retained. The Minister takes power to make regulations. Under the Interpretation Act, of course, the regulations made under any Act have to be submitted to Parliament. In the Bill the Minister takes power to do as he

pleases. It is to be legal for the Minister to run lotteries, and it shall be at the Minister's option to distribute the money in any way he pleases. Parliament is to have no say. If the Bill passes, it will be the Minister who will run the lotteries in every detail.

Mr. Withers: Too many cooks spoil the broth!

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: There will be no broth to spoil.

Hon. S. W. Munsie: We want to get some broth for those who cannot get it for themselves. That is the whole point.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: The Minister takes power to appoint officials to run the lottery, a most important and responsible duty, but he says that he alone must do it.

Hon. S. W. Munsie: Who would you suggest should do it?

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: Some would say the Public Service Commissioner should do it.

Mr. J. H. Smith: The Lord save us from the Public Service Commissioner!

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: The Minister will do everything under the measure, and no one will have the right to question any act of the Minister. The Minister will gather in money under the Bill and distribute it as he pleases, giving it to this hospital or that, to this charitable institution or the other, and Parliament will have no say.

Mr. Thomson: Ministers to-day give it to this hospital and that hospital.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: To-day Ministers come down here and get a vote. They distribute the money and tell Parliament how it has been spent. We, therefore, have the right to question their actions. Under this Bill the Minister will have the right to do what he pleases with the money without let or hindrance.

Hon. S. W. Munsie: As I am raising the money I should have some say in its expenditure.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: The Honorary Minister who is paid a magnificent salary by the State, must remember that he will be raising the money for the Crown.

Hon. S. W. Munsie: To do this?

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: If the Honorary Minister thinks he has a right to do what he pleases with this money, he had better disabuse his mind of it. This Bill is giving him too much power and it ought to be altered. If this is raising money to meet public expenditure the disbursement should be subject to the will of Parliament. The Honorary Minister did not say whether the lotteries are to be run in this State or by this State. I think he said that Queensland might as well go on selling Golden Casket tickets in this State. I hope he will correct me if I am wrong.

Mr. Taylor: He is going to sell these tickets in the Eastern States?

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: I do not think that is right.

Mr. Taylor: But there will be reciprocity.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: He has not got the Bill yet. If possible he should prevent the sale of Golden Casket tickets in this State, but I know he cannot do so, because it is a Federal matter. This lottery is in addition to the others. It reminds me of the song—"Another little drink won't do us any harm." This is another little lottery which, in the opinion of the Honorary Minister, will apparently not do us any harm. The Honorary Minister may have had it in his mind to stop all forms of gambling in this State except through this lottery.

Mr. A. Wansbrough: He will have achieved something if he does.

Mr. Taylor: I like his chance!

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: I do not say anything about that. Apart from whether or not we approve of lotteries, or of gambling, it is for this House to decide if, by means of a lottery, we can raise funds for public purposes.

Mr. Taylor: Get all the revenue by lotteries.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: It is for public purposes that this money is to be raised. If we can raise money for hospitals in this way, I do not see why we should not raise money in the same way for education and for other purposes of State. I do not see how we can discriminate between one class of Government expenditure and another. I think there is a better way. The Minister dealt with two ways, his and the way of my Government last session through the Hospitals Bill. He condemned that Bill very roundly. Both these methods are designed to relieve the Consolidated Revenue.

Hon. S. W. Munsie: No, they are not.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: Yes. It would be absurd to say that the money it is proposed to raise will not be used for public hospitals.

Hon. S. W. Munsie: The money you were going to raise you intended to put into the Treasury, and save some of the expenditure already incurred.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: The money raised under this Bill will go to public hospitals, and save the Treasury from paying over a similar amount.

The Minister for Mines: It will go towards them in addition to what is now being spent.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: No. It would be ridiculous to say that we are going to pay accounts for the hospitals twice over.

The Minister for Mines: As much money as they are getting now.

Mr. Teesdale: Let the Honorary Minister have a say.

Mr. Corboy: The money will be used for expenditure which is not now being made.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: The Honorary Minister said that the present hospital vote would be continued, and that this money would be in addition.

Mr. Corboy: That is so.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: He said that five hospitals had been erected last year and that eight more would be opened this year, and yet the vote from Consolidated Revenue is to be the same as it was last year. This Bill, therefore, must be to relieve the Consolidated Revenue. If it were not for the Bill the Treasurer would have to add to the expenditure.

Hon. S. W. Munsie: Certainly he would.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: Now we have it. The Bill is to relieve Consolidated Revenue. We are getting down to a common basis. The Bill is for the same object as the Bill of last year.

Hon. S. W. Munsie: No, it is not.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: The Honorary Minister admitted that it was.

Mr. Wilson: It will keep the money in the State.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: He has no right to endeavour to raise money unless it is to relieve Consolidated Revenue. It would be wrong to do so. I venture to say that if this money is not to relieve Consolidated Revenue and not to help hospitals or charities, we should pass the Bill out without a moment's consideration.

Mr. Pantou: If I thought it was to relieve Consolidated Revenue I would not vote for it.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: Then the hon. member will not vote for it.

The Minister for Mines: He will.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: I shall claim the vote of the member for Menzies. If the Honorary Minister had intended to give any stated relief to any section of the people he would have said so.

Hon. S. W. Munsie: I did say so.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: He would have been frank about it.

Hon. S. W. Munsie: What are we giving to child welfare work now?

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: If the Honorary Minister had intended to relieve any section of the people with the money, apart from the votes of Parliament, he would have said so, but he did not say so.

Hon. S. W. Munsie: I did say so.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: If he is going to the people with this lottery to raise the few pounds that he will devote to the purposes he mentioned, he should not have brought the Bill down. The public funds can give all that is required for child welfare. We have to count the cost in this matter. I have referred to the way shown last year. I do not think members understood that Bill. It was put up to this House, referred to a select committee of very capable men, and was gone into thoroughly by them. They reported to this House, and their report is available for members to read. They recommended the Bill. It came

to this House and Mr. Money, who was then member for Bunbury, moved an amendment which was a decided improvement. The Bill was then considered. It provided that one penny in the pound should be paid in stamps on all incomes and all sales. For that penny in the pound a man drawing less than £4 a week was to get hospital accommodation for himself, his wife and 10 children, if he had that number. The 4d. a week is not more than half the union fee and yet he would have been saved all the danger, risk, unpleasantness, and awkwardness of having hospital bills hanging over him. Could anything have been better? Is this Bill equal to that? I say it is not. The Honorary Minister applauded the defeat of the Hospital Bill.

Hon. S. W. Munsie: I did.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: It was a great misfortune to the work of this country that the Bill was defeated, and nothing to the credit of anyone who voted against it. It was a good measure designed to do useful work, it was an honest and cheap way of getting the money.

Hon. S. W. Munsie: It was to reduce the deficit by £100,000 a year.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: This is to reduce the deficit by £100,000 a year.

Hon. S. W. Munsie: No, it is not.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: Does the Honorary Minister contend that he should go on a gamble and do what he pleases with the proceeds?

Mr. Wilson: The money will go to the State.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: The money is for the purpose of relieving the revenue. He said that himself, and that the vote of to-day would continue.

Hon. S. W. Munsie: You said it would not go to the Consolidated Revenue in the case of your Bill.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: I said nothing of the sort. Provision should be made by this House for the proper maintenance of hospitals. There are very few countries doing more in the way of hospital accommodation and medical attention than Western Australia. It is for the House to provide a proper amount for the work, and that is what we are doing. If the Minister says it cannot be done without this Bill, and he must say so or he would not have introduced the Bill, he is admitting that Consolidated Revenue will benefit. It is a responsibility of government to do this work. Under our Bill we said that everyone should pay, and a man drawing less than £4 a week would have benefited as I have shown. It was a wonderful Bill. What will happen under this Lotteries Bill? The Minister did not think that the men drawing comparatively low salaries should pay anything under the Hospitals Bill. A hundred thousand pounds collected in that way would have cost very little. The hundred thousand pounds to be collected under this Bill will cost a great deal. If

20 per cent. of the proceeds of the sale of tickets is to be regarded as the sum to be kept by Ministers, plus the expenditure of running the lottery, the remainder will be distributed in prize money. If the Government take 20 per cent. they will require to sell £500,000 worth of tickets to get in £100,000. I ask members to think where this £500,000 will come from? It will come largely from the workers, the very men that the Minister thought last year ought not to pay.

Mr. Mann: Fully 90 per cent.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: Is it a good thing to go to the people for £500,000 to be put up in this way? Of course a few will win prizes, and there will be a little excitement over the thing. Everyone will be looking to see who has drawn the winning tickets. The Honorary Minister did not say he would run the sweeps on horse-racing or merely on the numbers on the tickets.

The Premier: On the elections.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: I think that would be a good thing. They are a sort of lottery.

The Premier: And it was a lottery when we got in.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: Everyone else drew blanks. The public did not get much for their money. I should like to know from the Minister if he is going to run the sweep on horse-racing or trotting, or as is done in Queensland.

Hon. S. W. Munsie: I said my object was to run them exactly on the lines of the Golden Casket in Queensland.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: Now I know. I do not think the Honorary Minister said that when introducing the Bill.

Hon. S. W. Munsie: I did say that.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: I do not know that the Minister covered the method to be used. In that event we will have a little less excitement.

Hon. S. W. Munsie: But you will get the same money!

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: I have endeavoured to show that the public will have to supply £500,000 to get £100,000 under this Bill, whereas under the late Government's Hospitals Bill £133,000 was provided for. The latter was surely the cheaper way. I would advise the Honorary Minister to withdraw the Bill and introduce a Hospitals Bill. It would certainly be more dignified, to use the word of an hon. member during the recent debate. The Honorary Minister disputed warmly the point when the word "dignified" was mentioned. I know from the applause that greeted the Honorary Minister's remarks that he has a substantial majority in this House, a backing that is far too strong for me.

Hon. S. W. Munsie: Much too strong.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: I am afraid that some support will be given to the Bill from members sitting on the Opposition

side of the House, while some members on the Government side will be found opposing the measure. I do not know if the Minister means to get rid of the street collections and sweeps that are run so frequently now.

Hon. S. W. Munsie: I hope that will be the result.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: I recognise that, with the population spreading, the need for more hospitals is apparent and that means that more money will have to be found. I would prefer to have that money drawn from Consolidated Revenue and not from lotteries. Sweeps are run for all sorts of purposes and I presume the Minister will prevent that in the future. We have always set up a very high standard on the question of gambling. The Federal Government have said that people shall not send their letters through the post to Hobart. Having said that, they calmly take 12½ per cent. prize money and put it into the Treasury. I suppose that satisfies the Federal Government's conscience! We approached the question of gambling in a similar spirit and made it illegal. We said that men should not bet. But we said that if they did bet, they must put a duty stamp on their betting ticket. We printed those tickets, we put the stamp on them and then we sold them to betting people. Thus, if a man is charged before a magistrate with betting, I presume he will produce the Government ticket with the Government stamp on it. Both the Federal and State Governments take a high moral stand—but they collect the cash.

Hon. S. W. Munsie: Your Government did that.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: Yes, we collected it.

Mr. Thomson: But you introduced that system.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: That is not true! I opposed it. When I took office, I found that was the law on the statute-book. I believe it was introduced by Sir Henry Lefroy. I obeyed the law—and took the cash. We always obey the law when it pays us to do so. I opposed that provision, because I thought it was illogical, wrong, inconsistent and something further than that, too. However, the House passed the law and I suppose the member for Katanning (Mr. Thomson) supported it. I must look up the division list.

Mr. Thomson: That would not be a bad scheme, because you would then know where you are.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: No, I want to know where the member for Katanning was; I know where I am all right. The Honorary Minister is asking Parliament to allow him to do what it is illegal for others to do. We say it is illegal to run lotteries and carry on other forms of gambling, but if the Bill be passed, we are to say that it will be right and proper for a Minister of the Crown to do what a minister of religion must not do.

Mr. Marshall: It is optional; if a minister of religion desires, he can have a go at it.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: What is wrong, improper and immoral for others to do, will be right for the Honorary Minister! He will be a law unto himself if the Bill be agreed to. If money is obtained in this way the Honorary Minister will have to come to Parliament and arrange for the disbursing of that money. Are we going to say that he can get a special tax for such a purpose and do what he likes with the money? Are we going to agree to that sort of thing? It would be absolutely wrong for us to do so and I hope the Minister will not find a single member, not even his colleagues in the Ministry, to support him. The Honorary Minister has pointed out that the Auditor General is to conduct an audit of the finances of the lottery annually and report to Parliament. There should be a continuous audit.

Hon. S. W. Munsie: I will see that there is, too.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: The Honorary Minister should allow the Auditor General to audit the books continuously.

Mr. Withers: There would be no audit if you had your way.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: The Honorary Minister's speech satisfied me that the Bill will become law so far as this House is concerned.

Mr. Heron: Do you favour any portion of the Bill?

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: There is hardly any part of the Bill that is not wrong. The Honorary Minister himself said there were two ways of doing it. The late Government took the wrong way and he is now taking the right way. That may be his opinion but I contend we took the proper course, after the matter had been investigated thoroughly by a select committee that took a lot of evidence and furnished a considered report. We said that a man with small means should get hospital attention free. The present Bill says nothing of the sort. On the contrary, it will cost the poor man five times as much as it would have cost under our Bill. There is very little to recommend the Bill. I know that people do gamble and even boys gamble for marbles. I suppose there is no hon. member of this Chamber who does not have a pound on a horse at least once in the year. Probably there is no member who does not take a ticket in Tattersall's sweeps.

Mr. Panton: Why send the money to Tasmania instead of keeping it here?

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: People will gamble, I know; we cannot stop that.

Mr. Marshall: It is impossible to stop gambling.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: It is not impossible to keep it within bounds, so long as it is not legalised in any form. The Honorary Minister, I presume, has prevented the running of many sweeps, just as we had to do when we were in office.

When the Bill is passed, the House will say that it is not right to gamble but that the Minister must have the monopoly of the right to conduct lotteries. I do not oppose the Bill for the reason that occasionally I do have a bet, and perhaps take a ticket in a sweep—it is a long time since I had one in Tattersall's sweeps—but I oppose it because it is bad. This is not the proper way to raise money for the purposes set out by the Honorary Minister. Queensland may do this sort of thing but it is a very bad example.

