

Legislative Council,

Wednesday, 21st December, 1932.

	PAGE
Assent to Bills	2707
Petition : Lotteries (Control) Bill	2707
Bills : Lotteries (Control), all stages	2707
Secession Referendum, Assembly's Message	2739
Reserves, Assembly's Message	2739
Metropolitan Whole Milk, Assembly's Message	2739
Wheat Pool, recom., report, 3r.	2740
Appropriation, 3r.	2744
Criminal Code (Chapter XXXVII.), Amendment, all stages	2744
Tenants, Purchasers and Mortgagees Relief Act, 1930 (No. 2), all stages	2745
Auctioneers Act Amendment, all stages	2746
Lotteries (Control), Assembly's Message	2746
Wheat Pool, Assembly's Message	2746
Timber Workers, 2r. defeated	2749
Motion : "Golden Eagle" nugget	2746
Leave of absence for President	2750
Close of Session, complimentary remarks	2750
Adjournment	2751

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

ASSENT TO BILLS.

Message from the Lieut.-Governor received and read notifying assent to the undermentioned Bills:—

- 1, Reduction of Rents Act Continuance.
- 2, Mortgagees' Rights Restriction Act Continuance.
- 3, Financial Emergency Act Amendment.

PETITION—LOTTERIES (CONTROL) BILL.

HON. J. J. HOLMES (North) [4.33]: For and on behalf of Hon. J. Nicholson I have to present a petition in connection with the Lotteries Bill. The petitioners desire to be called to the Bar of the House. The clerk has certified that the petition is in conformity with the Standing Orders. It is signed by 15 representatives of different organisations. I move—

That the petition be received and read.

Question put and passed.

BILL—LOTTERIES (CONTROL).

First Reading.

Received from the Assembly and read a first time.

Second Reading.

THE CHIEF SECRETARY (Hon. C. F. Baxter—East) [4.40] in moving the second reading said: The Bill is being introduced

with the object of legalising certain forms of gambling. I must admit that the task of introducing such a measure is not a very congenial one, but it is considered necessary that gambling, if it cannot be stopped altogether, should be controlled more effectively. The Bill refers particularly to lotteries and sweeps. At the present time we have all sorts of sweeps, art unions, crossword, news-word and other sorts of puzzles operating over which there is no effective control. Most of these are represented as being in aid of some charitable object.

There is one vital consideration in a measure of this description, and that is the inherent liking of the average Australian for a modest gamble, even if it is only a six-penny crossword puzzle competition, and, if he cannot have it legally, then he is quite prepared to have it illegally. It is this trait that we wish to control and if possible to direct into avenues that will return some useful result. The purpose of the Bill is to form a Commission of four members who shall have power to conduct lotteries, or to receive and make recommendations to the Minister in regard to applications made by other persons to conduct lotteries. The Commission will have full power to control and supervise such lotteries that may be conducted. Such lotteries will only be allowed for the purpose of raising funds for charitable purposes.

Many citizens object, on conscientious grounds, to any form of gambling. Many of these are prepared to admit that it is a vice that cannot be stamped out altogether, and would prefer to see suitable legislation enacted to enable a more efficient control to be exercised over it. Such control as is provided for in the Bill will enable many of the abuses arising from certain forms of gambling, to be stamped out. Unfortunately many of our voluntary charitable institutions have had to rely on lotteries and sweeps to raise funds to carry on their work. Although opportunities are ever present for voluntary donations, such donations are not sufficient to meet the needs of the various institutions. Many people will not give a straight-out contribution to charity, but will willingly purchase a ticket that offers a gamble, never mind how worthless the prize may be. The object of the Bill is not to encourage gambling, but to control it.

For the past 15 months the Government have recognised that certain latitude must be granted and, with the object of control-

ling the business as far as possible, have permitted the conduct of certain sweeps under State control. This action meant that we had to override the Criminal Code to a certain extent, but the sweeps have been conducted in a way that has removed many of the most objectionable features. The result has been that to date nine consultations have been held. The total receipts amounted to £75,504 13s. 6d., and the prize money distributed to £34,200 10s. 5d. Expenses amounted to £14,126 15s. 5d., equal to 18.7 per cent. of the gross receipts, and the amount available for distribution to charitable institutions amounted to £27,168 7s. 8d. The expenses included the 10 per cent. commission paid to sellers of tickets.

If this Bill is enacted it is expected that the expenses will be reduced and it is safe to assume that the expenses over and above 10 per cent. commission paid to ticket sellers will not exceed 6 per cent. One result of these State lotteries has been to retain within the State a large sum of money that would otherwise have been sent out to purchase tickets in sweeps such as Tattersalls and the Golden Casket. This also is one of the aspects to which serious consideration must be given as it is essential that all money be kept in circulation within the State. It cannot be denied that prior to the inception of State lotteries many thousands of pounds were sent out of the State annually to purchase tickets in other sweeps.

The provisions of the measure include that for a lotteries commission, which will have statutory authority and will be indemnified against the provisions of the Criminal Code and the Police Act. This provision will also apply to other persons or bodies who may be given permission to conduct sweeps and lotteries. Then there are the limitation of the number of sweeps to not more than 15 in any one year, and the definition of a "lottery." The present definition of "lottery" in the Criminal Code has been difficult to interpret, as certain competitions which were deemed to require an element of skill were not considered to be lotteries. They are exemplified in the present newspaper competitions, in which the skill required is, to say the least, of a minor character. All such competitions will be included under the definition of "lotteries." Then there is the provision that any person wanting to conduct a lottery must apply to the commission for permission.

Such an application is to be submitted by the commission to the Commissioner of Police for a report as to suitability of the person applying, and on receipt of that report the application will be submitted to the Minister for his decision. The commission will be held responsible for the conduct of State-wide lotteries in accordance with the conditions set out in the Bill. The total expenses are not to exceed 25 per cent. of the gross amount received in subscriptions, the balance remaining after deduction of prize money and expenses to be applied to charitable purposes specified in the permit. Wide powers are to be granted to the Commissioner of Police in order that the police may have the right to enter any place where a lottery is being conducted, with power to examine books, vouchers, etc., and to have a representative present when drawings are being made; and power to enter, by force if necessary, places where lotteries are suspected of being conducted without a permit, with the right to seize and take possession of all monies, papers, documents, etc., relating to any such lottery.

The definition of "illegal lotteries" includes all competitions or lotteries for which no permit has been given, and all lotteries or sweeps conducted and drawn wholly outside the State. The advertising of such illegal lotteries is prohibited. A number of other provisions in the Bill are self explanatory. It will never be possible to excise gambling altogether, and the only thing left to do is to control it so that it will not become a serious evil. It has existed throughout the ages, and if one would but take time to consider the various aspects of everyday life he would be surprised to find to what an extent his actions and purposes hinge on what, after all, is nothing less than a gamble. When such chances are increased and organised so as to become a danger to the community, they must be controlled. It is not always possible or advisable to try to control them by making laws which will make such acts criminal acts, because such laws will often defeat their purpose. For bidden fruits are sweetest, and we have had an example of this in the effort made by the United States to establish prohibition. As it is impossible to stamp out gambling altogether, the next best thing is to so direct and control it that the State and people as a whole will benefit from it. The Bill provides the machinery to do this. I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

Amendment—Six months.

HON. G. FRASER (West) [4.51]: I move an amendment—

That the words "now" be struck out and "this day six months" inserted in lieu.

I move this amendment in view of the fact that we are now in the dying hours of the session, leaving no time for consideration of this very contentious measure.

HON. SIR EDWARD WITTENOOM (North—on amendment) [4.52]: I will support the Minister in this.

THE PRESIDENT: The hon. member must speak to the amendment now before the Chair.

HON. SIR EDWARD WITTENOOM: I am opposed to the amendment because I believe the spirit of speculation permeates almost every Australian. I am in favour of sweeps and the totalisator, but am opposed to the bookmaker: not because I regard him as being worse than anyone else, but because unfortunately he gives credit whereas the totalisator and the sweeps do not. I recognise that, were it not for the bookmaker, there would be no races, and so I will not say anything against him, but will oppose the amendment and support the Bill.

HON. J. J. HOLMES (North—on amendment) [4.54]: The reason given by Mr. Fraser for moving his amendment is that we are close to the end of the session and therefore have not the time to deal with the Bill. I take a contrary view; if we cannot do it this side of Christmas, then there is plenty of time for it in the new year. I should not like it to go abroad that this House could not attend to its duty merely because Christmas was approaching. I do not care whether the Bill be read a second time now or in six days or in six months, but I should like to hear the pros and cons of the Bill.

THE CHIEF SECRETARY (Hon. C. F. Baxter—East—on amendment) [4.55]: Nobody is more astonished than am I at such an amendment being moved on the ground submitted by the hon. member, the lateness of the hour in the session. During the 19 years I have been here we have never before had so clean a Notice Paper in the closing days of the session, and there is still a large part of the week left in which to consider, if

necessary, more contentious measures than is this one.

Hon. J. Cornell: Would you agree to leave it over until to-morrow?

THE CHIEF SECRETARY: If the House wishes it, yes. I have no particular desire to get through it to-day. It is unthinkable that we should use the guillotine on an important measure on which there has been so much discussion outside of Parliament, and so much investigation. I do not think members will take on themselves the responsibility for saying that, with the greater part of the week ahead of us, we have not time to consider the Bill.