Mr. Wilson: Queensland furnishes a very fine example.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: It is a very poor example for Western Australia to follow and I am surprised that the Honorary Minister has followed it. We are not so badly off in Western Australia that we cannot raise money in other ways to deal with our hospitals and equip them in a proper way. I do not think the Minister's proposal will produce the result he imagines. I believe, however, it will not have an elevating effect on the community. I hope the Minister will withdraw the Bill and get the funds he requires by direct means. How can he set out in such a measure what he will do for the people? He cannot do so under such a Bill because he does not know how much money he will get. There should be no difficulty in raising the necessary funds to properly equip our hospitals. I hope the Minister will not go into Committee to deal with the Bill to-day. I believe it was intended to pass the second reading to-day and to deal with the Bill in Committee as well. I hope the Honorary Minister will not do that but will delay consideration in Committee so that he may look into the omissions I have mentioned. I have put them before him in a spirit of helpfulness, although I do not approve of the measure. The member for Williams-Narrogin, I am sure, is most anxious to say something about the measure and I am also certain that other members will not be prepared to give a silent vote on the question of legalising gambling. I invite them all to express their opinions.

Mr. SAMPSON (Swan) [5.30]: I recall the fact that soon after I was elected to Parliament a measure was brought down by the late Mr. John Boyland, the then member for Kalgoorlie, having for its object an amendment of the Criminal Code for the purpose of legalising the holding of sweeps. The idea at the time was to provide a sum of money to be devoted to the Fresh Air League, the children's ward at the Kalgoorlie Hospital and the Wooroloo Sanatorium. We deplore the fact that the late hon. member was a very sick man at the time. His desire was that more funds should be provided for the three institutions named and he considered that all that was needed would be raised by the conduct of sweeps. The measure passed through the Assembly

without a division. The Honorary Minister (Hon. S. W. Munsie), I am sorry to say, did not on that occasion express an opinion on the Bill. The Bill went to the Council, where it was defeated by 13 votes to 10. It is interesting to note that the vote in another place was as follows: in favour of the measure—Messrs. Ardagh, Baglin, Hamersley, Harris, Hickey, Kirwan, Lovekin, Moore, Panton and Witte-noom.

Mr. Panton: I was in good company then.

Mr. SAMPSON: The hon. member recorded his vote, at all events. The noes were—Messrs. Colebatch, Duffell, Ewing, Greig, Holmes, McKenzie, Miles, Mills, Nicholson, Rose, Saw, Stewart and Sanderson. Messrs. Cornell and Dodd paired for Aye and No respectively. There was a limited intention in respect of that Bill, but the Hospitals Bill which was introduced in 1922 aimed at dividing all the funds to be raised amongst all the institutions, with a couple of exceptions. There was a good deal of discussion on that Bill in this Chamber, and some of it was acrimonious. The Bill passed this House and was sent on to the Council. The principle of the Bill was the taxation of income at its source. It aimed at collecting 1d. in the pound on all incomes of £1 and over. A very useful amendment was submitted by the then member for Bunbury, Mr. Money, who suggested, and the House agreed, that free treatment should be provided for those men and women in receipt of less than £4 a week as well as for those who were in indigent circumstances. It has been said by the Honorary Minister that that Bill would have relieved the Consolidated Revenue. I admit that is so, and I have no doubt that the Honorary Minister has to-day some fellow-feeling, in that he is facing the same difficulties that every one of his predecessors had to contend with when in control of hospitals and charitable institutions. The amount that had previously been contributed by the Treasurer for hospitals and charity was £86,714 and it was estimated that under the Bill the revenue received would total £133,000. Thus the hospitals would be better off to the extent of £46,286. Members will recall the fact that the Wooroloo Sanatorium and the King Edward Memorial Hospital were to be excluded in respect of the funds required to carry on those institutions. Again, on this measure the present Honorary Minister (Hon. S. W. Munsie) was silent save for a few words in Committee. I was disappointed, on looking up "Hansard," to find that the House did not have the benefit of an expression of opinion from him with regard to the virtues or otherwise of the Hospitals Bill. The Bill had a somewhat stormy passage, and there were one or two late sittings. When the Committee stage in the Council was reached, on the motion of Mr. Hamersley, the Chairman was

voted out of the Chair, and so the Bill was defeated. It is interesting to note that in the Council only three members spoke in regard to that measure. They were Mr. Colebatch, Mr. Duffell and Dr. Saw. The sudden death motion was supported by Messrs. Baglin, Burvill, Duffell, Hamcrsley, Harris, Hickey, Kirwan, Lovekin, and Stewart, while those opposed to it were Messrs. Colebatch, Greig, Macfarlane, Miles, Nicholson, Rose, Saw and Mills.

The Premier: Does it affect the principle of this Bill to relate how another place voted?

Mr. SAMPSON: It is interesting to recall how members there voted. I am not taking up very much time in reviewing the position.

The Premier: It is not a question of the time being taken up, but it all seems so irrelevant.

Mr. SAMPSON: It is interesting to note that certain members were opposed to both methods of raising money for the hospitals and we may ask whether this measure, which is framed on similar lines to the Bill introduced by the late Mr. Boyland, will meet with a similar fate.

The Premier: Are you asking that we should be guided by what another place does?

Mr. SAMPSON: No. I am merely drawing attention to what was done by another place. I have not said I would follow the lead of members there, nor have I indicated that I am antagonistic to the efforts of the Honorary Minister in endeavouring to raise funds for hospital administration. I recall the fact that the present Premier, who was then Leader of the Opposition, stated clearly on more than one occasion that funds for services such as these should be raised by taxation. I agree that that is the correct method for raising money for hospital and similar services.

The Premier: I think what I said was that if funds were to be raised by taxation, they should be raised by general taxation, and not by way of a special tax as was provided in the Hospitals Bill.

Mr. SAMPSON: I know the hon. gentleman was opposed to the Hospitals Bill and consequently he was opposed to that method of raising the required money, but he did express himself quite clearly that the money should be raised by means of taxation.

The Premier: Not specific taxation.

Mr. SAMPSON: Just so. I am pleased to know that the Honorary Minister has assured the House that the Consolidated Revenue will not be relieved insofar as the sum hitherto provided is concerned but that the amount produced by means of the proposed lotteries or series of lotteries will be used in addition. That, of course, is a very big argument in favour of the measure, and the Minister's assur-

ance is gratifying. It has frequently been stated, and it cannot be disputed, that the raising of money by means of lotteries is expensive. On the other hand it must be acknowledged that in many instances unless there is some opportunity of securing a prize, very little money will be forthcoming. There are not wanting those who claim—and I think it will be difficult to dispute it—that the legalising of this method of raising money must have the effect of encouraging gambling. Under this scheme the purchase of sweep tickets becomes almost a virtue, because one will save his conscience—if it requires saving—when purchasing a ticket, by remembering that he will have an opportunity of not only winning a prize, but doing good to a charitable institution. I understand the Minister intends to prevent the holding of other lotteries, the State lottery thus enjoying a monopoly.

Mr. Teesdale: Hear, hear!

Mr. SAMPSON: There is something to be said on the other side. I do not know whether the Honorary Minister intends to provide funds for luxuries, say for the Wooroloo Sanatorium. There is a society, the St. Vincent de Paul Society, which provides what may be termed luxuries for the Wooroloo patients. The organisation is carrying on an admirable work, and I should regret it if upon the passing of this measure the sanatorium no longer had the advantage of the money so raised.

Mr. Teesdale: The sanatorium would get its share under this Bill.

Mr. SAMPSON: The Honorary Minister has not said that funds will be provided for such a purpose, and I do not think it would be quite fair for me to question him on that point. It may be possible to secure funds by way of direct contribution. I have the honour of being president of the Wooroloo Welfare Fund, which last year distributed among the patients goods to the value of over £350.

Mr. Panton: Obtained by lotteries?

Mr. SAMPSON: No; by direct appeals to the public, to which the public responded generously. However, this country is flooded with lotteries, and if we are to have lotteries, let us have them under the control of the Government with properly audited accounts and with as little waste as possible in the matter of administration. I hope the Honorary Minister will not vary his opinion. We know what happens in Queensland. This State is flooded with literature as to lotteries which have been approved by the Queensland Government.

Mr. Panton: Are you quite correct in saying that?

Mr. SAMPSON: It is absolutely true that books of tickets are forwarded from Queensland to people here entirely without request, and I have been assured that in one case no less than three letters have been forwarded insisting that the amount represented by the book of tickets be forwarded



or else the book of tickets, the receipt of which was never requested, be returned. Such proceedings, of course, have no reference to the Golden Casket.

Mr. Panton: Are you sure that the Queensland Attorney General has given permission for that kind of thing?

Mr. SAMPSON: The various lotteries which come from Queensland, in addition to the Golden Casket, are marked "Approved."

Mr. Panton: That may be so. I get such tickets myself, but I do not believe what is marked on them.

Mr. SAMPSON: The hon. member interjecting may be able to give the House some information regarding the length to which Queensland lottery promoters go. I earnestly hope the Government of this State will not make a welter of lotteries here. It has been said that the provision of money is the best test of a Government. This Bill will certainly produce money, but produce it by a method which has not been generally approved by leading Governments throughout the world. Unfortunately, in view of the existing position, and of the difficulty with which the Minister is faced as to the provision of funds for carrying on our hospitals, I cannot oppose the measure. It has been stated that civilisation is the flowering of the human species, and certainly hospital service is the best criterion by which civilisation can be judged. Therefore I say we must at almost any cost have our hospitals properly staffed and thoroughly well equipped. We want not only in our leading hospitals, but in the various country hospitals, the best that science can give. We want apparatus of many kinds. We want to see a greater number of pathologists employed. We want to make it possible for an X-ray outfit to be a part of the equipment of practically every hospital throughout the State. We want to make the lot of those who, in addition to being sick in health, are sick in pocket, as light as possible by affording them the same conditions that come to those who are better placed in respect of the world's goods. The Minister has stated that the amount now provided by Consolidated Revenue will not be reduced, but I urge that as the need increases, and as the State's income increases in the ratio which we may reasonably expect, the amount from Consolidated Revenue should be increased as the years go by. I submit it should not be laid down as a definite principle that only the amount which has been provided up to now should in future be set down by the Treasurer for the Hospitals Vote.

Hon. S. W. Munsie: I have not said that, and the Bill does not say it.

Mr. SAMPSON: No. The Bill, in fact, does not say very much, but I understood the Minister to say the amount would not be less.

Mr. Munsie: Yes.

Mr. SAMPSON: Very good. I am suggesting that as the revenue increases, and as

the need enlarges, the amount provided by the Treasury shall also increase, and that we should not regard the present amount as the full contribution required. The measure, while silent on many points, is articulate in regard to income tax, declaring that no State income tax shall be payable on the prizes. I disagree with that principle. Those who win prizes can afford to pay income tax, and I venture the opinion that there would be very little objection to the impost. It is only those that win who can afford to pay. The unfortunate losers are not in a position to pay taxation. Under the measure many advantages will be possible, among them a further reduction, I hope, of the hours which nurses work. The nurses are the slaves of the medical service. I know the Honorary Minister is sympathetic in that regard, and I hope he will take practical steps towards the further reduction of those hours.

The Premier: We could well spend another £10,000 a year in that direction.

Mr. SAMPSON: Yes, easily. There is opportunity for the expenditure of almost an illimitable amount in regard to our hospitals, and money can hardly be spent for a better purpose, especially with respect to the hours and pay of the nurses. There is another anomaly to which reference has not been made by either the Honorary Minister or any other speaker, and that is as to those hospitals which are carried on by committees in certain country centres. For certain hospitals the funds and the equipment are wholly provided by the State. In the case of other hospitals, when anything is required, recourse must be had to special efforts, special collections, and special appeals among town and country people. In many instances an unfair burden is thus added to those people. In this connection, I recall particularly the case of the Kellerberrin hospital, concerning which the member for Avon (Mr. Griffiths) has often spoken to me. That hospital is an example of what can be done by the people. The farmers there bring in firewood to the hospital, and both the townspeople and the country people bring in poultry; and in case of pigs being killed, they send in perhaps a carcase; and in many other ways they assist the hospital. How different it is in other centres where the Government carry the whole of the burden. I do not say that Kellerberrin is worse off, because its people realise the importance of helping themselves, but I do say it is an anomaly that in one centre the people should be required to provide so much in money and in kind whereas in other centres there is almost a total lack of regard for hospital expenses.

Mr. Panton: The miners in the back blocks have to find their own doctor, having the hospital provided for them.

Mr. SAMPSON: The miners pay into a relief fund, I understand.

Mr. Panton: Into a hospital fund.

Mr. SAMPSON: A medical fund. They are helping themselves. If they live in certain centres, that obligation would not be on them, but on the Government, who would provide for all that is required. I question the wisdom of the whole of this obligation being accepted by the Government. To some extent, at all events, people might reasonably help themselves. There is, however, a limit to the financial ability to provide funds.

Mr. Thomson: How about the Perth Hospital?

Mr. SAMPSON: The people of Perth provide an example of apathy in regard to that hospital; but that is the case always in big centres.

Mr. Mann: The people of Perth raise £8,000 a year for the Children's Hospital.

Mr. SAMPSON: The Children's Hospital is a splendid institution, and in passing I think an acknowledgment might be made of what we owe in this connection to the Ugly Men's Association, the Trotting Association, and certain other organisations.

Mr. Griffiths: I think the position is largely due to the work of the Ugly Men and other bodies who have pushed to get money.

Mr. SAMPSON: The Honorary Minister has a big task before him, and a heavy obligation to fulfil, and the people of Western Australia look to him to see that that obligation is discharged. I have no doubt it will be discharged to the best of his ability. If it were a less serious matter I certainly would oppose the Bill; but, realising the importance to our hospitals of medical services and equipment, it is not my intention to vote against the second reading.

Mr. CHESON (Cue) [6.1]: I, too, will support the Bill, for it will be the means of keeping in the State large sums of money that now leave it, and the Government will draw a percentage for charity. The Minister, when moving the second reading, told us the prizes will be exempt from State income taxation. I agree that they ought to be. There will be 3d. for stamp duty.

Mr. Richardson: The Minister said he was going to cut out the stamp duty.

Hon. S. W. Munsie: That is so.

Mr. CHESON: Well, probably the 3d. will be the amount deducted to furnish the necessary funds. Up to the present our hospitals have been practically starved, the money allocated from Consolidated Revenue being altogether insufficient for the upkeep of those institutions, especially in the back country. Out in the back blocks the local people tax themselves for the maintenance of their hospitals to a much greater extent than do the people of the bigger towns. This drain is very heavy on those in out-back districts. By the proposed lotteries the State will receive ample money for distribution amongst hospitals and charitable

institutions, and so the people outback will be largely relieved.

Mr. Teesdale: The Minister has not yet mentioned what the percentage is to be?

Mr. CHESON: No, but we may take it that the percentage retained will be sufficient for the purpose—perhaps 20 per cent.

Mr. Teesdale: That may be too much if we want to compete with Tattersalls.

Mr. CHESON: Surely we are all loyal enough to support a lottery run by the Government of our own State, with a percentage deduction earmarked for charity; in those circumstances we will all support the local lottery rather than send our money to Queensland or to Tasmania.

Mr. Teesdale: There is but little sentiment in some people.

Mr. CHESON: I think all will have sufficient sentiment to support the State lotteries as against lotteries out of which we get nothing but the bare chance of winning a prize. I suggest to the Minister that he make every hospital secretary an agent for the State lotteries, and so save agents' commissions. All the hospital committees will work loyally in support of their local secretary.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: You must not encourage people to gamble.

Mr. CHESON: The hon. member, like the rest of us, has a flutter occasionally, and I do not think his opposition to the Bill is very serious. The Council of Churches are up in arms against the Bill, but I think they require first to put their own house in order. All of us who have attended church bazaars know that gambling takes place there, perhaps to a greater degree than on racecourses. Every inducement is offered one to take a ticket in the raffles.

The Premier: Inducements by nice girls.

Mr. CHESON: And sometimes to take a throw with the dice, which might be loaded against us. The only consideration with the Council of Churches is that this money to be derived from State lotteries is not going to their own cause. Of course opposition to the Bill gives the Council of Churches an opportunity to get into the limelight; but the mere fact that they are denouncing State lotteries in Western Australia does not prevent the money going to Queensland and to Tasmania. Even those good people must realise that it is only human nature to want to take a chance. I do not care tuppence to what churches they belong, they must be behind the Government in support of the Bill if they realise that the hospitals, particularly those in the back country, are understaffed, badly equipped, and virtually starved. In view of the condition of the State's finances, it is of no use asking the Government to increase out of Consolidated Revenue the subsidies to hospitals. But under the Bill we shall have sufficient money to allow the various hospital committees in the outer districts to pay their nurses a reasonable wage, increase

the staff and shorten the hours of duty. The wages of probationers to-day are 7s. 6d. weekly, and those in back-country hospitals have to work from 12 to 15 hours daily. In some hospitals there is but one nurse, with the result that she is on duty, or at least at call, for 24 hours on end. While we may protest against gambling, we must realise that it is ineradicable, and that if we can keep the money in the State a percentage of it will be earmarked for charitable purposes. If we appoint agents in the other States, probably the Federal authorities will put an embargo on their correspondence, while at the same time reaching out for 12½ per cent. taxation on the prize money distributed. Recently the Tasmanian Government successfully applied for a remission of taxation in respect of Tattersalls. Something of the sort might be attempted here. It is quite clear that members of the Assembly are in favour of the Bill, and I hope there will be little if any opposition to it in another place. At all events I give the Bill my blessing, if that is any good to it.

Mr. THOMSON (Katanning) [6.13]: The Bill creates a difficulty for every hon. member. If he assents to it he is going to offend a section of his constituents, while if he opposes it he will offend some other section.

Mr. Panton: There is no chance to judge the position?

Mr. THOMSON: It is certainly difficult to judge. However, that is not going to affect my attitude towards the Bill. The Minister and the Government are to be commended on having the courage to give the House an opportunity to vote on the measure. For years past large sums of money have been going from Western Australia to Tattersalls in Tasmania. It is difficult to estimate the exact amount, but we know that Tasmania has derived a large revenue from the lotteries.

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

Mr. THOMSON: The Government can be commended for giving the House an opportunity to express an opinion on this matter, which has been considered by many members and outside people. I am not a gambler and do not frequent racecourses. I know that the churches are opposed to the Bill. They consider it will encourage gambling. That may be so. Large sections of the community say they will not be associated directly or indirectly with anything that is in their opinion wrong. We are, however, faced with the position that, whilst we may not believe in lotteries, there are hundreds of thousands of pounds going out of the State to Tasmania and Queensland for these very purposes. If we could by law prevent all gambling, I would not vote for this measure. Those who are opposed to this form of raising money may not know that large sums are already obtained by the State from gambling sources. In 1922-23 we received from totalisator duties £54,411

and from totalisator licenses £934. These two items alone amount to a considerable sum of money. The State has also acquired money by means of the 2d. tax on every betting card that is issued by bookmakers. Between 1905 and 1923, the State collected out of the organisations connected with horse racing a sum of over £391,000. That shows that the State has publicly recognised the gambling spirit and has benefited by it. This question has been brought home to my district as a result of the visit of the Honorary Minister. When there he recognised that the district was entitled to better hospital accommodation. The reply I have received to the representations I made to him is in the following terms:—

You are no doubt aware that the funds at our disposal for hospital purposes are very restricted, and you are also no doubt aware of the considerable number of districts previously quite unprovided with hospital facilities which are adopting hospital schemes. During the past 12 months five new hospitals have been opened and during the next 12 months probably eight or nine more will be opened, and in each case such new hospital will be at least 20 miles from any previously existing institution. It is obvious, therefore, that with the limited funds available the Government's responsibility must be towards assisting the provision of hospitals where none previously existed, and that districts like Gnowangerup, which are already served, must wait.

In the portion of my district referred to the hospital is small. The Honorary Minister goes on to say that the block of ground is also very small and the accommodation apparently inadequate. Here is a district that is willing to raise pound for pound to assist the Government in establishing the very necessary hospital requirements, and yet, owing to the lack of funds, those who are sick have to put up with inadequate accommodation and very inadequate and out-of-date appliances. The Government are spending large sums of money in encouraging people to fill up our vacant spaces. I feel inclined to support the measure, not because I believe in gambling but because I consider there are many men and women who are sending money away each year to Tattersalls and to the Golden Casket in Queensland, and are not contributing one penny towards the income tax of this State. This Bill will provide at least one means of making them contribute in this way. A statement has been made on this side of the House that the Hospitals Bill was a proper means by which revenue could be raised to provide for our hospitals. No one can say that more money is not urgently needed for our hospitals. I believe the main reason why the Legislative Council turned down the Bill was because the then Administration had increased taxation, and the Bill was regarded as placing an additional burden on the people. Approximately 19,000 people in this State are contributing

the whole of the taxation. In 1923 there were 21,325 persons who contributed to the income tax. Of these 1,607 contributed £2,108. This brings the figures down to a little over 19,000 persons who are contributing £240,783 to income tax alone. By the imposition of a hospitals tax we would have placed an additional burden on those who were already too heavily taxed. The Bill now under consideration will not injure anyone, nor do I believe it will encourage gambling any more than it goes on to-day. There are very few members who have not sent a few shillings to Tattersalls.

Mr. Richardson: Speak for yourself.

Mr. THOMSON: I have occasionally done so but have never won anything. This has not given me any desire to go in for gambling. The Honorary Minister said that in 1920-21 Queensland raised £66,000 through the Golden Casket, in 1921-22 over £100,000, in 1922-23 over £88,000, and last year over £65,000. If we can raise £33,000 every year by means of this lottery, without placing an additional impost upon the people, it will be a good thing. Those who say they will not countenance the raising of money in this way, because it will encourage gambling, must remember that the State already derives a large sum of money from the racecourses by the means I have stated. I know that two wrongs do not make a right, but we have this example before us, and I intend to assist the Government in their endeavour to raise a little more revenue without placing a further impost on the people. I support the second reading of the Bill.

Mr. RICHARDSON (Subiaco) [7.45]: I feel it my duty to say something on this Bill. At the outset let me remark that I am entirely opposed to the principle of the measure. I sympathise with the Honorary Minister as to the administration of hospitals and other charitable institutions throughout Western Australia. I realise that he has a formidable task ahead of him to finance them. Personally I trust that he will be able to get through and add to the number of the institutions. But I regard this matter from a viewpoint quite different from that of various speakers this evening. The last speaker said that two wrongs do not make a right, but yet his remarks show him to be entirely in sympathy with the Bill, the principle of which he admits to be wrong. I contend that no Parliament in any part of the world has any right to legalise what is believed to be wrong. That is the attitude I take up. We have two ways before us to raise money for our hospitals and kindred institutions. One is by means of direct taxation, the other by means of lotteries. There is no reasonable ground, so far as I see, why we should not impose direct taxation for this purpose. It is easy for members who favour a State lottery to say that the profits will not go

to Consolidated Revenue. To my way of thinking, however, it is a simple matter to provide for that by making a trust fund of all the moneys collected. Further, I believe it to be the duty of every man and woman in Western Australia earning money to contribute something towards the upkeep of hospitals. We never know the moment when we may be struck down by sickness. To provide against the contingencies of death is a simple matter, but one cannot provide sufficiently against sickness. One may have no sickness during his life, or one may have continuous sickness. Therefore it is impossible for any man or any woman to say, "I am going to provide a fund to meet the contingency of sickness." The only means towards that end consists in public hospitals and similar institutions. The Bill before us is quite a short measure, giving next to no particulars. The Honorary Minister, however, has been good enough to furnish many details of what he intends to do. There must be something lacking with regard to a Bill of this description. We can estimate pretty closely what the cost of upkeep of hospitals and charities will be during the coming year, and by means of direct taxation we can provide for that cost. But with respect to a lottery we do not know whether it will provide sufficient funds or not. In my opinion the starting of a State lottery will immediately cut out all voluntary contributions.

Mr. Clydesdale: The Queensland experience does not show that.

Mr. RICHARDSON: We always have Queensland thrown up at us. However, I shall discuss the matter from a purely local standpoint. With a State lottery we have no guarantee that we shall provide funds adequate to carrying out what is intended by the Honorary Minister. I feel the measure will be enacted. If it is, I wish the Minister every success, and I trust that he may receive sufficient money. There is another peculiar phase of the subject. The Bill attempts to legalise something illegal, for the Honorary Minister says the lottery under this Bill will be the only lottery henceforth permitted in Western Australia. From that aspect there is a striking anomaly. Further, we do not know what will be the percentage of deduction under the measure. The member for Cue (Mr. Chesson) in particular suggested that the deduction would be 20 per cent. If that is so, a large amount of the money being contributed through the purchase of tickets will not go in the right direction; we shall have only one-fifth of the money going towards hospitals, while the rest will go to some individual whom perhaps we have never heard of, and who possibly does not deserve it. My feeling is that every penny subscribed should go to hospitals. I know perfectly well that there is any amount of gambling going on in Western Australia.

and I do not think anyone can accuse me of being a wowser, a killjoy, or a non-sport. But I do realise that we should take a stand on behalf of the country. In no respect has history repeated itself so consistently as with regard to great empires which have become immoral through legalising certain things. Such empires have fallen into the dust and perished. I do not want to see Western Australia, by reason of this measure, reduced to such a condition. I want to see this young country grow, and grow on moral lines. I know we cannot prevent gambling. There is amongst us a certain gambling spirit. But let us not extenuate gambling. We must do everything in our power to keep it in control. By legalising lotteries, however, we shall be conveying to growing boys and girls the idea that gambling is absolutely in order. And so they will proceed from one form of gambling to another. I regret very much that the member for Cue (Mr. Chesson) took this occasion to ridicule parsons and priests and the whole of our congregations. I feel that that ridicule was entirely uncalled for and I make this protest against anything of that description. If we had in our midst no churches, and no religion, there would be very little law. For that reason I take a certain amount of umbrage and raise my protest. The figures which the Honorary Minister quoted are of a striking character. The more I look at those figures, the more I sympathise with him. I realise that every member should render the Honorary Minister every possible assistance. On glancing through the Honorary Minister's figures I notice that he requires an annual turnover of about £277,000. That is an astounding amount for a small population like ours to raise. Unquestionably, whether we are opposed to the method proposed by the Honorary Minister or not, we must in the near future give serious consideration to the question of raising money. My own belief is that the only reasonable and proper method to achieve that purpose is direct taxation. If we can arrive at that point, we shall be maintaining our hospitals and charities in a proper way, and the cost will fall largely upon those people for whom the member for Katanning (Mr. Thomson) feels so sorry because they have already paid taxation. But it is only the poor man who subscribes to Tattersalls or the "Golden Casket."

Mr. Thomson: That is the reason why I am supporting this Bill.

Mr. RICHARDSON: Because the hon. member wants the poor man to pay for everything.

Mr. Thomson: He does not pay.

Mr. RICHARDSON: The rich man does not bother about a chance which is 5,000 to one against him. It is the poor man, practically the man on the bread line, who attempts all through his life to win something in that way. The vast majority of the tickets which will be sold if the Bill

passes, will be subscribed by the workers of Western Australia. Every hon. member opposite says it is the worker who subscribes to all these things. Yet those hon. members are supporting a Bill which is going to allow the wealthy man to get out of his payments towards hospitals and charities.

Ministerial Members: No.

Mr. Panton: How are you going to make the rich man pay?

Mr. RICHARDSON: Through income taxation.

Mr. Panton: And he would not pass that on to the worker!

Mr. RICHARDSON: Even if he does pass on a little of it, the worker will have to pass it on somewhere else. But if 10,000 workers are going to pay for the whole of the needs of the hospitals, and if there are 10,000 rich men paying nothing, it is a wrong position. Better make the rich man pay his share, even if he does pass a little over to the workers. One thing that has pleased me very much is the Honorary Minister's reference to baby clinics. Undoubtedly the need of such clinics is most pronounced in Western Australia. May I suggest to the Honorary Minister that we have at our doors the King Edward Memorial Hospital; and in passing I desire to associate myself with the remarks made about the matron of that institution. Assuredly we shall be compelled in the near future to pay attention not only to post-natal clinics, but likewise to ante-natal clinics. The Subiaco institution which I have mentioned can be adapted for that purpose at very little cost.