Hon. G. Fraser: A few sessions ago, in the late hours of the session, we refused to deal with a Health Bill, a more important measure than this.

THE CHIEF SECRETARY: But never before have we had the Notice Paper in such good order at this time of the session. The amendment offers an apparently easy way of defeating the Bill on the plea that there is no time for its consideration. But the House must recognise that there is ample time for its consideration. This is one of the very few Bills that has been widely discussed for months past. It has been discussed from every angle in the Press and wherever in the city men assemble. Probably there has never been a more controversial Bill brought before Parliament, yet I do not know of any ordinary citizen, much less a member of Parliament, who is not fully acquainted with every phase of the measure. So I hope the House will not injure itself by supporting the amendment.

HON. J. CORNELL (South—on amendment) [4.57]: I am not a wowser, for I have played two-up and hazards and a lot of other things, but I absolutely decline on the last day of the session to discuss a measure as far-reaching in its effects as is this Bill. I do not propose to enter into a discussion of the pros and cons of the Bill at this stage, or even the advisability or inadvisability of supporting the amendment. The Bill legalises lotteries, which are now illegal. In 1924 the Labour Government brought down a similar measure, but they saw to it that it reached this House with ample time for consideration. If members will turn to "Hansard" they will find that 10 members voted for the second reading of that Bill, 15 against it,

four paired, and so, with the President in the Chair, it was decided by a full House. That Bill came to us on the 22nd October, and the motion for the second reading was put on the 25th November. So the Bill was in the House for a clear month. At this late hour of the session I decline to give consideration to so important a measure as this. It is not right for the Chief Secretary to say that we are shirking our duty.

The Chief Secretary: I did not use those words.

Hon. J. CORNELL: No, not exactly those words, but the Minister said the Notice Paper was never before so clean at this stage of the session and so we ought to go on with the Bill. Consideration that ought to have been shown this House has not been shown, for this Bill has been in another place for about three months. Therefore I decline to consider it.

HON. J. T. FRANKLIN (Metropolitan—on amendment) [5.0]: I intend to support the amendment for reasons similar to those advanced by Mr. Fraser and Mr. Cornell. The Bill is of importance to the whole of the State and merits every possible investigation. I should also like to know what it is proposed to do with regard to the petition that was received to-day. We have not the time in which to comply with its request. The Bill has been before another place for many weeks and it has reached us in the closing hours of the session. The time is much too short in which to give the Bill the consideration it deserves. I intend to support the amendment.

HON. J. M. MACFARLANE (Metropolitan-Suburban—on amendment) [5.2]: Apparently there is a feeling in the House that the consideration of the Bill should remain in abeyance for a time. I will not support the amendment, not because I particularly want to see the Bill passed—I gamble perhaps as little as anyone in the House—but a Bill of a similar nature was before the House on a previous occasion and the Bill itself has been before another place for a considerable time and members have had every opportunity of following the debates in another place.

Hon. J. Cornell: But this was made a new Bill by another place last night.

The Chief Secretary: Nothing of the sort.

Hon. J. M. MACFARLANE: We have dealt with Bills of equal importance in the closing days of the session, and there is no reason why this should not receive the same consideration, even though we are near the end of our labours for the time. I suppose every member has made up his mind as to the attitude he will adopt towards the Bill. If necessary, the debate could be adjourned until the next sitting of the House.

HON. W. J. MANN (South-West—on amendment) [5.4]: I intend to oppose the amendment. I am rather surprised at the attitude of some hon. members regarding the closing hours of the session. We are here to attend to public business, and because we are within a few days of Christmas, that is no reason why we should refuse to attend to Bills that are sent to us for consideration. The Government can be excused for the lateness of the appearance of the measure in this House. As a country member who has to travel 150 miles to attend the sittings of the Legislative Council, I am prepared to come back after Christmas, if necessary. The Bill is of considerable importance to the community, and it should receive the consideration it deserves at the hands of the House.

HON. C. H. WITTENOOM (South-East—on amendment) [5.6]: This is an important measure, and we have all to-day and this evening, and all night, if necessary, in which to consider it. There is even nothing to prevent us coming back to-morrow to discuss it if we cannot complete the debate to-day. More important measures than this have been dealt with in the closing hours of the session, and if we cannot finish our work before Christmas, we can come back early in January. I intend to oppose the amendment.

HON. H. J. YELLAND (East—on amendment) [5.7]: We cannot get away from the fact that usually there is a rush of important business of this sort at the end of the session. A Bill such as the one we are now asked to consider should not have been submitted at such a late hour when it is recognised that there are only

two days left in which to complete our labours. I understand that every effort is to be made to conclude the session before Christmas. Why rush the Bill through now, remembering, as the Chief Secretary said, that it has been before another place for three months. It is not fair to ask members to do this.

The Chief Secretary: I did not say anything of the kind. I object to that statement.

The PRESIDENT: The Chief Secretary objects to the hon. member's remark.

Hon. H. J. YELLAND: I misunderstood him: I withdraw willingly. Even if it has been before another place for only two months, this House should not be expected to pass it in two days.

HON. SIR CHARLES NATHAN (Metropolitan-Suburban—on amendment) [5.9]: We have been discussing the amendment for an hour, and in that time three or four speeches might easily have been made on the second reading. I hope no further time will be occupied in further discussing what is merely a side issue. I oppose the amendment.

HON. L. B. BOLTON (Metropolitan—on amendment) [5.10]: I too oppose the amendment. I will take the risk of saying that a considerable amount of time has been wasted by some members during the present session. Some members rise and tell us that they will be brief in their remarks; they go on talking for half an hour and repeat that they intend to be brief.

Hon. J. Cornell interjected.

Hon. L. B. BOLTON: Mr. Cornell is one of the offenders in that respect. I intend to oppose the amendment.

HON. E. H. H. HALL (Central—on amendment) [5.11]: I agree it is regrettable that the Bill should have been brought down so late in the session, but we as the law-makers of the State must not be content to allow the present unsatisfactory and uncontrolled state of affairs regarding gambling to continue one day longer than we can help. I shall oppose the amendment.

HON. G. W. MILES (North) [5.12]: I move—

That the question be now put.

Motion put and passed.

Amendment (six months) put, and a division taken with the following result:—

Ayes	6
Noes	19
Majority against	13	—

AYES.

Hon. J. Cornell	Hon. E. H. Harris
Hon. J. T. Franklin	Hon. W. H. Kitson
Hon. G. Fraser	Hon. H. J. Yelland
	(Teller.)

NOES.

Hon. C. F. Baxter	Hon. G. W. Miles
Hon. L. B. Bolton	Hon. R. G. Moore
Hon. A. M. Clydesdale	Hon. T. Moore
Hon. J. M. Drew	Hon. Sir C. Nathan
Hon. J. Ewing	Hon. H. V. Piesse
Hon. E. H. H. Hall	Hon. E. Rose
Hon. V. Hamersley	Hon. Sir E. Wittenoom
Hon. J. J. Holmes	Hon. C. H. Wittenoom
Hon. J. M. Macfarlane	Hon. E. H. Gray
Hon. W. J. Mann	(Teller.)

Amendment thus negatived.

Hon. W. H. KITSON: In order that I may have an opportunity to study the Bill, I move—

That the debate be adjourned.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: By way of personal explanation, I wish to inform members that the Bill is in their hands, and if they do not desire to deal with the measure to-night, I shall not attempt to force it through.

Hon. E. H. Harris: You will give us an opportunity to read the Bill?

The CHIEF SECRETARY: Yes, it is in the hands of hon. members.

The PRESIDENT: The motion cannot be discussed.

Hon. G. W. Miles: Can we move an amendment?

The PRESIDENT: No.

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

Ayes	10
Noes	15

Majority against .. 5

AYES.

Hon. J. Cornell	Hon. E. H. Harris
Hon. J. M. Drew	Hon. W. H. Kitson
Hon. J. T. Franklin	Hon. C. H. Wittenoom
Hon. G. Fraser	Hon. H. J. Yelland
Hon. E. H. Gray	Hon. R. G. Moore
	(Teller.)

NOES.

Hon. C. F. Baxter	Hon. G. W. Miles
Hon. L. B. Bolton	Hon. T. Moore
Hon. A. M. Clydesdale	Hon. Sir C. Nathan
Hon. J. Ewing	Hon. H. V. Piesse
Hon. V. Hamersley	Hon. E. Rose
Hon. J. J. Holmes	Hon. Sir E. Wittenoom
Hon. J. M. Macfarlane	Hon. E. H. H. Hall
Hon. W. J. Mann	(Teller.)

Motion thus negatived.