Mr. Clydesdale: What do you call little cost?

Mr. RICHARDSON: I am assured that for an expenditure of £150 or £200 a year a baby clinic can be established at the King Edward Memorial Hospital. The wards and the nurses and the honorary physicians are there, and the expense of establishing a baby clinic there would be but small.

Mr. Clydesdale: Why, they want £1,000 for a start!

Mr. RICHARDSON: The member for Canning knows everything, whether it affects his district or not.

Mr. Clydesdale: I was at the King Edward Memorial Hospital to-day.

Mr. RICHARDSON: On this point I am a higher authority than the member for Canning. Whenever one introduces something that is new, one always finds alleged exorbitant cost brought up against him. If it is necessary to spend even £3,000, the object is worth it, absolutely. Why should the member for Canning cavil at an expenditure of £1,000? The clinic is needed, and we know it is needed. It has been a serious question for the last 16 or 17 years, and therefore I am surprised to find the member for Canning opposing the suggestion.

Mr. Clydesdale: I was there this afternoon trying to devise means to find the money.

Mr. RICHARDSON: I am indeed pleased to hear it, and of course I withdraw some of the things I said about the hon. member. I must, however, raise a protest against this Bill; I shall always raise a protest against such measures as this so long as I have the honour of being a member of this House. I cannot support anything which will tend to promote gambling.

Mr. Hughes: I have never heard you protest against the Stock Exchange.

Mr. RICHARDSON: I again acknowledge that there is plenty of gambling going on.

Mr. Clydesdale: Do you think the passing of this Bill will increase it?

Mr. RICHARDSON: Not perhaps amongst men of our generation, but amongst the growing generation. We have to look to the future, and we must guard against anything that will implant in our children the inclination to gamble, or to ill-treat themselves in any other direction. Because of that I am opposed to the Bill, and I hope it will not be agreed to.

Mr. Clydesdale: Are you really sincere in what you have said?

Mr. RICHARDSON: The member for Canning (Mr. Clydesdale) is never sincere. Sometimes I am sincere, and I am sincere to-night regarding this Bill. I have opposed such legislation for many years past, and have opposed it on the platform. My present attitude is nothing new to me. As for the interjection of the member for Canning, if he is insincere in his statements in this House, no person can point the finger of scorn at me and say that I am not sincere. When I condemn the Bill to-night, I do so because I do not believe in it. I believe it will have a derogatory effect upon the youngsters of Western Australia, and for that reason I am sincere in protesting against the Bill. I hope the House will not agree to it.

Mr. J. H. SMITH (Nelson) [8.2]: I disagree with the member for Subiaco (Mr. Richardson) on many points. I support the Bill. I have supported such legislation ever since I have been in Parliament, and I was in favour of it long before I entered politics. I have expressed my views from the public platform and I, therefore, applaud the Honorary Minister who has been game enough to introduce a Bill that is in accordance with his convictions. I have before me a circular issued by the Churches. I suppose every member has one before him.

Mr. Hughes: No, some members on the Labour side are regarded as incorrigible.

Mr. J. H. SMITH: That circular makes no difference to me and no difference in what I shall say regarding the Bill. The Leader of the Opposition has condemned the Bill, and he was followed by the Opposition whip, who spoke in a similar strain. I hope

the Premier will not be content with what his Minister has done, but will re-introduce the Bill that was lost in another place last session, the effect of which would have been to make everyone pay. I would make even conscientious objectors pay. They should not be allowed to go scot free under the Lotteries Bill. The legislation should be brought forward to tax everyone to support the hospitals, and other charities. Probably some hon. members may have a flutter occasionally, not only in connection with Tattersall's sweeps, the Golden Casket of Queensland, and others that may be going. We all do, in fact. Let us not only tax ourselves; let us tax those people who object to this sort of thing! In my own electorate from £500 to £1,000 per month goes out of Western Australia for the purchase of sweep or lottery tickets.

Mr. Taylor: This Bill will catch some of that.

Mr. J. H. SMITH: Workers will have their gamble, and neither you, Mr. Deputy Speaker, nor I, nor even somebody else in higher authority, can prevent them having their flutter. That is one reason why the Bill should be passed. Long ago when the Honorary Minister and I attended meetings to discuss various matters, this was our ambition and I hope the House will agree to the Bill. In the words of a little couplet:—

In the mystic future what shall it be,  
A lottery Bill on the Minister's knee?

I hope the Bill will be agreed to and that instead of these constant street collections, money will be raised for the hospitals and charities by statutory means.

Mr. GRIFFITHS (Avon) [8.7]: If the Bill be passed will the Government withdraw the present subsidies to country hospitals, or will it still be necessary to provide those subsidies? Will the funds raised under the Bill be in addition to those subsidies?

Hon. S. W. Munsie: I distinctly said so in my speech.

Mr. GRIFFITHS: There is a good deal of hypocrisy regarding the support of, and opposition to, lotteries. Although lotteries are not legalised, they prevail from one end of Western Australia to the other.

Mr. George: Life is a lottery itself, is it not?

Mr. GRIFFITHS: If any hon. member has passed along Hay-street or any other street during the last few months, he must have seen tickets for motor car raffles and for other forms of lotteries being offered for sale, all for the purpose of raising money for charities. While I do not think lotteries are altogether good, if this lottery is to be run in the way lotteries are conducted to-day, it is better to have it legalised than to have it going on under the lap. I do not know what amount of money leaves Western Australia for Queensland or Tasmania annually, but it must represent a

large sum. Many people are making a handsome living out of Tattersall's sweeps, and the Golden Casket. With all this talk about moral degradation and the evil effects of lotteries, I do not know that Tasmania has gone down to those moral depths of degradation we have heard of! I believe Tasmania is much better off to-day because of the operations of Tattersall's sweeps. They are winked at by the Commonwealth Government and by ourselves to-day. I presume that, in view of the funds to be raised by lotteries, we shall be able to do away with the cadging and begging that goes on at street corners for hospitals and other charitable institutions. The member for Swan (Mr. Sampson) mentioned country hospitals that were run by committees, and referred to the Kellerberrin hospital. I asked a number of questions about that institution some little time ago. That hospital is run in as public spirited a manner as any other similar hospital in Western Australia. The settlers are all doing their bit towards the maintenance of the institution and a subsidy of £150 a year is also received. That amount about covers the cost of the treatment of indigent patients at the hospital. An arrangement was made by the late Government and confirmed by the present Government, that a pound for pound subsidy should be paid for the purchase of an X-ray plant. The committee of the hospital went to a lot of expense and ordered a plant. It is now in Fremantle and they are told that there is no money in the Treasury to permit of the promise being kept. Wherever I go in the country districts I am asked to approach the Minister regarding better conditions for the people outback, including improved hospital facilities, maternity provisions and so forth. On every occasion when I have approached the Minister I have met with a sympathetic hearing, but the state of the finances has prevented him from doing what he would have liked to do. If a hospital tax could be levied, I would prefer it; but failing that, I will support the Bill. I have heard a good deal of talk about the lottery question. I have a circular before me in which it is stated:—

In England State lotteries were conducted for revenue purposes, and for public utilities for more than 200 years. After inquiry by a select committee of the House of Commons they were abolished in 1826 and have not been permitted since. That may be so, but we know that many countries on the Continent are running lotteries. Queensland is taking a lot of money from Western Australia, and an immense sum must be going to Tasmania. If we can stop that outflow it will be so much money kept in the State. As to the talk about the moral aspect of lotteries, we have lotteries conducted to-day. We have bazaars running raffles, and we have other varieties of lotteries in our midst. I have been in the position of having to ask the Minister to suspend the operation of the law.

The member for Swan raised one point when he expressed the hope that the running of lotteries for a Wooroloo institution would not be interfered with. The R.S.L. are also running a lottery. I suppose the Government intend to monopolise this privilege. That being so we have to consider what the effect will be on the outside bodies. While I think the hospital tax would be the better course, rather than go on in our present indefinite way, I shall support the Bill.

Mr. TAYLOR (Mt. Margaret) [8.15]: This Bill has caused some pulpit vituperation, as we saw reported in the Press of Monday last. From the point of view of the churches I do not think that one can argue against what has been said. Unfortunately, however, there is a large proportion of the people in Australia who do not think that way, and I am not prepared to say that those who do not think as the churches think are not right. I do want to say that if we, as a Parliament, grappled with the situation it would be our bounden duty to impose a tax, and not merely introduce legislation of this kind. We have already made several efforts to assist the hospitals and other institutions by way of legislation and have failed. This appears to be the easiest way by which we can raise a small amount of money in order to assist those institutions. I do not think it will be possible for us to get very much because the population of our State is not very big. Queensland has a much better chance of being successful with its lotteries by reason of their greater population and also because of their close proximity to a State that has a population of two millions of people. We have an adult male population of only 190,000 people and of that number only 19,000 are contributing direct taxation. We know, of course, that a large number of our male adults are not paying anything at all in the way of taxation, and that is the only justification, I consider, for the introduction of this Bill. The Bill will reach that large section because it will appeal to the workers of Western Australia. They, as well as many others, are possessed of the spirit of gambling, and they will have their 5s. investment in these lotteries each week, and in that way they will assist towards the maintenance of the hospitals. Last year we tried hard to persuade the Trades and Labour Council of Perth to assist the Perth Hospital. A system was suggested by which every member of a union would contribute 1d. in the pound towards the upkeep of the Perth Hospital. For every penny a worker contributed he would receive a book with stamps, and if at any time he went to the hospital for treatment, every stamp in his book would be treated as two stamps. The Hospital Board also allowed employers to take tickets in a similar way, and the employer could send in his book for any of his employees if taken ill. The proposal was turned down

by the Trades and Labour Council, and in no uncertain way. The method proposed in the Bill is the only way by which we can now reach these people.

Mr. Panton: What is the good of talking like that; the workers are reached every day in the week.

Mr. TAYLOR: The workers on the goldfields are, but not so those in the metropolitan area. On the goldfields the workers have always contributed 1s. and 1s. 6d. a week towards the maintenance of the hospitals, and when those institutions have gone down, married employees have subscribed as much as 2s. 9d. Contrast that with what has been done by the workers in the metropolitan area where they have all the comforts and conveniences that are associated with civilisation.

Mr. Marshall: They contribute in other ways as well on the goldfields.

Mr. TAYLOR: The hospitals on the goldfields are almost entirely maintained by the people there.

Mr. J. H. Smith: That does not apply solely to the goldfields.

Mr. TAYLOR: I am not so conversant with other parts of the State. When I was a Minister of the Crown I remember that in the farming areas the hospitals were supported entirely by the Government. I believe that is still the position.

Mr. J. H. Smith: The Honorary Minister can tell you differently.

Mr. TAYLOR: On the last Estimates there was a big sum of money provided for the maintenance of the country hospitals.

Hon. S. W. Munsie: The position is exactly the same with the exception of the Kalgoorlie Hospital which is purely a Government hospital.

Mr. TAYLOR: When speaking of the goldfields hospitals I was referring to those in the outback districts, in places like Menzies, Leonora, Laverton, Southern Cross, Cue, Meekatharra, and right up to Peak Hill. These institutions were always liberally assisted by the people. Now we propose to catch the community in the metropolitan area. In my opinion that is the only justification for passing the Bill—we shall reach a section that has never been reached before in respect of the maintenance of our hospitals.

Mr. NORTH (Claremont) [8.22]: I intend to support the Bill. During the last election campaign I introduced the subject by way of a change, and I found that it met with a very poor reception. Unfortunately, on the night that I mentioned the subject, the audience was composed largely of members of the Women's Service Guild, who were not partial to the idea of a State lottery. We cannot get away from the fact, however, that there is urgent necessity for something to be done in the manner proposed by the Government, and necessity, as we are aware,

knows no law. Whatever we may think or do in normal times when the finances are in a flourishing state, and when money is easily obtained, we must in these days of stress adopt other measures. It appears to me that more than one advantage will accrue from the passing of this Bill. In the first place we are likely to prevent a good deal of money from going out of the State; in the second place, we shall be able to discharge the heavy liabilities of the hospitals which now cannot be met; and in the third place, there is a great chance that we may be able to prevent street collections and invasions of offices, which have been going on now for some years, and which have become a positive nuisance in Perth. In addition to the objection raised by the Women's Service Guild, I have before me a letter—and other members have also received copies—in which reasons are given against the passing of the proposed legislation, and one that is quoted is this: "There is no peril which more constantly threatens human nature than the habit of yielding to the disposition of gambling." Those are the words of Viscount Bryce. Of the two proposals, the peril of direct taxation and the peril of taking a sporting chance, the average man always prefers to take the sporting chance. I believe that if the whole of our taxation were designed on some such lines we would pay with more smiles than we do to-day, because someone must then always gain. Perhaps there are one or two more serious views that we might take when dealing with this measure. One is that prevention is better than cure. We are endeavouring to raise funds to assist in curing the sick who are in the hospitals, but we are taking few steps to prevent some of the diseases which keep our hospitals full. I do not know why more time is not devoted to this aspect. To give one instance from many. Within the last few days we have read in the papers that there has been a campaign launched against the consumption of white bread, which has always been the staple diet of the community. We have been told in all seriousness that white bread is almost poison, that it is deficient in nourishment, and that instead we should eat brown bread. In my humble opinion a matter such as this should not be allowed to pass unnoticed. If it is seriously true that white bread is a menace to the community, that in itself will be an important subject for the Government to tackle. It may be the means of our hospitals not being quite so full as they have been. Some experts have told us that white bread is responsible for malnutrition and even cancer. I urge that the Health Department should devote more of its time to the prevention of diseases which we know invariably end in the sufferers finding their way into the hospital. It is my intention to support the second reading of the Bill.



Mr. BROWN (Pingelly) [8.27]: I intend to oppose the second reading of the Bill for the reason that we have too much gambling in our midst at the present time. This will affect the workers more than anything else I know, because in the past they have contributed more to gambling than any other section of the community. On going into almost any tobacconist's shop to-day, one sees the notice in conspicuous letters, "We communicate with Hobart," and one sees numerous people making application for tickets in Tattersall's sweeps. I would ask how much has come to Western Australia as a result of these lotteries. They are a curse to the working community on account of the vast sums of money that are sent away in these speculations, sums that should remain in the home for the proper maintenance of the family. We do not seem to be able to get the gambling spirit away from the home, but that is no reason why we should go further and encourage it. Let us see what the Government now propose to do. It is intended by this Bill to legalise gambling. But what happens when a few Chinese get together and indulge in a little gambling? They go away from everyone, and the police wait until they get a good mob of them and then raid them. The Chinese are not doing any harm; they gamble amongst themselves. We are told that we must put down the gambling spirit. What happens to-day? One has only to make an application to the Department for the conduct of a lottery and permission is given, and the assistance of young ladies is called in in order to sell a greater number of tickets. Sometimes, too, one will be asked to indulge in a lottery which consists of guessing the number of peas or grains of wheat in a bottle. All this is gambling. We are not doing that which we should be doing in order to improve the human race. We should not in any shape or form encourage gambling. How many men have made fortunes by gambling? Very few. If we can help the hospitals only by gambling means, then God help us. If we cannot find any other way of raising revenue to assist in the maintenance of the hospitals it is a poor lookout for the community and the State. In New South Wales gambling in any shape or form is absolutely forbidden. In this State one has but to travel in a railway train to find that many men cannot even play a game of cards without having money on it. When the Government sanction this sort of thing, I say it is not for the betterment of the country. I will vote against the Bill.

Mr. LAMBERT (Coolgardie) [8.30]: One would think that by means of the Bill the Government intended to introduce gambling. Is there any gambling going on in our midst? Are any raffles being organised in Western Australia, any sweeps being contributed to, any stock exchanges being con-

ducted? Are any persons buying wheat or wool for speculative purposes? If there has ever been a parade of gigantic hypocrisy, it has been the hypocrisy levelled against the Bill. I had some respect for the views of the member for Subiaco (Mr. Richardson) until I heard that arrogant parade of hypocrisy to-night.

Mr. Taylor: The hon. member should not be offensive.

Mr. Richardson: I object to the word "hypocrisy."

Mr. LAMBERT: I withdraw. In no sense did I desire to be offensive. What I meant was the hon. member's political hypocrisy.

Mr. Richardson: I ask for an unconditional withdrawal of the words "arrogant hypocrisy."

Mr. LAMBERT: I withdraw. No responsible body would be justified in making the departure suggested by the Bill unless firmly convinced that all other avenues for the raising of money for charitable purposes had been exploited. It is admitted by many, including the member for Mt. Margaret (Mr. Taylor), who has devoted years to the hospitals, that the major avenues have been exploited in a desire to do justice to those institutions. We also have amongst us the member for Canning (Mr. Clydesdale), who devotes a great deal of his time to the public good, and who has but little regard for the hypocrisy and cant that may be levelled against efforts to maintain our hospitals. In the face of public criticism the Government are endeavouring to enact legislation that will afford opportunity for the upkeep of our charitable institutions.

Mr. J. H. Smith: It is not a party measure, is it?

Mr. LAMBERT: No, of course not. The Government are to be commended on their desire to relieve our hospitals. I know of nothing more deplorable than to have some of our outback hospitals starved, as they are to-day. I give place to no member in my opposition to gambling generally. I regard the gambler as a fool. The only man who can afford to gamble is the millionaire. However, I go to a racecourse sometimes for an afternoon's enjoyment in the sun.

Mr. Clydesdale: What about wet days?

Mr. LAMBERT: I never go in wet weather. No man has a greater detestation of gambling than have I. I would invite the closest analysis of the Bill and its likely effects upon our growing generation. I would have more respect for the protestations of responsible bodies had those bodies long ago, by petition to Parliament, tried to stop the numerous sweeps conducted throughout the State. Month after month, in season and out of season, we have girls 10 years of age selling sweep tickets, without the slightest protest from responsible bodies.

Mr. Mann: The Bill will not prevent that.

Mr. LAMBERT: The hon. member need not anticipate my remarks. Under the Bill the Minister will have power to frame regulations; and I would not support the second reading were I not convinced that the Minister will frame regulations to stop the objectionable sweeps being carried on in the streets of Perth every day in the week.

Mr. Griffiths: Over which there is no control.

Mr. Chesson: Not even over the drawing.

Mr. LAMBERT: If the Government exercise their power to frame regulations to stop that objectionable feature of our street life, they will at least be doing something for the moral tone of Perth and of the bigger centres of population throughout the State. As an offset against any possible harm to accrue from the Government running a State lottery, the project has much to commend it. I appeal to members to support the second reading, and I appeal to the Government to take steps to prevent boys and girls, under all sorts of pretences, conducting sweeps and lotteries and raffles in aid of various objects. One week it is called a button day, another week it is termed a flower day, and in the third week it takes the form of a raffle for a motor car.

Mr. Mann: You are going to stop all that, are you?

Mr. LAMBERT: I would hesitate before saying we should do away with any of the many good efforts with which the hon. member is associated. I have a far higher regard for the hon. member and his altruism than I have for the screaming hypocrites who, for political reasons, are prepared to denounce the Bill. If they can suggest some practical substitute to the Bill, I will listen to them with interest. But while I know that innocent children in the Children's Hospital are being starved to-day—

Mr. Teesdale: That is a gross exaggeration. We might as well advertise the statement that we are starving the children. Why don't you let us vote on this Bill?

Mr. LAMBERT: I do not know that the hon. member should be allowed to cast a vote in connection with any Bill. Many of our deserving institutions require funds.

Mr. Teesdale: I do not believe you, so it does not matter.

Mr. LAMBERT: There are some in my district.

Mr. Teesdale: What about the Children's Hospital?

Mr. LAMBERT: That needs funds to-day.

Mr. Teesdale: I object to your use of the word "starving." You are too fond of using it.

Mr. LAMBERT: I was not referring to the children being starved, but to the funds being starved.

Mr. Teesdale: Why didn't you say so?

Mr. LAMBERT: Surely the hon. member can discriminate between the use of words.

Mr. Teesdale: I never yet heard children referred to as funds.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. LAMBERT: What can one do with such an impossible person? The funds of the Children's Hospital and nearly all our charitable institutions are starving. The member for Mt. Margaret (Mr. Taylor) for years devoted a great deal of his time to the affairs of the Perth Public Hospital, and knows well the dire straits in which it is. That and kindred institutions can only be maintained by means of ample funds.

Hon. W. D. Johnson: If there are no funds they starve.

Mr. LAMBERT: Yes. The position in the metropolitan area is not as bad as it is in the outlying portions of the State. On the goldfields there are no moneyed people to donate £300 or £400 to a medical fund or a local hospital.

Mr. Taylor: We do not get many requests either.

Mr. LAMBERT: No. It is no use appealing to the Government for funds from Consolidated Revenue. If we are to have any regard for the standards of decency, even if this measure be called a tragic expedient we are justified in asking Parliament to pass it. The responsibility of the Government hardly ceases when this Bill does become law. If it is not passed we must remove from our centres of population the objectionable feature of street collections that has been so greatly intensified during the last few years. It is not a question of a man buying a 5s. ticket in Tattersalls or the "Golden Casket," but of having poked under his nose in every street and every by-way tickets for raffles in motor cars and every commodity one can think of. If members who protest against this Bill would show a greater sincerity in their opposition to these objectionable features we might consider there was some tinge of genuineness in their attitude.

Mr. DAVY (West Perth) [8.50]: I rise without any camouflage very definitely, positively and absolutely to oppose this Bill. I am one of the screaming, glaring, miserable hypocrites who dares to differ from the member for Coolgardie. If we did not know him as well as we do we would accept what he says a little more seriously than we do. To use such extravagant language towards hon. members who happen to hold a different view from his, seems to me not in accord with the duties of a member. I am opposed to the Bill because I believe it is sacrificing the good of the people for all time for a temporary advantage. The Bill is merely an expedient.

Mr. Lambert: Did you tell the returned soldiers that when they were running sweeps?

Mr. DAVY: I was a member of the executive of the Returned Soldiers' League for 2½ years, and fought them the whole time on the question of running sweeps. I protested that this was beneath the dignity of the league, and never ceased to protest all the time I had anything to do with it, and have continued to protest ever since. That is my reply to the hon. member.

Mr. Lambert: They did not take your views seriously.

Mr. DAVY: No more seriously than, judging from the tone of the speeches to-night, I expect members to take the views I shall express here. The member for Subiaco (Mr. Richardson), the member for Bunbury (Mr. Withers) and I are practically the only members to oppose the Bill. The Premier: That is all.

Mr. DAVY: Ours seem to be small voices crying in the wilderness.

Mr. Heron: What about your leader?

Mr. DAVY: In this matter we have no leader. We are permitted to hold our own opinions on all matters not connected with policy. We have had an excellent example furnished from the other side of the House in that on all matters whether of policy or otherwise, members are directed in the course they shall follow. We do not expect any member on the opposite side of the House to vote against this Bill. Whatever my leader thinks about it, with all due respect to him, I am emphatically opposed to it. I propose to tell the House why I am opposed to it. When a colony of the British Empire was formed, it carried with it so much of the law of the Old Country as was applicable to local conditions. When Western Australia was formed it brought the laws of England that were applicable to it. Part of that law was a distinct forbiddance against gambling. That law has been passed down until we find in Section 212 of the Criminal Code—

Any person who opens, keeps, or uses any place for carrying on a lottery of any kind whatever is guilty of a misdemeanour, and is liable to imprisonment with hard labour for three years; or may be summarily convicted before two justices, in which case he is liable to imprisonment with hard labour for six months, or to a fine of £100.

The term "lottery" includes any scheme or device for the sale, gift, disposal or distribution of any property depending upon or to be determined by lot or chance, whether by the throwing or casting of dice, or the drawing of tickets, cards, lots, numbers, or figures, or by means of a wheel or trained animal or otherwise howsoever.

At present if any member undertakes to run a lottery he is liable to imprisonment with hard labour for six months.

Mr. Panton: Do the police know of that section?

Mr. DAVY: I believe so. I regret that in the past the police have not enforced it, or the Governments for the time being have not seen that it was enforced. I am strongly opposed to any law remaining on the statute book unenforced. I know not where to look for a more disgraceful exhibition of hypocrisy on the question of gambling. We have seen poor Chinamen dragged to the court regularly every month for playing their harmless game of fan-tan, which is just about as vicious as a game of penny loo, and they have been fined from £100 down to £3.

The Minister for Mines: Have you ever gambled?

Mr. DAVY: Yes.

Mr. Lambert: Would you prohibit it in the Weld Club?

Mr. DAVY: No. I would amend the law on such subjects. Every civilised race, as far back as we know the history of the world, has discouraged gambling.

Mr. Lambert: And yet indulged in it.

Mr. DAVY: Certainly. Our penal code at present provides a penalty of six months imprisonment with hard labour, or a fine of £100 for anyone conducting a lottery, and yet the Government whilst leaving that section in the Criminal Code propose to do something for which any one of our citizens may be imprisoned for six months or fined £100. Such a piece of legislation is monstrous, and I am opposed to it heart and soul. Most of the arguments adduced to-night have been in the direction of suggesting that this is a matter of the end justifying the means. I have never thought that the end could justify the means in any matters of this kind. What is wrong in principle is wrong whether it brings about indirectly a good or a bad result. The argument is not worth a moment's consideration. It is suggested that there is no other means of getting money with which to finance our hospitals and charitable institutions. It has also been urged that those who oppose the Bill are in favour of our hospitals and charitable institutions being starved. The member for Coolgardie has suggested that because one member on this side opposed the Bill, he is in favour of starving our children in the Children's Hospital.

Mr. Lambert: Financially.

Mr. DAVY: The Government have unlimited taxing powers.

Mr. Clydesdale: You would be the first to squeal about increased taxation.

Mr. DAVY: Not at all. If there is money to be got out of the people—if there is not, this Bill will be valueless—let it be got out of them by the proper means.

Hon. W. D. Johnson: The Government have not unlimited powers of taxation.

Mr. DAVY: Subject to the amount of money the people have.

Hon. W. D. Johnson: What about the Legislative Council?

Mr. DAVY: I accept the correction. Let us say Parliament has unlimited power. The Government have no power to tax, but power only to propose taxing measures to both Houses. But the two Houses of Parliament, I say, have unlimited power to tax the people of Western Australia; and if the money is necessary to finance our hospitals and charitable institutions, that is the proper way to finance them.

Mr. Griffiths: But the Upper House threw out the Hospitals Bill of last session.

Mr. DAVY: Suppose that be so, is it any reason why the present Government should bring in a Bill which proposes that the Government of the country shall do something, for doing which the private citizen may be sent to gaol? That seems to me a monstrous proposition.

Mr. Griffiths: The thing is being done every day now. Sweeps are run and legalised.

Mr. DAVY: They are not legalised. Any person running a sweep is liable to be sent to gaol. The present Government, and even the late Government, allowed this section of the Criminal Code to be broken. The argument used always was that the end justified the means. In Western Australia the State has assumed some of the functions of the parent, and it is tending to assume more and more of those functions every day. The State is the educative body for children. All children are bound to go to school, and the vast majority of them go to schools provided by the State. In those schools they are taught morals, and, quite apart from religion, are taught what line of conduct will most conduce to their happiness and prosperity. One thing they are taught is to avoid gambling.

Mr. Lambert: What effect has the Golden Casket had on the children of Queensland?

Mr. DAVY: I have no doubt it is breeding up a race of hopeless gamblers there. How can the State teach children that gambling is an evil and at the same time conduct lotteries? Without any camouflage at all, I must vote against the Bill; and in this respect I am not afraid to rank myself amongst the glaring, screaming, and miserable hypocrites condemned by the member for Coolgardie.

Mr. HUGHES (East Perth) [9.5]: The last speaker has made an important discovery, which I am sure no other member ever knew of before, namely, that Section 212 of the Criminal Code prohibits lotteries. When rushing to make that important discovery the member for West Perth evidently failed to observe the last paragraph of Section 211, which authorises the Western Australian Turf Club, or any other club, incorporated or otherwise, registered by the Western Australian Turf Club, and author-

ised by the Colonial Treasurer, to use the totalisator on race days.

The Premier: And the totalisator is a gambling machine.