HON. A. M. CLYDESDALE (Metropolitan-Suburban) [5.20]: The Bill before us is long overdue; I am afraid that is now a stock phrase. However, if members attempt to satisfy all sections of the community they will be sadly astray in their judgment. There is one section of the community that will not listen to anyone being permitted to gamble. Another section, if given carte blanche, will run riot and spend more than they can afford, with the result that their dependants and they themselves suffer in the process. Notwithstanding any laws that may be placed on the statute-book, the majority of Western Australians, if not permitted to do so in this State, will find ways and means of investing in other countries. As we know, an enormous amount of money has been sent to the Eastern States extending over many years past. Since the appointment by the Government of the Art Union Control Committee to conduct consultations in Western Australia, the position has gradually improved. The committee have been in existence for 18 months only, and by the judicious expenditure of money on advertising, the results have exceeded anticipations. Since the first sweep was conducted by the committee, there has been a gradual demand for tickets from the Eastern States, and during the last six months the amount received from the East for each consultation has more than doubled. By yesterday's mail applications for 600 tickets were received. Another factor to be considered is that the majority of the Western Australia public are now investing in their own consultations instead of sending their money out of the State. I estimate the balance to-day, taking into consideration money received from the East and the amount kept in this State, amounts to at least £5,000 per annum in our favour. There is no doubt that if no restrictions are imposed on the number of sweeps to be conducted, a very large sum of money will be obtained. One has to ask this question. "What amount of money is required to place legitimate charitable organisations on a sound footing?" From my experience as chairman of the control board, I would say that the maximum amount required annually is from £25,000 to £30,000. One consultation a month, with odd ones for special occasions, would be sufficient to provide that amount. Should any attempt be made at present to

raise more than the amount I have mentioned, I say without fear of contradiction, taking into consideration the size of our population, that we would be extracting more money from the people than they could legitimately afford. I feel sure that by conducting a monthly consultation, the cost of administration will be considerably reduced from the present figure. There is a vast difference between running at least 12 consultations a year and running the five that were conducted by the committee during their first 12 months. Less money will have to be expended and all that will be required will be a few more clerks to dispose of the extra number of tickets, thereby making available more money for distribution. Excepting the "die-hards," who will never be convinced, there is a marked change apparent in the opinions of the people compared with the experience of a few years ago when a Bill of almost similar character was rejected in this Chamber. Prominent churchmen have considerably altered their views, and have now arrived at the conclusion that properly conducted and controlled art unions represent the most sensible means by which the funds necessary for our charitable organisations can be raised. Let members visualise the position if the Bill be rejected. Sweeps, puzzles, tipping competitions and so forth will be in such evidence that the state of affairs will be intolerable. Under a system of control by a board or commission, there will be little to complain of. You, Mr. President, will probably remember that when the Labour Government were in office they decided to stop the tipping competitions that were flourishing at that period. From what I can ascertain, if the Bill does not become law, no Government will have the legal power to put a stop to such competitions. If that should arise, then the possibilities are that a worse position will be apparent in the future. I do not know that any member of this Chamber could be placed in such a category, but certainly no one would accuse me of being a "wowser." On the other hand, it is impossible for members to sit here and suggest that the present-day conditions should continue. At this juncture those in charge of our charitable organisations are at their wit's end to know how to raise funds. They are doing everything they can with the means at their disposal to provide money

with which to continue their operations. If that money is found for them by means of consultations or lotteries, they will be able to devote more time to the domestic affairs of their institutions, and do the work better than is possible under existing conditions. In connection with the expenditure necessary to run consultations, it may interest members to know that over a period of 15 months, nine sweeps have been conducted. The total money received has been £75,505. of which £34,210 was distributed as prize money, representing 45.3 per cent. of the takings. The expenditure aggregated £14,127, which is 18 per cent. only of the total amount received, and includes 10 per cent. commission paid to sellers of tickets. The balance, £27,168, was distributed among the various institutions and that amount represents 35.9 per cent. of the total proceeds. I consider that the time has arrived when the present unsatisfactory position should be rectified. What will happen if steps are not taken in that direction? Soon a general election will be held, and it will be fought on two subjects—secession and consultations.

Hon. Sir Edward Wittenoom: You mean lotteries?

Hon. A. M. CLYDESDALE: We know there is a section that will not support gambling in any shape or form. Everyone knows that if a gambler is allowed to do what he likes, it becomes necessary to protect him against himself. I regard the position of the gambler as akin to the situation that arose in Melbourne some considerable time ago when the police strike occurred. With the absence of members of the police force from the streets, there was no one to control the people, who soon got out of hand, and rushed around smashing windows and taking what they desired. If a gambler is not controlled, he will run riot and spend more than he can afford. On the other hand, what will become of the charitable institutions that require upwards of £30,000 a year, if the Bill does not become law? What will the Government do about it? Will they say that everything must stop, and that the charitable organisations will have to be closed down? If we are to minimise gambling and control it by the means suggested in the Bill, the effect will be that the charitable organisations will be placed in a healthy financial position and instead of hundreds of thousands of pounds being sent out of

the State for investment in consultations in the Eastern States, that money will be kept here and, in addition, we will receive a large amount of money from the Eastern States that will help further towards the support of our charitable organisations. I have great pleasure in supporting the second reading of the Bill.

HON. W. J. MANN (South-West) [5.28]: Members are somewhat at a disadvantage in not having had an opportunity to peruse the Bill but that fact notwithstanding, I consider it to be our duty to deal with the measure as far as we can. I think we should sit until the measure can be properly considered. I intend to support the Bill, but at the same time I am somewhat disappointed because instead of a measure merely to control lotteries, I would have preferred the Bill to deal with the control of lotteries and betting or, shall I say, gambling. Lotteries, in my judgment, may be open to question, but they are not nearly so questionable as is much of the gambling that is carried on in our midst.

Hon. J. Cornell: The Bill provides for a monopoly.

Hon. W. J. MANN: I am surprised that the Government, hard up as they are and searching for every avenue that will produce revenue, have so far neglected to deal with the gambling question. As Mr. Clydesdale rightly said, no legislation that this or any other Parliament could pass would absolutely prevent the people from indulging in gambling.

Hon. Sir Edward Wittenoom: Every Australian wishes to gamble a little.

Hon. W. J. MANN: That being so, we should exercise some control over it. If we permit the present state of affairs to continue, I visualise a very sad position prevailing before long. Who would argue for a minute that we should remove the restrictions on the liquor traffic? Members will agree that, except under certain circumstances, the liquor traffic is a menace, but, properly controlled, it is quite a legitimate business that ministers to the needs of a large proportion of the population. If we can control the liquor traffic, surely we are not so bankrupt of ideas as to be unable to formulate some method to control gambling! I do not claim to be prepared to submit any concrete proposal, but the combined wisdom

of Parliament should be capable of evolving a system of control for gambling and ensuring that that portion of it which is to be permitted to continue returns some revenue to the State. The liquor traffic returns considerable revenue to the State. The good people who are making vigorous complaints against this Bill seem to forget that the amount of revenue received from the liquor traffic is, in the aggregate, much larger than that yielded by any other form of industry or business. I wish to repeat a statement I have previously made in the House that I consider the Government have been remiss in not attempting to deal with the street betting evil. I have kept my eyes wide open and in my estimation street betting is one of the greatest curses of the country. It is not only a street betting evil; it is becoming a door-to-door evil. Speaking in the House some time ago, I mentioned a dairyman who, when doing his round on Saturday morning, produced a race-card and asked Mrs. Brown and Mrs. Jones what they wanted to put a couple of bob on that morning. Doubtless he was conducting what was for him quite a lucrative business. That sort of thing is still going on in every town and hamlet in the State.

Hon. E. H. H. Hall: Not up my way.

Hon. W. J. MANN: Perhaps not in Geraldton, where they are all good church-going, God-fearing people. But it is so in other places, including Fremantle, where the people are probably not quite so pious and good. Members know that on race days in any city, town or hamlet in the State, sights may be seen that are wholly degrading. Boys of school age may be seen going furtively into back lanes and putting their pocket money on horse races, frequently with men. I was told recently that of the number of men operating in St. George's Terrace on a recent Saturday, 75 per cent. of them possessed some knowledge of Fremantle. I do not allude to that portion of it in which Mr. Fraser lives; I am referring to the Government institution.

Hon. G. Fraser: The institution on the hill.

Hon. W. J. MANN: Should that kind of thing be allowed to continue? The registered bookmaker, as a rule quite a fine type of citizen, who desires to carry on his business, pays to the governing body a fee to be permitted to bet, and on every betting ticket he pays stamp duty. I do not suppose there

are any means of computing the amount of money that passes through the hands of starting price bookmakers each week, but in one fair-sized town not long ago a man who was operating starting price bookmaking advised me that £1,200 had passed through his hands that day, and a number of others were operating in the same town. If it is reasonable and right to tax and control the bookmaker on the racecourse, surely it is reasonable and right to control the other men! It is useless to tell me that gambling is a vice that ought to be crushed and that we ought to have nothing to do with it. If anyone can show me how it may be crushed or how, by a stroke of the pen, gambling may be effectively cut out, I should be inclined to support him, but my opinion is that until we change the psychology of the people, we shall not be able to rid ourselves of gambling for a long time. Until a lot of the good people who complain of gambling get down to bedrock and endeavour to grapple with it, instead of uttering mere platitudes, it is our business to control the evil. Take the experience in our own social circle: there is a mild form of gambling in many homes every day and every evening. There is the game of bridge.

Hon. G. W. Miles: That is not gambling; that is skill.

Hon. W. J. MANN: I have heard bridge players reflect on their opponents in a manner indicating that they played for anything but skill.

Hon. G. W. Miles: Skill more or less.

Hon. W. J. MANN: The element of gambling is there. Even the poor old Chinaman, whose premises are raided, likes his little gambling game now and again. For the moment I forget the name of it.

Hon. G. Fraser: Fan-tan.

Hon. W. J. MANN: The member for Fremantle knows it.

Hon. J. Cornell: People gamble on yo-yo, too.

Hon. W. J. MANN: The hon. member may joke about those things, but there is no escaping the fact that the tendency of the people is as I have indicated. I suppose every member of this House has indulged in some form of gambling at some time or other. I have no objection to that; it is part of the spice of life; but when gambling becomes a serious evil, it is time for Parliament to step in and control it. Mr. Clydesdale quoted figures to show the amount of money coming into Western Aus-

tralia from the Eastern States for the several charity consultations that have been conducted. Let me give the hon. member a little private information. Amongst my activities, I am interested in a concern that has conducted a Golden Casket agency ever since the Golden Casket was established. Although I am living in a small town and there are two other similar agencies in the same town, the turnover would astonish anybody. Members are aware that there have been two consultations in the Commonwealth for a number of years—Tattersall's and Golden Casket. Anyone who knows anything about the business will not deny that, generally speaking, the larger of the two concerns is the Tattersall's consultation. I know nothing about that, but it is generally understood that the turnover of agencies handling the Tattersall's business would be considerably more than that of the Golden Casket. The point I wish to make is that only a week or two ago I took an opportunity to peruse the book recording the applications for tickets in the Golden Casket, and I found that the business had practically disappeared. I attribute that to the fact that people are now buying tickets in the Western Australian consultation. I do not for a moment contend that people are not spending the same amount of money as they spent previously, but I consider they have diverted it to the State consultations rather than send it to Queensland or Tasmania. That is one of the reasons why I feel disposed to support the Bill. There is another phase which I am sure members will forgive me for mentioning and that is the newspaper competitions. I feel fairly confident that had it not been for the widespread interest in newspaper competitions, we would have heard very much less about street gambling in the last few years. Any man conducting a business is quite entitled to do his best to make the business as successful as possible. While I am somewhat uncertain regarding the ultimate result of the crossword puzzles and newspaper competitions, I feel sure they are a very minor concern as compared with the big question of gambling. I do not hold with the present condition of affairs as regards newspaper competitions.

Hon. G. W. Miles: Do you approve of them?

Hon. W. J. MANN: Yes, provided they are controlled. Newspapers have instituted competitions and they have grown to pro-

portions beyond the wildest dreams of the promoters. But the newspaper competitions conducted in Western Australia are easily the best and fairest of their kind and return the largest amount to the people who invest in them. They are better than any similar competitions that I know of in the Empire. In the Mother Country there are many newspapers which conduct competitions, but they set aside a certain amount for prizes. For instance, the first prize may be £1,000 or £2,500, but no matter how much is received in the competition, the amount in excess of the prize money is retained by the newspaper proprietors. Whatever is said about the newspaper competitions in this State, it must be admitted that the proprietors of the newspapers are playing the game. They certainly reap an increased turnover as a result of increased sales of their paper, but that increase is not so great as many people imagine. It must be borne in mind also that the competitions are conducted at no cost to the people who enter them, and that the newspaper proprietors have voluntarily agreed to hand over portion of the amount subscribed to charities. I think it only fair that members should be acquainted of these facts. It is nothing less than a sin for the authorities to say—if they do not say it in so many words, then they imply it—"You can carry on the competitions, but you must not draw them publicly; you can draw them in a room or in the backyard or anywhere else you like, and we will take no notice." That is an objection I have had for quite a long time to the administration of some of the laws of this State. Government after Government have been equally blameable, because they wink the eye at various forms of gambling. I consider such an attitude is hypocritical. Let us say to the newspaper proprietors, "You can make application to a committee for permission to conduct a competition; you must conduct it on certain lines and conduct it openly." Provision should be made whereby the books dealing with the competitions shall be open to public investigation. I hope the Bill will be fully debated. I deplore any attempt to defeat the Bill by guillotine tactics, because that would reflect upon the intelligence of the House. We are here for business; let us carry it on if we can.

HON. J. M. MACFARLANE (Metropolitan-Suburban) [5.50]: I support the second reading of the Bill, but at the same

time I have an open mind with regard to it, as I wish to hear the opinions of other members. Personally, I have had a leaning for many years past towards some form of control of gambling. As I said in the House a little while ago, I am perhaps the member who gambles least. A great deal of gambling is going on, and some of it is done by people who can afford it. There are others, however, who cannot. I refer to the people on sustenance or in receipt of relief who contribute to crossword and money-word competitions. Notwithstanding that these people are stated to be in the last stages of poverty, we find they are able to invest in these competitions.

Hon. G. Fraser: There is a reason for that.

Hon. J. M. MACFARLANE: I am convinced they do so with the object of bettering their conditions. They hope that fortune will favour them and that they will win money to assist themselves and their families, because at present they are receiving hardly sufficient to enable them to live decently. Knowing that the gambling spirit is inherent in the people of Australia, I think it is better to control gambling rather than let it run riot.

Hon. Sir Edward Wittenoom: Hear, hear!

Hon. J. M. MACFARLANE: In any case, the conditions have been better during the past 12 months than they were before, when one was accosted at every street corner and requested to buy lottery tickets for some purpose or other. But people are still gambling and still sending money out of the State. That, to my mind, is very silly indeed. I think our best course is to control gambling.

Hon. G. Fraser: Betting is controlled today.

Hon. J. M. MACFARLANE: It does not concern me whether the proceeds of controlled gambling are applied to charitable purposes or are utilised in paying interest on our loans, or for any other purpose.

Hon. G. Fraser: We control betting today.

Hon. J. M. MACFARLANE: Under the present system, if one form of gambling is stopped, some bright intellect brings forward another scheme and again the evil thrives. There is no adequate control of gambling at present. The commission which it is proposed to set up will review all these conditions and will have power to grant

permission to conduct such form of lottery as the Commissioner of Police and the commission approve of. That is as near as we can get to control and I think it will lead to good results. I do not wish to go further into the matter at the moment. Although I have not considered the Bill in detail, I thought I would speak on the second reading and say that if there is no better argument advanced against its being carried than has been brought forward, I will support not only the second reading, but the Bill throughout.

HON. R. G. MOORE (North-East)

[5.55]: I do not support the second reading of the Bill, but I shall not resort to devious means in order to defeat it. If I could let off a charge that would kill the Bill stone dead, I would do so. If I had not made up my mind to vote against the Bill prior to its being introduced into the House, I would have been inclined to do so because of the lamentable reason given by the Leader of the House for its introduction. I have never heard of such weakness on the part of any Government. The Government say they intend to make lawful some form of gambling because at present they have no effective control over it. That is tantamount to saying they intend to legalise a certain amount of gambling because they will not put into operation the existing laws to prevent it. There is no doubt that if the Government desire to stop gambling they can do so; but the position is that they simply wink at it. Now and then a raid is made on certain gambling places and fines are inflicted on the proprietors, but 20 minutes after the raid the gambling proceeds in just the same way. The police know it; the Government know it; and the people know it. What assurance have we that if the Bill is passed the Government will take further steps to suppress gambling? We know very well that the gambling spirit prevails in Australia; but to make lotteries lawful and so condone an evil in order that good may result is wrong. I am sorry that I have not had more time to go into the matter, but all we knew was that the Bill was being introduced into the House. Mr. Clydesdale has said he will support the Bill because gambling was running riot and if we did not pass the Bill and make lawful a few lotteries, a worse state of affairs would result.

Hon. Sir Edward Wittenoom: He is quite right.

Hon. R. G. MOORE: Mr. Clydesdale said, "Goodness knows what will happen if we do not legalise gambling."

Hon. A. M. Clydesdale: It is done in the other States.

Hon. R. G. MOORE: The spirit of gambling will persist. One of the arguments adduced in favour of the Bill is that the end justifies the means. Gambling is to be made lawful because good may result and charitable institutions will be supported. But gambling does not produce wealth. The winner merely receives money that belonged to someone else. If money is required for the relief of the sick and the infirm, the Government have power to raise it in a fair and equitable way. They should not get it from people who gamble. We recently passed an Act under which practically everybody in the State has to pay 4½d. in the pound of his income in order that money may be raised to help the unemployed. I can assure members one of the hardest things I ever did in my life was to vote in favour of that measure, but I did so because I believed the Government were urgently in need of the money. If more money is required, we should get it in the same way rather than by means of legalising lotteries. If there is not sufficient legislation to deal with gambling, it will not improve matters to bring down a Bill like this. Had the Government earnestly desired to stop gambling, they could have brought down special legislation to impose just as many penalties as are imposed in this particular measure. At all events, they would have shown the people that they meant what they said when they declared there was too much gambling going on. They are now only tinkering with the business. It is merely an excuse to bring down this Bill. People could be prevented from gambling openly as they are doing to-day. The principle of legislating for evil in order that good might come out of it is a poor one, and I intend to oppose the Bill.

HON. A. THOMSON (South-East) [6.2]: Instead of condemning the Government we should congratulate them for having the courage to face the position. Since 1921-22 the Government have collected from the totalisator tax, and by way of taxation on horse-racing, a total of £930,427.

Hon. R. G. Moore: The Government are still going to collect those taxes?

Hon. A. THOMSON: I hope so. Apparently the hon. member does not object to that. Many small bodies in the community are doing excellent work, and have received substantial financial assistance from the art union committee. The Bill will limit the number of consultations to 15 in the year. If its defeat would cause a stamping out of the gambling spirit, I might be inclined to vote against it, but I hardly think that would be the effect of such a course. For many years money has been going out of the State which should have been kept in it. This source of revenue should have been tapped a long time ago.

Hon. J. Cornell: Will this Bill stop the money from going out?