Mr. HUGHES: If the member for West Perth had been lucky enough to make that discovery also, he might not have indulged in remarks which cause the charge of extravagant language to apply to him rather than to the member for Coolgardie (Mr. Lambert). Notwithstanding the circular that has been issued to us by certain gentlemen, I venture to suggest there is somewhat of a gamble in the commodity they deal in. The member for West Perth waxed eloquent about every country having endeavoured to stop gambling. Does not the hon. member know that in every important capital of Europe there is a Stock Exchange, and that on stock exchanges there is conducted the most pernicious form of gambling, gambling that is unlimited? Again, no one objects to gambling on the racecourse. I never heard the member for West Perth either in this House or when endeavouring to get into it, raise any protest against racecourse or stock exchange gambling. My view is that the way to run the hospitals of the State is to nationalise them and raise the necessary funds by taxation. But I know as well as the member for West Perth that the Government have not unlimited powers of taxation: there is another Chamber, which will throw out any additional taxation the present Government may seek to levy.

Mr. Taylor: That is a reflection on another place.

Mr. HUGHES: Another place would not even discuss the Hospitals Bill of last session.

Mr. SPEAKER: I ask the hon. member not to reflect upon another place.

Mr. HUGHES: I challenge the statement of the member for Mt. Margaret (Mr. Taylor) that I was reflecting on another place.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member must not argue. It is a reflection upon another place to insinuate that when this measure reaches it, or any taxation measure reaches it, it will act in opposition to the will of this House.

Mr. HUGHES: Last year a Hospitals Bill was passed by this Chamber and defeated elsewhere. Evidence was afforded on that occasion that the Government have not power of unlimited taxation. I do not think many people would object to paying a reasonable tax for the upkeep of hospitals providing they had the assurance that in case of illness they would receive hospital services. In the absence of such a guarantee, however, they are unwilling to pay hospital taxation. In my youth I have probably not been as good as the member for West Perth, and I know most of the forms of getting rid of one's money by gambling. I agree with the member for Coolgardie that only fools are punters, but the evils of gambling are worse when that gambling is unlimited.

Gambling is a fever, the excitement of which is apt to induce a man to risk more money than he intended. Where there is no limit on the amount one can invest, the tendency is when one has lost a pound on the first race, to invest £2 on the next race, the idea being still to show a profit. Similarly with regard to poker playing. But where gambling is restricted, and a ticket is purchased and the result is not known for a long time, in my experience there is no desire to purchase two tickets immediately after buying one, and thereupon buying another half-dozen. The average person is content with an interest in a sweep. The first time I ever saw a spinning jenny running was at a church bazaar. It is possible to go into any barber's shop in Perth and purchase a ticket for a lottery or a sweep. Those lotteries or sweeps are under local supervision. I regret that it was inferred by an hon. member sitting on the Government side of the House that those operations were not under supervision. Before the permission of the Commissioner of Police can be obtained for the running of a sweep it is necessary to furnish information as to the purposes for which the money is to be raised, and subsequently, for a properly audited financial statement to be made available.

Mr. Taylor: If you make any mistake, that is the end of you for the future.

Mr. HUGHES: That is so. I have conducted sweeps in Perth recently, and I know that this is necessary.

Mr. J. H. Smith: That does not apply to Tattersall's or the Golden Casket.

Mr. HUGHES: I referred to local sweeps. I have never heard it suggested that there was anything wrong in connection with the drawing of Tattersall's sweeps. The drawing of sweeps is conducted publicly, and people can attend the drawing and see that their butts have been included. Lotteries run in this State are under strict supervision. In addition, the drawing is always done in the presence of representatives of the Commissioner of Police, who may not be on the platform, but are always in the audience.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: They are there for a good purpose.

Mr. HUGHES: Of course they are. It is desirable that that precaution should be taken. I merely point out the fact, however, to show that it is not right to say that lotteries are carried on here in unrestricted fashion. Every sweep of any dimension at all is under proper supervision.

Mr. Taylor: And no harm has ever come of it.

Mr. HUGHES: No. The secret of the lottery business is that the amount of the investment is known, and that once a person has bought his ticket he is satisfied. I do not consider that if we run a lottery in Western Australia we shall obliterate the transactions here in connection with Tattersall's or the Golden Casket. While people will continue to patronise those lotteries,

should they desire to do so, we shall certainly retain a proportion of the money now leaving our State, and that money can be devoted to the upkeep and maintenance of our hospitals. I make no appeal for support for the Bill, because I believe it will be agreed to. I had intended congratulating one hon. member who discovered a section in the Criminal Code of which, apparently, he thought members were unaware. He could have drawn attention to another section as well. If that hon. member is sincere in his opposition to gambling in any form, he should take advantage of his privileges to bring down a private Bill to repeal the sections of the Criminal Code regarding exemptions.

Mr. Thomson: And he should cut out Tattersall's operations.

Mr. HUGHES: And the Stock Exchange too.

Mr. Taylor: He would have no chance of doing anything with it.

Mr. HUGHES: If an hon. member wishes to stop gambling, it is no good assuring the religious bodies that he is opposed to it. This is the place where he can speak what he thinks, and bring down a Bill to deal with the question.

Mr. Griffiths: What sort of a reception would he get?

Mr. HUGHES: I commend that suggestion to the member for West Perth (Mr. Davy), and when he follows that course I will be prepared to believe that he thinks there should be no gambling in Western Australia.

Mr. MANN (Perth) [9.21]: There are several points of view in connection with the Bill that can well be discussed. The Minister has not told the House what amount of money he expects to raise by means of sweeps, nor has he told us what he estimates the cost of conducting the sweeps will be. Those are two important points. I have to ask myself whether the money to be earned by means of the sweeps will be so much that the Minister will be able to prohibit the voluntary associations that are working to-day. Does the Minister intend to close down the operations of those associations that are now working in a voluntary capacity, and to rely wholly and solely on the amounts raised by means of sweeps? The hospitals in Western Australia are hard up against it for funds. I can speak from first-hand knowledge regarding the Children's Hospital. A vast amount of fine work has been done at that institution, and wonderful operations have been performed, thereby saving the lives of hundreds of children. Up to the present time work has been carried out voluntarily. The Government have paid a subsidy of £6,000 a year, but the voluntary workers have raised from £8,000 to £10,000 a year. Does the Minister intend to stop the operations of those voluntary workers, and to rely wholly and solely on the sweeps?

Does he intend, on the other hand, to encourage those workers to carry on as in the past? My impression, drawn from his speech, was that he intended to take unto himself the sole control of those institutions, that he intended to administer and finance them by means of the sweeps, and that any institution that the Minister desired should not receive any assistance, would be cut out. Such institutions would have to rely upon other means of support. I tried to ascertain from the Minister, which institutions he intended to support, and which he intended to suppress with the passing of the Bill. I have been connected with voluntary work, and voluntary institutions for many years, and much good has been done. Money has been raised voluntarily at little cost. Does the Minister say that all these institutions have to depend on what he directs that they shall receive from the sweeps, the running of which, I am afraid, will be somewhat costly. I am with the Minister in his attempt to better the conditions of our hospitals, and of our charitable institutions. I commend the Minister for his suggested assistance for the child welfare and ante-natal movements. Is the Minister aware that there is an institution that has been carrying on ante-natal work for years, and that the money has been raised by means of art unions? Are those art unions to be suppressed in the future? Is that institution to rely upon what it may receive from the Minister? If that is so, I am afraid the money that will be raised by means of the lotteries will not be sufficient to go round, and that the money raised will not be as much as the Minister anticipates. It is not possible to compare our position with that of Queensland. We will get very little money from the Eastern States, but on the contrary the money raised will be mostly local.

Mr. Clydesdale: No fear!

Mr. MANN: The hon. member may have more inside information than I have, but the fact remains that Tattersall's sweeps have been established for generations, and the Golden Casket for many years. They are established in thickly populous areas, whereas we will have to rely upon the sparse population of Western Australia. It puts me in mind of a number of men sitting down to play Murrumbidgee.

The Premier: What is that?

Mr. MANN: I do not think the Premier is sincere.

The Premier: No, I do not know.

Mr. MANN: It means that we are going to play on ourselves all the time! An objection was raised against the previous Bill that it would impose a tax. In my opinion 90 per cent. of the money that will be raised by means of the lottery will come from the workers, because it is the worker who contributes so largely to the sweeps in the Eastern States. It is the

worker who will contribute to the lottery here. Instead of being taxed 1d. in the £ he will be taxed 1s. in the £.

The Minister for Mines: This is not a taxation measure.

Mr. MANN: It is not a taxation measure, but it provides a means whereby those who are so inclined may invest their money. If I thought that by means of the lottery we would wipe out the operations of Tattersalls and the Golden Casket here, I would say the work was well done. I hope that the work will be well done, and that it will prevent thousands of pounds from going outside the State. I hope that money will remain here for our charitable institutions. I want to know something more about the way the Minister intends to operate the lottery. The House should know what institutions are to participate.

The Minister for Lands: All the hospitals.

Mr. MANN: If the assistance is to be confined to hospitals, there are many worthy institutions that will suffer.

The Minister for Lands: Read the Title of the Bill!

Mr. Hughes: The Bill will not stop the other 1s. and 2s. sweeps.

Mr. MANN: If I understood the Minister aright, the Bill will stop those sweeps, and it may be a good thing too, provided those institutions that rely on small art unions to keep going, will be able to find other means. Take the Fresh Air League on the goldfields; for years a sweep has been run on the fields, and the proceeds have been used in order to bring down boys and girls to the coast during the summer months.

Hon. S. W. Munsie: What profits have they got out of that sweep each year?

Mr. MANN: I do not know, but I understand that the profits have enabled the children to come down each summer.

The Premier: They had been coming down for many years before the sweep was started there.

Mr. MANN: If the money it is proposed to raise by the agency of the Bill is going to be allocated to Government hospitals, or hospitals subsidised by the Government only, then the measure will not prove the great benefit that would have been the case if the Bill submitted two or three years ago had passed into law. That measure made provision for art unions as well, and it was not intended that there should be a costly department set up. The object of that Bill, too, was to assist all worthy charities. Many objections have been voiced outside the Chamber against the Bill now before us, and I consider that the people who have spoken against it are fully entitled to have their views respected. We, as members of Parliament, should give those views the consideration they deserve.

The Premier: That is a rather ambiguous remark.

Mr. MANN: I do not believe that the objectors have raised their voices against the Bill out of pure cussedness, but I do think that when people do not agree with anything that is suggested, they should set up a counter proposal.

The Minister for Lands: You might tell us before you finish whether you are in favour of the Bill or against it.

Mr. MANN: I will make my position very clear.

The Premier: You are making it very clear by having 10s. each way on it.

Mr. MANN: I have no desire to hide my position. In any case, my career during the past few years makes it known how I stand in this matter.

The Premier: Now you have made it clear as to what side you are on.

Mr. MANN: I intend to support the second reading of the Bill, but when it is in Committee I intend to move amendments that will have the effect of preserving the existing rights of certain institutions and associations that have been working for the public benefit in the years that have gone.

Mr. MARSHALL (Murchison) [9.35]: I did not happen to be here when the Minister introduced the Bill. Therefore I had to rely on "Hansard" for what was said. I commend the Minister and the Government for having the courage to introduce a Bill which they felt assured would meet with considerable opposition from certain organised public bodies. Of course those organisations have their views on public matters, and they are entitled to those views. I have no fault to find with the opinions they hold in regard to gambling. Determined to arrive at the exact meaning of the word gambling, I consulted a dictionary. The morning after the Minister introduced the Bill I noticed that certain organised bodies had taken exception to the proposed legislation because, they contended, it would create a spirit of gambling. Now let us see what gambling really means. Having consulted the dictionary, I can only say that it is a case now of "as you were."

Mr. Clydesdale interjected.

Mr. MARSHALL: I will bow to the experience of my friend who interjected, because he does know something about it. I have been unable to get anything in the shape of a definition of the word gambling. Some people say it is merely chance. If that be so, then the person who believes in the Bible believes in chance, because he is sacrificing a lot of material benefit and human nature for a chance. He cannot say where he is going to when he leaves this earth. It is all very well to tell me what I am to do.

Member: There is no doubt as to where you are going.

Mr. MARSHALL: As a matter of fact, a person's presence in this Chamber is a gamble, and every member here knows it, too.

Mr. Maley: You are taking a chance standing under that globe over your head.

Mr. MARSHALL: And the hon. member takes a chance every time he leans over. But is all that any reason why gambling should be restricted? I am not prepared to take that view of it. I admit it may not be good for every section of the community to be forever confronted with hazard or two-up schools. For instance, I do not know whether it would be right for a child to attend a racecourse. With certain reservations, I consider that gambling can be carried on without affecting the efficiency of the nation. My friend opposite talked about destroying the efficiency of the nation by permitting gambling to take place, and only a few evenings ago he eulogised the people of China because they were industrious and because they laboured long hours, from early morning until dusk, and never interfered with anyone. But let me tell him that there are no greater gamblers on the face of the earth than the Chinese. Therefore, if gambling promotes efficiency in one nation, may it not do the same in another? The greatest gamblers are the Orientals and if they are good and steady workers, and of so much value to their nation as the hon. member makes out, I can only come to the conclusion that we shall be doing an injury to our people if we prevent gambling. My friend contended that we cannot bring about greater efficiency in the present day Australian worker because he devotes too much of his time to recreation. How does he reconcile the two arguments? We should try to prevent our hospitals from being so crowded. That state of affairs is due largely to the motherhood of the nation in their young days having been enslaved.

Mr. Brown: And there will be greater slavery if this Bill goes through.