Hon. A. THOMSON: Members have protested that they were obliged to vote for the 4½d. tax. That is a compulsory tax which all must pay. In the case of this Bill, the money that is collected and distributed to the organisations concerned will have been subscribed voluntarily. No one is compelled to buy a lottery ticket. In Queensland, considerable sums of money have been handed over to hospitals and charities as a result of the Golden Casket competition. Over £1,000,000 has been handed to hospitals and charities as the result of the New South Wales lotteries. Those lotteries have meant a loss to Tasmania of about half a million in a year. I have occasionally bought sweep tickets, but I was never compelled to do so. It is time these things were brought under control. I hope by the passing of the Bill our citizens on every Friday will be able to walk the streets without having boxes jammed under their noses.

Hon. E. H. Gray: The Bill will not stop that.

Hon. A. THOMSON: I hope it will. Funds will be provided for the various organisations concerned, so that they will no longer have personally to seek for public support. I have great sympathy for the ladies, both young and old, who take up these collections week after week to help those institutions in which they are so keenly interested.

Hon. E. H. Harris: What clause in the Bill prohibits those collections?

Hon. E. H. Gray: It will not affect them at all.

Hon. A. THOMSON: The Bill provides for the raising of funds for the relief of former soldiers, sailors or nurses of His Majesty's sea or land forces resident in the State, for an institution in the State for the care of the blind, deaf or dumb, and for any body whose activities are substantially State-wide, dispensing voluntary aid or medical or nursing advice to expectant mothers, nursing mothers and children under the age of 16 years.

Hon. E. H. Harris: Is the Silver Chain covered?

Hon. A. THOMSON: Not specifically. The organisation of which Mr. Gray is State president will evidently benefit as a result of this Bill.

Hon. J. CORNELL: What does the hon. member think of the list of offences, of which there are 25? In some cases the penalty is five years' imprisonment.

Hon. A. THOMSON: The penalties may or may not be adequate. There is nothing compulsory about these lotteries.

Hon. G. Fraser: People are not compelled to gamble to-day.

Hon. A. THOMSON: No, but they do. The State is reaping a comparatively small revenue from the gambling proclivities of the public, but will fare better under this Bill. I am not saying anything against the newspapers which are conducting crossword competitions. I notice in a leaderette in one of the newspapers that that paper will be only too pleased, if the Bill is passed, to resume its ordinary functions as a newspaper. I support the second reading.

HON. J. CORNELL (South) [6.10]: I oppose the second reading. I hope to convince those members who have made up their minds this is a good Bill, that it is not so good, and that a measure which has such far-reaching effects requires more consideration at our hands than we are able to give it.

Hon. E. H. Harris: It was so good that another place would not give it a life of more than one year.

Hon. J. CORNELL: Disguise it though we may, this Bill is to legalise something that is illegal. It is also designed to give a State monopoly to some body. Mr. Clydesdale said that people to-day were running riot in the matter of gambling, and that there was no definite means available to prevent it.

Hon. A. M. Clydesdale: I said that gambling was unrestricted.

Hon. J. CORNELL: The hon. member knows a bit about betting.

Hon. A. M. Clydesdale: I know nothing about it.

Hon. J. CORNELL: The hon. member has given valuable assistance in an endeavour to prevent it.

Hon. A. M. Clydesdale: And that is not right.

Hon. J. CORNELL: So it is rumoured.

Hon. A. M. Clydesdale: But there is no truth in the rumour.

Hon. J. CORNELL: I know that rumours are not always correct.

Hon. A. M. Clydesdale: They are incorrect in this case.

Hon. J. CORNELL: Notwithstanding the law, the restrictions and the efforts of the police and the proprietary and non-proprietary clubs, street betting is one of the most successful businesses the Government are conducting to-day, so far as revenue is concerned. Every Monday a batch of street or shop bettors is charged before the Police Court and produces certain revenue for the Treasury. That is a complete answer to Mr. Clydesdale's argument. It is claimed by the sponsors of the Bill that the existing law is not sufficient to enable the Government to cope with the situation. The Bill amends more laws than any other we have had before us. If there is no machinery to deal with lotteries, why is the term "lottery" given the same meaning as that which is described in Section 212 of the Criminal Code, 1913?

Sitting suspended from 6.15 to 7.30 p.m.

Hon. J. CORNELL: Before tea I was dealing with the assertions of supporters of the Bill that the measure is necessary to control or alternatively to suppress lotteries. It is said the existing law is not sufficient for the suppression of lotteries. But the definition of "lottery" in the Bill is according to the same definition in the Criminal Code. So for the purpose of dealing with something that can already be dealt with under the Criminal Code, a similar definition finds a place in the Bill. Then there is an extension of the definition of lottery, and this is the birdlime with which it is hoped to catch the little birds known as crossword puzzles. That definition is offered as an

excuse for passing the Bill. It reads as follows—

“Lottery” has the same meaning as the term “lottery” in Section 212 of the Criminal Code, 1913, and, further, includes any disposition of property under any scheme or competition which the public or any specified section of the public may be or is invited to enter, the nature or conduct of which (though skill on the part of the entrants or competitors is required) is such as in the circumstances of the case to preclude the fair consideration of the answers of the entrants or competitors.

It is claimed that one of the purposes of the Bill is to suppress crossword puzzles, and on the definition I have read hangs the suppression of those competitions. I should like to hear the opinion of Mr. Drew on that definition. I venture to say there is a better chance of catching the crossword people under the Criminal Code. But if it is intended to suppress crossword puzzles, I want to know why the necessity for including them in the Bill? Why should the commission be bothered with the suppression of crossword puzzles? Why should those competitions not be left out of the Bill and treated under the Criminal Code, the same as street betting? This is one of the savouries imported into the Bill to induce some persons to support the Bill on the ground that it will suppress crossword puzzles.

The Chief Secretary: It is not correct to say the definition is camouflaged in order to induce members to support the Bill.

Hon. J. CORNELL: It is camouflaged, and it has been given out that the Bill, if passed, will suppress crossword puzzles. If the Bill becomes law, is it the intention of the Government to stop crossword puzzles?

Hon. E. H. Harris: His Honour the Chief Justice has described them as lotteries.

Hon. J. CORNELL: If the Government are going to suppress crossword puzzles, it is under the words of the definition that they will be suppressed. It would be better to leave out crossword puzzles from the Bill and, if they must be suppressed, let them be suppressed under the Criminal Code. Even if, under this definition of lotteries it was possible to enforce this measure against crossword puzzles, it would be only 24 hours before those responsible for the competitions found a way out. To-day a blind man could almost work out the puzzles, and if there is more than one successful competitor the

coupons are drawn from a heap to determine the winners. Suppose a newspaper went on running these competitions and made them even more simple than they are now, eliminated the incorrect solutions and printed on the coupons an intimation that in the event of more than one competitor being successful, they would be asked to decide by lot who should have the prize money. If the competitors consented to that, and if the definition in the Bill were held to include those puzzles, the competitors as well as the promoters would be brought in as equally culpable in breaking the law. As I have said, if crossword puzzles are to be suppressed, the existing law is sufficient for the purpose. The Lord Mayor of Perth will tell the House there is in the Municipal Corporations Act sufficient to stop the army of men selling crossword coupons in the streets to-day. One of the chief reasons why no attempt has been made to enforce the existing law against crossword puzzles is that we are very close to a general election for the Assembly, and no one dares to be a Daniel. The Labour Government are deserving of credit for that, notwithstanding an approaching election, they did stop tipping competitions. If those could be stopped, certainly the Government to-day could stop crossword puzzles. The stopping of the tipping competitions had a very salutary effect on the fortunes of Labour candidates at the last elections. A working man said to me, “We cannot indulge in a shilling competition on a Saturday, but other people can go out to Belmont and Goodwood and Perth and Canning racecourses in high-powered motor cars, and bet with impunity. So we amongst ourselves want a small tipping competition.” I certainly know that as a result of that action on the part of the Labour Government some of the electors did reverse the votes they had previously given. Without this Bill at all the present Government could stop crossword puzzles if they desired to do so. The element of poverty enters into most forms of gambling, which are engaged in in the hope of making a bit of a rise. I myself have been in that position and I can speak feelingly for those in it to-day, who in consequence of poverty indulge in a mild form of gambling in the hope that there will be some reward. To the house next door to mine the other

day £10 came and no £10 was more welcome than that. If we pass the Bill and we legalise lotteries it is proposed to conduct 15. One ticket in a sweep is equal to five tickets in a crossword puzzle and people will patronise the sweeps for the same reason that they patronise crossword competitions to-day. The charities that the consultations will help are only a secondary consideration, or I should say a twentieth consideration to the people who supply the bulk of the money. I agree with the Leader of the Opposition that as we get older we either give up gambling or we are past redemption. The Bill puts a premium on gambling. It proposes to regulate a certain form of it. Gambling has gone on since time immemorial and, again like the Leader of the Opposition, I am averse to making gambling a vested interest. That is what the Bill does. We are going to set up lawful machinery where to-day that machinery is unlawful. My opinion is that there is no need for the Bill. According to Mr. Clydesdale, in spite of the law, unlawful action has pioneered the Bill. A board was set up some time ago and it has functioned to the extent of conducting consultations instead of in the past their being run indiscriminately. Why cannot that continue? Is there anybody who objects to things as they are to-day? The only objection is with regard to crossword puzzles and I have already indicated that a simple amendment of the Criminal Code would get over the difficulty. We have recently had two Bills before the House in which the deliberative and casting vote of the Chairman played a part. At my instigation this House took away the double-barrelled vote in the Road Districts Act Amendment Bill. In the Bill before us it is proposed that there shall be a commission of four and the chairman shall have a deliberative and a casting vote. Under the procedure laid down by this House in the Milk Bill and the Road Districts Bill the double voting power given to the chairman was gone away with. Why should the chairman of the Lotteries Board have two votes when in other Bills to which I have referred we denied the chairman that right? It is proposed that the members of the Commission shall be paid 2½ per cent. of the gross proceeds up to a minimum of £1,000 in any one year. That works out that each member of the board may draw £250 per annum for his services. If we are going to have State lotteries, why not do away with the

proposed commission; why not conduct them with one man in control and pay him, if necessary, £1,000 a year?

Hon. E. H. Gray: Is there not safety in numbers?

Hon. J. CORNELL: Not always. There is also another provision that no person shall suffer disqualification under Section 32 of the Constitution Act by reason of his being a member of the Commission. What is that for, unless it is that there shall be no question about a member of Parliament being a member of the Commission?

Hon. J. M. Drew: The Minister told us that that provision was struck out.

Hon. J. CORNELL: That is in the Bill. Bills are supposed to come to this place certified as being correct. I know that the President of the Chamber would not allow a Bill to go to another place unless it was certified by the Chairman of Committees as being correct.

Hon. E. H. H. Hall: Has this Bill been certified by another place as being correct?

The PRESIDENT: It came to us from the Legislative Assembly and the assumption is that it has been certified to by the Chairman of Committees there as being correct.

The Chief Secretary: The clause referred to has not been struck out.

Hon. J. CORNELL: My experience is that there are very few, if any mistakes in Bills that come from another place. The proviso in question can only be there for one purpose, that is to get over Section 32 of the Constitution which precludes any member of Parliament accepting monetary consideration from the Crown. Members of Parliament will be able to occupy seats on this commission.

Hon. E. H. Gray: That will improve the commission.

Hon. J. CORNELL: It might give tone to it, but I object to the Constitution being amended because of some special consideration such as this. Again I do not agree with the proviso to Subclause 4 which declares that preference of employment should be given to returned sailors, soldiers and nurses. For 15 years, with one exception, I have been a member of the West Australian branch of the Returned Soldiers League Executive, and several Governments have agreed, all things being considered, that preference shall be given to returned sailors and soldiers. If the working agreement that has existed with Governments since the

war and preference to returned sailors, soldiers, and nurses were general, I would be in favour of the proviso to Clause 4, but I shall not favour the inclusion of the preference clause without qualification in this one measure, seeing that the system of preference is with qualifications in other directions. I will repeat statements I have made at R.S.L. conferences and executive meetings when I say that there are those in our midst to-day who, in the words of our biblical authority, Mr. Holmes, "know not Joseph," seeing that they were mere children when war was declared in 1914. It is high time that that phase was considered. While I am prepared to advocate preference to returned men as against the individual who would not go to the war, I am willing to relax a great deal in favour of the young fellow who was six or seven years of age when peace was declared. If old soldiers do not adopt that line of reasoning, they will find, in their declining years, a large army of young fellows will be up against them, and rightly so. They should receive consideration and I am opposed to the proviso. I am prepared to stand or fall by the established policy of preference rather than see any such provision included in the Bill. The Bill provides that the commission may conduct 15 lotteries during the year.

Hon. J. M. Macfarlane: And they have one year to go.

Hon. J. CORNELL: In a sense, the members of the commission will act in an advisory capacity to the Minister, who may veto their recommendations. Before making any recommendation to the Minister, the commission must refer applications to the Commissioner of Police and be guided by him.

Hon. E. H. Gray: That is advisable.

Hon. J. CORNELL: The Bill also provides that the contents of the reports submitted as to the unsuitability of persons who may apply for permission to conduct lotteries are to be absolutely privileged from production in any court of law and no person whose official duties permit him to see the contents of reports is to be allowed to divulge information to any other individual. That is pretty strong. It represents one of the reasons why I am opposed to the Bill, which embodies penal provisions that are not to my liking. Clauses 13 and 14 provide extremely wide powers that can be exercised by the police.

Hon. E. H. Gray: Are they not necessary?

Hon. J. CORNELL: It has been suggested that because we passed the Metropolitan Whole Milk Bill, we should agree to the Lotteries Control Bill. During my 20 years in Parliament, I have seen many Bills but the one before us now is 100 per cent. ahead of any others I have perused. The Gold Stealing Act was a circumstance compared with this Bill.

Hon. W. J. Mann: Parliament did not make much of a job of that legislation.

Hon. J. CORNELL: A mess has been made of a lot of good fellows under that Act.

Hon. Sir Edward Wittenoom: The mere fact that you do not understand it, does not say the Bill is a bad one.

Hon. J. CORNELL: I can understand the hon. member's attitude. When men get old they get sterner. Punishment about which they would think twice when they were 35 years of age, they would not give a moment's consideration to when double that age. Probably Sir Edward's view is that what a man gets is the least he ought to have got. Clause 16 embodies an array of 15 offences and the penalties provide imprisonment with hard labour from five years or a fine of £500 down to a fine of £10. I shall not be a party to agreeing to a Bill that contains such penalty clauses, without a more strict inquiry. I do not know that the Government will be more successful in prohibiting offences under the measure if a man is sentenced to five years' imprisonment, than they are in their present endeavours to suppress street betting. There are offences mentioned that might result in a man of the highest integrity unwittingly doing something that would result in his incurring liability to a fine of £50. I hope members will not pass the Bill lightly, particularly in view of the offences outlined, and that they will give that phase serious consideration. Another feature of the Bill is the provision for the suppression of foreign lotteries. When I arrived in the United States of America, I discovered that an Australian was an alien. Now the Bill discloses that Australians in New South Wales, Queensland or any of the other States are foreigners. It is proposed to endeavour to stop the sale here of lottery tickets in consultations conducted in the Eastern States.

Hon. A. M. Clydesdale: There is nothing to prevent a person from buying a ticket, but the prohibition is on advertising. That applies in the Eastern States. That provision is copied from them.

Hon. J. CORNELL: I predict that that provision will be just as effective as the postal embargo against Tattersalls. Mr. Clydesdale told us that we will get something like £5,000 from the Eastern States. If we are to make the sale of their tickets illegal in Western Australia, I presume that £5,000 will come from other States where they have done without lotteries so far.

Hon. A. M. Clydesdale: And from States where lotteries are conducted as well.

Hon. J. CORNELL: Clause 12 provides indemnity for those who are authorised to conduct lotteries from incurring liability to prosecution under the provisions of the Criminal Code or the Police Act. Those who are opposed to the Bill should, I suggest, take the necessary action to get the Government to enforce the provisions of the measures against those participating in such undertakings, should the Bill not be passed. Then I claim that Clause 21 should really appear at the commencement of the Bill and not at the conclusion, because it shows the total weakness of the Bill and the case for the Bill. If the House sees fit to take the Bill into Committee, I hope Clause 21, limiting the duration of the measure to 12 months, will be deleted. If members after hearing the arguments extending over months in another place and outside Parliament accept Clause 21, they will be stultifying themselves. If the measure is justified, it is justified without any limitation as to duration. Is this an experiment, like the Metropolitan Whole Milk Bill? Why are such provisions inserted in measures? Because of some temporary happening or expediency. If members carry their memories back, they will recall that duration clauses originated during the war years, and now they are being continued in all sorts of legislation. If a case can be made out for the Bill, it should be done without including Clause 21. What sane administration would endeavour to put the provisions of the measure into operation if this sword of Damocles were hanging over their heads? In 12 months' time it is possible that the fruits of their work and energy would come to nought, and confusion then would be worse confounded. If any vote of mine can assist to prevent a

revival of the argument every 12 months, members will be welcome to it. I will oppose the second reading, and I hope the Bill will be defeated then or in committee.

Hon. C. B. Williams: You represent one of the best gambling places in the world.

Hon. J. CORNELL: Yes; for the miner it is a gamble almost from the cradle to the grave. All life is a gamble, but the life of the miner is the most hazardous of all. I quite expect that the mining community will be able to get along sufficiently well without the Bill.

Hon. C. B. Williams: Anyhow, they would respect your views.

Hon. J. CORNELL: If the Bill be passed as a permanent measure, I shall thereafter withhold my opposition, as any opponent ought to do, and anything I can then do to make the measure effective will be done.

Hon. G. FRASER: I move—

That the debate be adjourned.

Motion put and negatived.

HON. G. FRASER (West) [8.21]: I protest against the action of members in refusing time to discuss the measure.

Hon. C. B. Williams: We want to go home.

Hon. G. FRASER: The hon. member is quite entitled to do so, but that is no reason why we should not be given sufficient time in which to peruse the measure to ascertain the nature of its contents and to determine whether it be necessary to submit amendments.

Hon. C. B. Williams: That is utter nonsense. You have had two months to consider it.

Hon. G. FRASER: The measure was passed by another place only in the early hours of this morning, and I fail to see that we have had two months in which to consider it.

Hon. C. B. Williams: You are talking nonsense.

Hon. G. FRASER: The hon. member is a very poor judge of sense or nonsense.

Hon. C. B. Williams interjected.