Mr. MARSHALL: Nothing of the kind. I find that the member for Perth (Mr. Mann) is taking a prominent part in the child welfare movement. He told us that infantile mortality is increasing and that it is up to the State to do something to alter that condition of affairs. But why is such a state of things in existence? It is because women, long before they should, slave in factories and, later in life, fail as mothers. If the young women were properly cared for and looked after, probably there would not be so much need for this Bill. I do not know that it can be said that gambling is highly immoral. I do know this, that I never gamble, although I have watched gambling for hours, watched hazards and two-up schools and never had as much as a shilling on anything. It all depends upon the construction of a person. Irrespective of what Act of Parliament you pass, you will never take the gambling instinct away from a person who wants to gamble, nor will you implant the spirit into one who does not want to gamble. I have no inclination for gambling and, by the same rule, the person

who has a love for it will never be robbed of it. It is sheer hypocrisy to say that you can do this or do that in respect of gambling. Laws have been passed to prevent gambling in the community, but it goes on just as much as ever to-day. It has been argued that the effect of gambling is to take money away from the home. Is there such a deplorable state of affairs in existence that a person who desires to indulge in gambling in a mild form should not be able to do so without breaking up his home? If a person who works week in week out cannot earn sufficient to permit him to speculate a few shillings in some form of gambling at the end of the week, the lookout is very poor indeed. Gambling goes on everywhere. It goes on amongst the wealthy on the stock exchange, amongst those who never work. Gambling goes on at the Weld Club. There is no shortage of gambling at the numerous bridge parties that take place in West Perth. The people who indulge in those parties never work. Why should not a man who does work have a little more money for gambling, if he wishes to gamble? So too in regard to intoxicants; some men, if they have a glass of beer and so go home a shilling short, thereby impose on their family a sacrifice in point of food. Other men of course can be drunk for a week, and none but themselves be any the worse. While some men can go to the racecourse and gamble to their heart's content, the working man has to stay in the city and "sneak"—bet illegally; for it would cost him 15s. to go out to the course, and he cannot afford that much. The rich man, on the other hand, gets into his car, pays his admission fee at the gate, and gambles to as high an amount as he likes.

Mr. North: The Bill will not prevent that.

Mr. MARSHALL: Neither will it aggravate it. One hon. member said the Bill would aggravate the existing position. That is nonsense, for we find over many shops in the city the legend, "I communicate with Hobart," or alternatively, "Agent for the Golden Casket." Is the average man any worse off than he was before those lotteries came into existence? I do not think he is. I noticed in the newspaper a statement, by one who should know, that for over 250 years there were legalised lotteries in England. It took the combined wisdom of the United Kingdom 250 years to detect the ill effects of lotteries! I will vote for the Bill without any reservation whatever, because I can see that gambling is ineradicable. I hope the Government will get the Bill through, and that it will relieve the hospitals and charitable institutions, rendering it possible for them to secure up-to-date equipment and thus alleviate some of the trials and tribulations of unfortunate people stricken in health.

Hon. S. W. MUNSIE (Honorary Minister—Hannans—in reply) [9.48]: I thank hon. members for their very mild criticism of the Bill. Some, of course, hold that we

are adopting wrong principles. To those I offer no objection, for of course they have full right to their opinions. The Leader of the Opposition thinks the Bill should state definitely how much is to be paid in prizes. It is my intention to run the lotteries, if Parliament permits me, on exactly the lines on which those in Queensland are run.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: I do not know anything about Queensland.

Mr. Teesdale: You can take my word; it is all right.

Hon. S. W. MUNSIE: I do not intend to specify in the Bill how much is to be paid in prizes.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: I want to know not how much, but what the percentage will be.

Hon. S. W. MUNSIE: The Leader of the Opposition complained that the Minister is to have power to appoint the necessary officials. If I am to conduct the lotteries, I want the right to appoint the officials.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: But you cannot appoint an office boy, except through the Public Service Commissioner.

Hon. S. W. MUNSIE: The lotteries staff are not going to be under the Public Service Commissioner.

Mr. Hughes: You will require only three or four officials.

Hon. S. W. MUNSIE: That is all the hon. member knows about it. During the 3½ years that State lotteries have been held in Queensland, the average number of officials employed has been 92.

Mr. Taylor: You will need half that number for a start.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: Are you going to appoint the lot?

Hon. S. W. MUNSIE: No. There are already in the Public Service many that can be availed of. I shall want some from the Audit Department to see that everything is correctly carried out, so as to facilitate the annual audit. The Leader of the Opposition also wants me to state definitely in the Bill how the money is to be distributed.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: Not in the Bill; but Parliament should determine it.

Hon. S. W. MUNSIE: Parliament will know exactly where the money has gone. That obtains in Queensland.

Mr. Taylor: There a balance sheet is presented to Parliament.

Hon. S. W. MUNSIE: And the Bill provides for my presenting a balance sheet each year. To attempt to enumerate in the Bill the institutions to be benefited would be futile, for within three months after the passage of the Bill some new institution, just as deserving as any existing institution, may spring up.

Mr. Clydesdale: How will you treat it?

Hon. S. W. MUNSIE: It will get its share. The Leader of the Opposition said I had made it easy for him to criticise the Bill by attempting to criticise the Bill brought down by his Government last session. On top of that, he went on to re-



peat the statements he made last session, which when moving the second reading I said were misleading to the public.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: They were not misleading.

Hon. S. W. MUNSIE: I say there were. The Bill provides in black and white—

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: More black than white.

Hon. S. W. MUNSIE: That the money collected under the Bill shall be in excess of the amount already paid out of Consolidated Revenue. Notwithstanding this, the hon. member infers that the Bill will save Consolidated Revenue. It will—from increased expenditure.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: There you are!

Hon. S. W. MUNSIE: But here is the point: The Bill introduced by the late Government was not for the purpose of protecting future revenue, but for cutting out the money the Government were then finding for the charitable institutions. When the then Colonial Secretary was moving the second reading, the present Minister for Lands interjected, "The Bill merely represents a further increase of taxation," following on which the "Hansard" report reads—

The Colonial Secretary: But in this case there is the satisfaction of knowing that the money raised will be definitely applied to the object for which the Bill has been brought down, namely the support of hospitals.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: It is the same as income taxation.

The Colonial Secretary: This measure will reach a large section who, so far, have not contributed directly by way of income taxation. The hospitals and institutions under the Medical Department at present cost the State £180,000 yearly. Of this amount Consolidated Revenue last year contributed £105,000. The passage of this measure will, it is hoped, relieve the Consolidated Revenue to the extent of at least £100,000.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: What will your Bill do?

Hon. S. W. MUNSIE: It will not relieve expenditure from Consolidated Revenue by so much as one penny. The Government guarantee that the amount paid out of Consolidated Revenue to-day for the upkeep of hospitals and charitable institutions will still go on and, if necessary, be increased; but the whole of the money raised under the Bill will be in addition to the contribution from Consolidated Revenue.

The Minister for Lands: You cannot guarantee that if members opposite get over here.

The Premier: That is a remote contingency.

Hon. S. W. MUNSIE: I was surprised to find that the only objection the member for Swan (Mr. Sampson) has to the Bill is that it provides that the prizes shall be

free from State income tax. The Leader of the Opposition complains of the scant information I have given in the Bill. In Queensland there is no Bill. The "Golden Casket" lotteries are conducted under regulation.

Mr. Griffiths: Something in the Queensland Criminal Code permits of that.

Hon. S. W. MUNSIE: Yes. If I received the sanction of the Government I could conduct lotteries just the same as can be done in Queensland, and no one could prosecute me or my agents.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: You could not do so.

Hon. S. W. MUNSIE: I would not attempt to do it. The question is of sufficient importance to bring before the House so that members may say yea or nay to it.

Mr. Taylor: If you lose this Bill you cannot then do it.

Hon. S. W. MUNSIE: I could.

Mr. Taylor: That would be a large order.

Hon. S. W. MUNSIE: The only objection of the member for Swan was to the cutting out of the income tax. He also said he hoped if the Bill was passed it would provide sufficient money to enable the Government to reduce the working hours of nurses. Within a few days of the last election, the hon. member, as Colonial Secretary, controlling this department, publicly announced that he was pleased to say the Government had agreed to reduce the working hours of nurses.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: You promised 44 hours.

Hon. S. W. MUNSIE: And we have given it wherever we promised it. We have passed a Bill in this House legalising it, and it will be passed into law whether the hon. member likes it or not. The Colonial Secretary knew it was not possible for any Government to reduce the working hours of the nursing staff at the Perth Hospital until fresh quarters had been built for the housing of the extra staff necessary.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: You could rent a house.

Hon. S. W. MUNSIE: This session I am asking permission to build a house. Throughout the Government hospitals under the control of the Public Health Department we have reduced the hours of the nurses.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: We did it.

Hon. S. W. MUNSIE: Wherever it could be done it has been done, but the conditions at Perth and Fremantle prevent this.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: Are you giving them long service leave?

The Premier: That is irrelevant.

Hon. S. W. MUNSIE: Most of the criticism has been levelled against the Bill on the score of gambling. This afternoon my presence was required at the King Edward Memorial Hospital at Subiaco. There were

present representatives of the board of management, the matron, and the doctor of the Children's Hospital. During the discussion the doctor made a statement that is the best reply I have heard to critics of this Bill. He said—

To those who criticise the Bill on the ground of gambling with money, I would like to point out that for the actual want of money we are to-day gambling with human life. If anyone who is criticising it comes to the Children's Hospital I can convince him that this is an absolute fact. It is quite true that we are to-day gambling with human life.

Mr. Richardson: That is a one-sided view for him to take. There are other ways of raising money.

Hon. S. W. MUNSIE: This Bill offers no bar to any person who may desire to raise money in any way and present it to the Children's Hospital. I would encourage anyone to do that.

Mr. Mann: Would you object to a committee running a lottery?

Hon. S. W. MUNSIE: I would.

Mr. Mann: How are you to provide the extra £10,000?

Hon. S. W. MUNSIE: That is not being provided by a lottery.

Mr. Mann: A big percentage is.

Hon. S. W. MUNSIE: The hon. member raised the question of the Fresh Air League in Kalgoorlie. If the Bill goes through no sweep will be run in connection with horse-racing in this State to assist the Fresh Air League; but I will get more out of one sweep than the hon. member has obtained in twelve months in Kalgoorlie or the Children's Hospital.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: But you will be doing a bit more harm than he did.

Hon. S. W. MUNSIE: The hon. member has also brought up the question of the cost of raising this money. The Bill provides that regulations shall be drafted for carrying it out, and these regulations will be laid on the Table of the House. The hon. member will then be able to get all the information he wants.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: That is a nice time to get it.

Hon. S. W. MUNSIE: No one can state accurately what it will cost to run the first lottery.

Mr. Mann: Have you any idea?

Hon. S. W. MUNSIE: Yes, by comparison with the costs in Queensland. I am not prepared to say whether it will cost 5½ per cent. or 6 per cent.

Mr. Mann: If you can do it for 10 per cent. you will be doing well.

Hon. S. W. MUNSIE: I will do it for considerably less than that. It does not cost that in Queensland.

Mr. Panton: The first lottery will cost more than the others.

Hon. S. W. MUNSIE: Yes. The hon. member also said I intended to suppress other institutions.

Mr. Mann: Yes.

Hon. S. W. MUNSIE: I do not know to what he refers. It is not my intention to suppress any institution that is in existence, but to assist them all. That is my reason for wanting to raise the money. If such institutions have derived assistance from the running of lotteries, I will help them through the State lotteries, and other charitable institutions as well.

Mr. J. H. Smith: That is your primary reason for bringing down the Bill?

Hon. S. W. MUNSIE: Yes. A good deal of work could be done in the State if we had the means of carrying it out. If our women's organisations could listen for half an hour to a lecture delivered by that splendid woman, the matron of the King Edward Hospital, I am quite sure that even those who have carried resolutions in opposition to the Bill would say, "Go ahead with it; if you want the money get it somehow." If the Bill goes through it will certainly not be the means of corrupting the morals of the people, but of cleansing them by cutting out the number of lotteries and sweeps that are being run to-day and canvassed in every little alcove in the streets of the city. There will be less incentive for young boys and girls to gamble if they can enter a respectable office in the city and purchase a ticket right away from the public gaze, than there is as a result of the canvassing that is now going on in the city. I hope the Bill will pass the second reading, and will in a short time become law.

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

Ayes	..	..	..	34
Noes	..	..	..	6
Majority for	..	..	..	28

#### AYES.

Mr. Angwin	Mr. Mann
Mr. Chesson	Mr. Marshall
Mr. Clydesdale	Mr. McCallum
Mr. Collier	Mr. Millington
Mr. Coverley	Mr. Munsie
Mr. Cunningham	Mr. North
Mr. Denton	Mr. Panton
Mr. Griffiths	Mr. Sleeman
Mr. Heron	Mr. J. H. Smith
Mr. Holman	Mr. Taylor
Mr. Hughes	Mr. Teesdale
Mr. Kennedy	Mr. Thomson
Mr. Lambert	Mr. Troy
Mr. Lamond	Mr. A. Wansbrough
Mr. Lindsay	Mr. Willcock
Mr. Lutey	Mr. Withers
Mr. Maley	Mr. Wilson

(Teller.)

#### NOES.

Mr. Angelo	Mr. Davy
Mr. Barnard	Sir James Mitchell
Mr. Brown	Mr. Richardson

(Teller.)

## PAIRS.

<p>AYES. Mr. Corboy Mr. W. D. Johnson</p>	<p>NOES. Mr. E. B. Johnston Mr. Latham</p>
---	--

Question thus passed.

Bill read a second time.

*In Committee.*

Mr. Lutey in the Chair; the Hon. S. W. Munsie, Honorary Minister, in charge of the Bill.

Clause 1—agreed to.

Clause 2—State Lotteries authorised:

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: I do not agree with the Honorary Minister that the necessary money cannot be raised by proper and legitimate means. The admission that the money cannot be obtained without the aid of this clause would be a scandalous one to make. Let the Honorary Minister tell us what the clause means. It seems to give him authority to run lotteries in any way he pleases. Does he intend to conduct fairly frequent lotteries, and how does he propose to conduct them?

Hon. S. W. Munsie: I am going to appoint the manager and organiser that I want, and he is not in the service now, either.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: Will you give us his name?

Hon. S. W. Munsie: Certainly not. Why should I?

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: We are the representatives of the people, and we are entitled to know. Let the Honorary Minister also tell us where he is going to get the money from? The Treasurer cannot give him one penny for the purpose unless this clause is altered.

Hon. S. W. Munsie: I'll chance that.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: How does the Honorary Minister propose to get money?

Hon. S. W. MUNSIE: The Leader of the Opposition is on the wrong clause altogether, even if he wants that information. This clause is practically the Bill. I intend to run lotteries under exactly the same conditions as Queensland. I gave full information when moving the second reading.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: What do you propose to pay the manager?

Hon. S. W. MUNSIE: When I get the man I want, I will consult him and the Public Service Commissioner.

Mr. MANN: What does the Honorary Minister include in the words "public hospitals and charitable institutions"? Are the hospitals meant those controlled wholly by the Government?

Hon. S. W. Munsie: No.

Mr. MANN: Is such an institution as the Home of Peace to be included in the charitable institutions within the meaning of this Bill?