The PRESIDENT: Order! I ask the hon. member to allow Mr. Fraser to proceed.

Hon. G. FRASER: I am surprised at the attitude of several members now as compared with former years. When measures of vital concern were received on former occasions, time to consider them was insisted upon. There has not been time to

examine this Bill. I have been endeavouring to do so during the course of the debate, but I have not completed my examination. We should not be expected to speak or vote on a Bill before we have had time to examine it thoroughly.

Hon. C. B. Williams: You have had two months.

The PRESIDENT: Order!

Hon. G. FRASER: So far as I have been able to examine the Bill, I am totally opposed to it.

Hon. C. B. Williams: Be truthful always! That is the main thing.

Hon. G. FRASER: If the hon. member is in the habit of being otherwise than truthful, I am not.

Hon. C. B. Williams interjected.

The PRESIDENT: Order! If any member cannot allow another member who is addressing the Chair to proceed without interrupting, I must ask him to retire. Mr. Fraser should be allowed to proceed with his address without unnecessary interruptions.

Hon. C. B. Williams: Provided he tells the truth.

The PRESIDENT: Order!

Hon. G. FRASER: I can afford to ignore that remark. Like one or two other members who have spoken, I am satisfied that the Bill will not achieve its object, and I am not anxious that it should. Many attempts made to control various other forms of gambling have proved ineffective, and I feel that this measure will prove equally ineffective. We are led to believe that the laws of the country are sufficient to control the betting evil, but in the Press every Monday or Tuesday we read the reports of prosecutions made to control various other forms of gambling during the week-end. If the same method of control is achieved for lotteries, a similar state of affairs will exist, and prosecutions will have to be launched against people conducting lotteries. When we consider the powers proposed to be conferred upon the commission, we can appreciate the number of deserving organisations that to-day are financed by lotteries, and the number that will be prepared to conduct lotteries in spite of the measure. It is wrong to give power to three men to determine who shall and who shall not conduct lotteries.

Hon. C. B. Williams: Make it five or 20 men.

Hon. G. FRASER: That would not matter.

Hon. E. H. H. Hall: That could be amended in Committee.

Hon. C. B. Williams: Why worry about the number?

Hon. G. FRASER: Three men should not have the right to determine whether an individual or organisation shall be permitted to conduct a lottery. I am opposed to that provision. It is most likely that the commission will grant permission for the conduct of lotteries for the objects specified in the Bill. In the sporting world particularly—

Hon. C. B. Williams: You know nothing about the sporting world.

Hon. G. FRASER: There are sporting bodies that are mainly financed by the conducting of small lotteries, and it is difficult to imagine how they will be able to finance themselves without. Certain bodies will receive money raised from the lotteries conducted by the commission. Outside the lotteries conducted by the commission, I assume that very few permits will be granted.

Hon. C. B. Williams: That is how it should be.

Hon. G. FRASER: I shall be glad to hear the hon. member state his reasons for supporting the Bill. The measure appears to be contradictory in one respect. Clause 7 of the Bill provides that subject to the provisions of Section 8 the Minister may, in his absolute discretion, approve or reject any application to conduct a lottery. It also provides that the Minister may, subject to the provisions of the Act, grant a permit to conduct a lottery on such conditions as he may think fit to impose in order to guard against fraud and to secure compliance with the Act and regulations. Later on, however, we find the Minister is not the person who is to have the final say. The Minister can only permit a lottery to be run if the commission approves of it. I think the actual words are "recommended by the commission." I take it that means the board. The Minister ought to have the final say, and not the board.

Hon. C. B. Williams: You must be worrying about something down at Fremantle that you will not get under the Bill.

Hon. G. FRASER: I am not worrying about that at all. I am voicing my objections to the Bill.

Hon. C. B. Williams: You are not honest. The PRESIDENT: Order!

Hon. G. FRASER: If the interjection had been made by any other member, I would have asked that it be withdrawn, but in this case I will not take any notice of it.

Hon. C. B. Williams: It is true.

The PRESIDENT: I did not hear the remark.

Hon. G. FRASER: A great deal has been said during the course of the debate upon the question whether newspapers shall be allowed to continue the competitions they are conducting to-day. At the risk of shocking most hon. members, I say I have no objection to those competitions as they are run to-day. While I realise some tightening up is required, I would point out that, through the conduct of those competitions, money is to-day being contributed to charities which otherwise they would not receive.

Hon. C. B. Williams: Do you object to cross-word puzzles?

Hon. G. FRASER: If the hon. member had listened he would have heard me say that I had no objection to newspaper competitions. Many people to-day are objecting to those competitions because they say that people who are down and out invest their 3d. or 6d. in them.

Hon. C. B. Williams: There is nothing wrong in that.

Hon. G. FRASER: Quite so, but many people to-day object to poor people taking advantage of an opportunity to win a prize that might perhaps lift them out of the distress they are in. I have known of cases where such people have won small prizes that have been of great benefit to them.

Hon. G. W. Miles: Are you putting that up as an argument?

Hon. C. B. Williams: He does not know where he is.

Hon. G. W. Miles: The competitions should be stopped.

Hon. G. FRASER: That is the hon. member's opinion. My opinion is exactly the opposite.

Hon. G. W. Miles: It is not much use keeping them going.

Hon. G. FRASER: The hon. member would object to a person investing—

Hon. G. W. Miles: And children, too.

Hon. G. FRASER: The hon. member objects to persons investing in these competitions, but he has no objection to persons frequenting racecourses and gambling there.

Hon. G. W. Miles: What right have you to object to the Bill?

Hon. G. FRASER: I am not objecting to people gambling on racecourses; but I do object to gambling which is unlawful in the true sense of the term. The hon. member is prepared to allow that to proceed without protest, yet he will take action which will prevent a poor person investing 3d. or 6d. in some newspaper competition. I have not heard the hon. member objecting to the gambling that goes on in Tattersall's Club.

Hon. G. W. Miles: You don't know anything about that.

Hon. G. FRASER: That is entirely against the law. I have no objection to gambling, either on the racecourse or in Tattersall's Club.

Hon. C. B. Williams: But you intend to vote against the Bill.

Hon. G. FRASER: Yes, because it is going to stop—

The PRESIDENT: Order! If the hon. member who is continually interjecting does not stop, I shall be obliged to take a course that I would very much regret to take.

Hon. C. B. Williams: I apologise.

Hon. Sir Edward Wittenoom: How do you know gambling takes place in Tattersall's Club?

Hon. G. FRASER: One would have to be rather simple not to know that.

Hon. Sir Edward Wittenoom: Have you ever been in the club?

Hon. G. FRASER: Perhaps I had better not remark on that.

Hon. G. W. Miles: We shall be here after Christmas if this continues.

Hon. G. FRASER: I am not particular whether we finish before or after Christmas. Exception has been taken to certain action of mine earlier in the day. That action was quite legitimate and in accordance with the Standing Orders. I have no say as to whether we shall come back after Christmas or not. That is a matter that rests entirely with the Government. Personally I do not mind if we finish this week or the week after.

Hon. L. B. Bolton: That is quite evident.

Hon. G. FRASER: I am prepared to sit on until the 31st January and discuss anything that may be brought forward; but I do object to the Government bringing down a measure of this description during the closing hours of the session, and without

members having had an opportunity of perusing it.

Hon. Sir Edward Wittenoom: You will get worse Bills than this.

Hon. G. FRASER: I was discussing newspaper competitions. One of the arguments used in favour of the Bill was that the Government wished to control gambling, so that deserving institutions might be assisted. If the Government had gone into figures and ascertained the amounts paid to various charities out of the proceeds of the newspaper competitions, they would know that about £400 a week was being paid to various charitable institutions from that source.

Hon. C. B. WILLIAMS: Is that not very good?

Hon. G. FRASER: Yes. I am quite satisfied with it.

Hon. C. B. WILLIAMS: I should think so.

Hon. G. FRASER: I consider that £400 a week will compare very favourably with any amount that may be raised under this measure. It has been said that the State is not receiving any benefit from the newspaper competitions, but I believe that about £100 per week is being paid in stamp duty to the Treasury as a result of these competitions. That should be a sufficient answer to the statement that charities are not benefiting from these competitions and that the State is not deriving revenue from them. I trust that when we reach the Committee stage the Minister will not try to rush the measure through. Members have not had an opportunity of examining the Bill, and if it should be passed I want it to be as nearly perfect as possible. I am prepared to abide by the result if I am defeated; but if I am, I want a measure put on the statute-book that will be a credit to the State and not something that will have to be amended within a very short space of time. In conclusion, I again express my opposition to the measure. I hope it will be defeated at this stage.

HON. C. B. WILLIAMS (South) [8.38]: I had no intention of addressing the House on the second reading of the Bill, but the previous speaker, who is a member of the party of which I have been a life-long member, has astounded me. He represents a province somewhat similar to those which you, Sir, and I represent, and our constituents are, after all, 99 per cent. sports. What is behind the objection to the Bill?

The PRESIDENT: I trust the hon. member is not imputing motives to any other hon. member.

Hon. C. B. WILLIAMS: I would not dream of imputing motives to the last speaker. He is quite honest, and is a very nice young fellow; but he does not understand his subject. I do not know anybody that I like better, but still, he is young.

Hon. Sir Edward Wittenoom: He cannot help that.