The Premier: Of course the Home of Peace is a charitable institution.

Hon. S. W. Munsie: Does the Home of Peace get any assistance from the Government to-day?

Mr. MANN: I cannot say.

Hon. S. W. Munsie: I can. It does receive assistance, and it certainly would be included.

Mr. MANN: I hope the Ugly Men will be included, although they cannot be exactly termed a charitable institution.

The Premier: The Ugly Men raise money.

Mr. MANN: But this Bill takes away their power to raise a percentage of their income, and therefore they should be included. Last year they raised £1,700 by one lottery, and gave the amount to the Children's Hospital. If the Honorary Minister will assure me that the Ugly Men's Association will come under this Bill, I shall be satisfied.

The PREMIER: The most deserving charitable institution will receive first consideration. Does the hon. member mean that the Ugly Men should get some of the proceeds under this Bill? What would be the use of giving some of the proceeds to the Ugly Men in order to pass the money on to the Children's Hospital, instead of giving it to the Children's Hospital direct?

Mr. MANN: I do not think the Government will be able to do the work which these numerous institutions have been doing in years gone by.

The Minister for Works: We will relieve you of some of your work.

Mr. MANN: I doubt it very much, and I think the Children's Hospital will be hampered, because, in addition to the £6,000 given to it by the Government, the institution has to raise upwards of £10,000 annually, and a large proportion of that amount is raised by means of lotteries. Does the Minister intend to prevent the small lotteries, and if so will he make up for that by providing £10,000 in addition? If that is the Minister's intention, I have nothing to complain of.

The Minister for Lands: We cannot put the Children's Hospital in a different position from other hospitals regarding the sweeps.

Mr. MANN: In that event, the Government must provide the hospital with greater revenue.

The Minister for Lands: Is not the Bill for that purpose?

Mr. MANN: I am afraid the Government will not realise from their efforts so much as they anticipate.

The Minister for Lands: The Bill will do some people out of their jobs!

Mr. MANN: The Minister has cast a slur upon some people—

The Minister for Lands: It is true.

Mr. MANN: He said it would do me out of my job.

The Premier: He said nothing of the sort. He said it would do some people out of their jobs.

Mr. MANN: And those people are giving their time and energy for nothing!

Mr. Teesdale: Why not give the scheme a "fly" and see how it gets on?

The Premier: Are you afraid this will suppress the Ugliers?

Mr. MANN: I am serious, and I am entitled to the information.

Hon. S. W. MUNSIE: The member for Perth is perturbed about the position of the Children's Hospital and the Ugly Men's Association.

Mr. Mann: I mentioned the Home of Peace too.

Hon. S. W. MUNSIE: I satisfied the hon. member regarding the Home of Peace when I said that that institution would be treated as a charitable institution if the Bill were passed. I do not know what amount of money has been raised by the Ugly Men's Association for the Children's Hospital or for any other institution by means of a sweep or lottery. I do not think they have raised £10 as a result of a lottery.

Mr. Mann: We raised £1,700 last year.

Hon. S. W. MUNSIE: That was by means of a sweep on the Melbourne Cup; that is not a lottery in the sense implied in the Bill. If the Bill be agreed to, tickets will not be on sale in Perth. We will have sufficient control to run our sweep, just as Tattersalls and the Queensland Government run their sweeps. No one can walk into a shop in Perth and buy a ticket in Tattersalls or the Golden Casket sweeps. The individual pays his money and gets a receipt, and the agent sends to the East for the ticket. If the State lottery is established, tickets will not be spread broadcast throughout the State but they will be dealt with in the same way as the other sweeps.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: We are to have one right up-to-date!

Hon. S. W. MUNSIE: When the individual pays his money to one of our agents, he will get a receipt and the ticket will be sent to him by the department. In what other way, would we know what number of tickets had been sold?

Mr. Taylor: That is not the method adopted when the member for East Perth runs a sweep.

Hon. S. W. MUNSIE: No!

The Premier: His is all in.

Mr. Hughes: The method indicated by the Honorary Minister will make jobs for people.

Hon. S. W. MUNSIE: But it will give the Government control.

Mr. Mann: How will you make up the £10,000 to the Children's Hospital?

Hon. S. W. MUNSIE: If the hon. member will prove to me that that £10,000 was raised wholly and solely by means of sweeps, I will give him that amount. Not an average of £1,500 has been raised by means of sweeps, and he knows it.

Mr. Mann: That is not correct and the Minister knows it too.

Hon. S. W. MUNSIE: Only two sweeps have been run for that purpose.

Mr. Mann: The Trayning Race Club ran a sweep and others have been running sweeps all over the country for that purpose.

Hon. S. W. MUNSIE: I do not want to interfere with any organisation that is raising money for the Children's Hospital to-day. I hope they will continue; they will have to do so, because not enough money will be raised by means of the lottery. The money to be raised under the Bill is to be regarded as in excess of what institutions are getting to-day. I hope the member for Perth will continue his good work, but I cannot allow outside organisations to interfere with me in the running of the lottery.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: We now have some information as to the work the manager of the lottery will have to do. I suggest there is no provision for the expenditure of a single penny in the Bill.

The Minister for Lands: Cannot we do what you always did and pay out of suspense account?

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: We carried on work that was authorised by Parliament.

Mr. Hughes: How much did you overdraw the Treasurer's advance account last time? A quarter of a million?

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: Very likely we did, and the money was well spent on works authorised by Parliament. Parliament has not authorised the expenditure involved in the Bill. I do not want the measure at all, but if we are to pass it, we should make provision for those things that are necessary to make it effective.

Mr. CLYDESDALE: The point raised by the member for Perth is important. The Ugly Men's Association, by means of sweeps raise £1,500 every year. Will the Government prevent them from obtaining that money, and if so, will the Minister make them a contribution of that amount from the results of the State lottery? Also, the Returned Soldiers last year raised some £2,000. Are they to be allowed to run their sweep, or will the Government prevent it, and subsidise them to that amount?

Mr. Panton: And will the same thing apply to the Trades Hall's effort?

Mr. Hughes: That is of more use to the community than are the Ugly Men's efforts.

Mr. CLYDESDALE: It may be so, but I should like to know what the position is to be.

The PREMIER: One would imagine that the object of the Bill was to deprive the Children's Hospital of some of the funds now raised for it. The object of the Bill is to provide money for hospitals, including the Children's Hospital. If any steps are taken that will prevent the Ugly Men from raising £1,500 for the Children's Hospital—

Mr. Clydesdale: Not for the hospital, but for other objects.

The PREMIER: The member for Perth said that £1,500 was raised for the Children's Hospital. If the Children's Hospital is to be deprived of money raised in that way, it will of course be recouped from the State lottery. The Bill can only result in increased contributions to those institutions it is designed to assist.

Mr. Clydesdale: What about the R.S.L.?

The PREMIER: How can it be said that institutions coming under the Bill—

Mr. Mann: They do not come under the Bill; the Minister has said that.

The PREMIER: No, the hon. member is wrong in believing that the Minister said that charitable institutions are only such institutions as are subsidised by the Government. The Minister said no such thing, except in regard to the Home of Peace. Many charitable institutions are receiving no Government subsidy whatever. Members need not be afraid that deserving institutions will suffer from the passing of the Bill.

Mr. Mann: I am prepared to accept the Premier's assurance of that.

Mr. HUGHES: Many institutions are raising money for worthy objects. I do not think the Government will rigidly enforce the Criminal Code to prevent those institutions from raising money by small, shilling sweeps. Can we have an assurance from the Premier that these sweeps will not be suppressed?

The Minister for Lands: I hope he will not give it. They are against the law.

Mr. HUGHES: I cannot see why it is necessary to close down all those sweeps simply because the Government are to run a 5s. sweep.

The Premier: I am not going to say whether they will be closed or not.

Mr. HUGHES: We ought to have the point cleared up. The Minister said all other lotteries would have to go.

Mr. Taylor: He was emphatic about it.

Mr. Clydesdale: It means they all have to go.

Mr. Mann: On this point the Minister says one thing, and the Premier another.

The Premier: I did not say whether or not they would have to go.

Mr. HUGHES: The Minister is unduly alarmed if he thinks a shilling sweep is going to militate against the success of his State lottery. If the member for Canning and I were associated in running a shilling sweep I do not think the Honorary Minister would put us in gaol and destroy the party majority. If these things are well supervised by the police there is no need for a rigid enforcement of the law.

Mr. TAYLOR: There seems to be no doubt as to the attitude of the Honorary Minister. The clause, however, is silent concerning the revenue of the Ugly Men's Association.

The Minister for Lands: That is purely a charitable institution.

Mr. TAYLOR: If the Ugly Men are prevented from going on in this way, many individuals who are now being assisted will be deprived of help. The Government may make good that portion of the Association's revenue that goes to charitable institutions, but may not do so in the individual cases.

Clause put and passed.

Clause 3—Application of proceeds:

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: I move an amendment—

*That in line 5 after "institutions" the following words be inserted: "and provide free hospital accommodation for a man earning £4 a week or less, and, if married, his wife and family."*

This will bring the Bill into line with the Hospitals Bill, the clause in which dealing with the subject was passed by the Committee last year.

Hon. S. W. Munsie: This clause does not deal with that subject.

The CHAIRMAN: I must rule the amendment out of order as it imposes a charge upon the revenue.

*Dissent from Chairman's Ruling.*

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: I move—

*That the Chairman's ruling be disagreed with.*

*[The Speaker resumed the Chair.]*

The Chairman having stated the dissent.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: If the Honorary Minister raises £100, there are two ways of spending it—by payment to a hospital and by payment to a charitable institution. My amendment proposes a third way, which will not add to the burdens of the people: the £100 will merely be divided into three parts instead of two. Moreover, this money does not go into Consolidated Revenue at all, and the fund is specially controlled by the Honorary Minister.

Mr. Speaker: There is a point of order. I am informed that the amendment moved by the Leader of the Opposition is to add the words "and providing free hospital accommodation for a man earning £1 per week or less, and, if married, his wife and family." Provided that there had been nothing in the Bill making it incumbent upon the Government to continue their subsidy or assistance to hospitals and that the whole of the funds for the maintenance, support, and continuance had been derived from consultations, sweeps, or lotteries, the amendment would have been in order. But since it is a possibility that the amounts raised by these means may not relieve the Government of part of the responsibility of providing for the support of hospitals and for the maintenance of charitable institutions, in the event of these amounts running short, the Government would then be

obliged, even by the terms of the Bill, to provide for the continuance of hospitals and charitable institutions, which would possibly impose a burden upon the people. Therefore, I uphold the Chairman's ruling.

*The Chairman resumed the Chair.*

Progress reported.

#### ADJOURNMENT—SPECIAL.

The PREMIER (Hon. P. Collier—Boulder) I move—

*That the House at its rising adjourn till 4.30 p.m. on Thursday.*

Question put and passed.

*House adjourned at 11.10 p.m.*

## Legislative Council.

*Thursday, 9th October, 1924.*

President's indisposition ... ..	Page 1180
Question : Water Supply, Osborne Park filter beds ... ..	1180
Bills : Legal Practitioners Act Amendment, 3A. ... ..	1180
Jury Act Amendment, 2B. ... ..	1183
Trust Funds Investment, Com. ... ..	1186
Private Savings Bank, recom. ... ..	1187

#### PRESIDENT'S INDISPOSITION.

The Clerk announced that, owing to the absence of the President, who was suffering from a severe cold, it would be necessary to appoint a Deputy President.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY (Hon. J. M. Drew—Central) [4.31]: I move—

*That the Chairman of Committees be appointed Deputy President during the temporary absence of the President.*

Question put and passed.

#### QUESTION—WATER SUPPLY, OSBORNE PARK FILTER BEDS.

Hon. C. F. BAXTER asked the Colonial Secretary: 1, Is he aware that the new work recently constructed at the Osborne Park filter beds, under the personal supervision and to the design of the Engineer-in-Chief, is badly cracked? 2, If so, to what extent? 3, Does the Engineer-in-Chief attribute the cracks, which have already appeared, to faulty design or construction?

The COLONIAL SECRETARY replied: 1 and 2, No. Some small cracks, of a nature not unusual in a wall of the length of Osborne Park filters, have developed; the work is not badly cracked. 3, Neither.

#### BILL—LEGAL PRACTITIONERS ACT AMENDMENT.

##### *Second Reading.*

Hon. A. LOVEKIN (Metropolitan) [4.34] in moving the second reading said: I feel that I shall add to my unpopularity in this Chamber by attempting to sponsor this Bill.

Hon. J. Duffell: Don't do that!

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: I realise that the Bill comes before us with some measure of prejudice against it by reason of the fact that it was introduced in another place by a member of the Labour Party who, if he does not hold extreme views himself, often gives expression to them. If I thought that this was a Bill that had been introduced in this Chamber or in another place by an hon. member for his own benefit, I should not agree to support it, much as I might respect the principle the Bill contained. In this particular instance, although the Bill was introduced by a member who is seeking to enter the legal profession, I am advised that it will not in any way benefit him personally, because he has already had to prepare for his examination and he expects to submit himself for examination in November next. There is no doubt that the hon. member who introduced the Bill in the Lower Chamber felt the difficulty of the position in which he was placed. He has spent a good deal of his life in the Government service. As an accountant in the Audit Department, he fully qualified himself and passed in commercial law. Like many others, he has some ambition in life. He desired to improve his position and the law appealed to him as a means by which he could do so. Having had to earn his living, he has not been able to find the necessary money to go to England, where he could enter the chambers of a barrister, read law and, at intervals, eat the requisite dinners at one of the Inns of Court, and so, without any examination whatever, qualify to become a barrister of the court.

Hon. A. J. H. Saw: Where can that be done without passing an examination?

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: I am informed that the examination consists of eating some six dinners during each term and having a sort of conversation with the eminent lawyers present to prove you are an educated person and qualified in the law.

Hon. A. J. H. Saw: Are you sure of your facts?

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: I do not know whether that is so or not, but I understand those are the facts. In Melbourne one can go to the university, where there is a Chair of Law, and by passing the necessary examinations in three years, can become qualified as a practitioner. Such a person can come here, where we have no Chair of Law at the University, and, by paying the necessary fees, be admitted to the right to practice. In the case of a person who desires to improve his position, but has no money, and has to work for his living, it