Hon. C. B. WILLIAMS: He cannot help that any more than I can help being a little younger than Sir Edward Wittenoom. I have not read the Bill to-night, but I read it months ago, and any member who complains that he is not acquainted with its provisions ought to resign. Since I have been a member of the Chamber, I have become conservative. I am just as jealous as any other member of the rights of the Chamber; and I say we should not be rushed with legislation in the dying hours of the session. The only fault I have to find with the Bill is that it will have the effect of closing down newspaper competitions. The newspaper competitions have contributed considerably to the revenue of the State by way of stamp duty paid in connection with cross-word puzzles. I put in a coupon myself when I have 3d. to spare. The only paper which has not indulged in these competitions is the "West Australian."

Hon. J. Cornell: Or the "War Cry."

Hon. C. B. WILLIAMS: Those people get a penny whenever they can. I am speaking of respectable newspapers. The "West Australian" has not reduced the price of its paper. Probably it gets the advertisements when the prize list is announced. The newspapers have only borrowed something they found was in vogue in England, and have done their best to popularise their own publications. All credit is due to the "Mirror" and the "Sunday Times." I am not worried if they have increased their circulation 1,000 per cent. They still put the boot into everyone, but they have supplied a want of the people, otherwise the competitions could not be a success. One member in another place who owns the "Sunday Times" is on the way to prosperity, because he has something to sell which is popular. We are elected to Parliament to represent the views of the people. They

say they desire to speculate in crossword puzzles. The Minister for Railways has decided to make a business of this, and there I fall foul of him. I see no reason why crossword puzzles should be stopped. The Minister has been so long in office that he is used to being instructed by public servants. He is too busy to mix with the world. Why should he stop these competitions? Half crown sweeps are being conducted by the Art Union Committee, and the first prize is £1,000. What a wonderful thing for any workman who could draw such a prize for 2s. 6d.! The Labour movement has no chance of financing its candidates unless it conducts sweeps. I hate hypocrisy. I know I have no opportunity to fight my next election unless the party I represent is able to find funds from somewhere.

Hon. G. Fraser: You will not get any funds if you support this Bill.

Hon. C. B. WILLIAMS: I do not want anything from you; you are a hypocrite. The PRESIDENT: Order!

Hon. C. B. WILLIAMS: I am not responsible for the hon. member's interjection.

The PRESIDENT: I must ask the hon. member to withdraw that remark.

Hon. C. B. WILLIAMS: I withdraw it. I know Mr. Fraser too well.

The PRESIDENT: The hon. member must unreservedly withdraw the remark.

Hon. C. B. WILLIAMS: Of course I withdraw it unreservedly. If our party is going to defeat the hon. member on my left, we must get in some cash. We do get it in by subscriptions to sweeps.

Hon. G. W. Miles: Do not give the show away.

Hon. C. B. WILLIAMS: I hate cant.

Hon. Sir Edward Wittenoom: Then sit down.

The PRESIDENT: The hon. member is not in order in asking another member who is addressing the Chair to sit down.

Hon. C. B. WILLIAMS: I want honesty of purpose from every member. We want these sweeps because there are 16,000 of our men out of employment.

Hon. A. M. Clydesdale: Under this Bill you will not be able to conduct your sweeps.

Hon. C. B. WILLIAMS: Now the hon. member is putting the show away. A Labour Government will undoubtedly be returned to power. A State-wide sweep would

suit me better. I am not pious. Let us have what we can get. Changes do occur in this House. Men have come and gone, and their places have been taken by others. Some day members will vote for a State-wide lottery. The Minister for Railways does not like being beaten. He knew he had some new supporters in the Council and decided to bring down the Bill. He is to be complimented. I consider I am as good a member of the Labour Party as is the Leader of the Opposition or Mr. Fraser. What chance has the working man of buying the necessities of life out of his wages? If he is willing to invest say 30s. a year in these chances, he is entitled to do so. For my part I would give all these competitions a go. The amount of money that is available at the time is all that can be raised. The newspapers are supplying a great want. They are bringing revenue to the Treasury and are helping deserving causes. It is a business, after all. What does it matter what the newspapers make out of it? I think the "Mirror" pioneered these competitions because they knew there was money in them. Some poor people are also getting a little as well.

Hon. Sir Edward Wittenoom: Have you ever heard of a spell-o?

Hon. C. B. WILLIAMS: Yes. I want to justify my support of the Bill. A personal friend of mine is bitterly opposing it. There is something wrong when two people, who drink out of the same tap, cannot agree.

Hon. Sir Edward Wittenoom: I am supporting your Bill.

Hon. C. B. WILLIAMS: The hon. member is a sport. He would support anything to help democracy, although he is Sir Edward Wittenoom. It hurts me to think that a young man who has not seen life should be opposed to the wishes of the people. The public servants of this State are the most stupid men I know, seeing that they have to look to the newspapers to show them how to get in money. The Labour Party of Queensland established the Golden Casket sweeps. They were a great success. The Moore party, when in opposition, declared they would cut them out, but when they were returned to power they found the people required that form of gambling. The people were quite prepared to invest their money in the Golden Casket sweep. The result was that in three years' time the Moore Government were defeated. Now let

us come to the most dreadful man in Australia, Mr. Lang. Pooh! one can almost smell his breath from New South Wales to here. But Mr. Lang preached to the people of Australia what they should do. Members of my party would go to Crawley Baths and dip themselves in the cold water rather than utter his name. Lang is a most awful man. Notwithstanding all the dirt and slime that has been slung at him, that man originated a State sweep in New South Wales than which there is none better in the world. Mr. Stevens said that when he got into power he would do away with the sweep; but Mr. Stevens is no fool, and so although he has been in power for some time he has not interfered with the Lang sweep. There is no need for me to labour the question, because the longer one speaks the sillier he gets, but that awful man Lang, worse than any Bolshevik, introduced that State sweep, and the Stevens Government have continued it. Why? Because they know the people of Australia will gamble. It is sheer hypocrisy to deny that gambling is rampant in this State. We all know that. I have a fifty to one double myself. I am sorry I did not bring the ticket with me to show the House. We want gambling, because 80 per cent. of our people live by gambling. Their very lives are a gamble. A man goes down a deep mine, and it is a gamble if he ever comes back again. A man is working a machine in a mine, and it is a gamble if he does not bore into a block of fracture. In 18 months' time I have to go up for election. Is not that a gamble? If a member of Parliament were true to the people who put him into the House, he would be honest with them. But people will not waste time with politicians: I would not waste time with politicians were it not that I happen to be one at the moment. The man who invests in the share list is a gambler, so why should we not help indigent people to invest their sixpences in a crossword puzzle competition in the hope of getting a return? If they had 1,000 shares in the Lake View or in Wiluna, they would not bother about crossword puzzles or sweeps. I say that members opposing the Bill are hypocrites, just low-down hypocrites. I have here a half-dollar ticket in a sweep. Fancy if I were to wake up to find that I had won a thousand quid! I would go to England on it. Fancy the delight of drawing £1,000. What a lovely sensation. Good God, I do not think I

would survive it. A working man has half a crown. Shall he invest it in a sweep, or shall he put it in the bank? Fancy a man putting 2s. 6d. into the bank! Labour members, whether in this Chamber or in another place, owe an apology to the electors who put them into their positions, for certainly they are very lucky. Our electors took Mr. Fraser and me from hard jobs and put us in here. When I lose my job here I will have to go back to strenuous work and poverty. A sweep is a co-operative effort. Suppose Mr. Holmes and I were to put in a half-a-crown each, how would we get on? I have often remarked Mr. Clydesdale and a Minister of the Crown toss to see who should pay for tea. Quite frequently Mr. Clydesdale loses.

The PRESIDENT: I suggest to the hon. member that he confine himself to advancing arguments in favour of the Bill, and that perhaps he would be more effective if his speech were less personal towards those members who are opposing the Bill.

Hon. C. B. WILLIAMS: There is nobody here, not even the President, who does not invest his money for gain and profit. If the people have any money they are always prepared to invest it in a sweep. It is the only hope available to the working man or, say, the farmer. Fancy if a cocky farmer were to win a £1,000 prize to-morrow. Why he would burn the old farm down for joy. The charities of the State are getting a good sum of money out of the present sweeps. At the present time the charities have no other source of revenue. We know well that if a person asks for a subscription of 6d. or 1s. for anything, it is not given. But give the people an opportunity to invest in a sweep, and they will do so. Sweeps have been tried in Queensland and New South Wales, and they have also been tried here. Now it is proposed to legalise them and I compliment the Minister for Police on his action. I have attempted to draw attention to the fact that the position of the Labour Party is selfish, but with regard to the present Government, I have evidence to show that they have always been fair to their opponents. The present proposal is an attempt to harness cash because the people, as we are aware, will not contribute anything towards our charities. There are many who will not give anything to charity, but I suppose 80 per cent. of the people are always prepared to invest in anything if there is a chance of gain. The people

will gamble and nothing will stop them. I hope it will not be our experience to do as the Premier of Tasmania had to do; go cap-in-hand to the Commonwealth Government for assistance because of the falling-off in the business of Tattersall's, which was one of the main sources of that State's revenue. I dissociate myself from the hypocrisy and cant of the Labour Party who are opposing the Bill.

Hon. E. H. Gray: Some of them.

Hon. C. B. WILLIAMS: I do not care if only one member of the Labour Party opposes it. The Labour Party should stand for the poorest of the poor whose only chance to get out of the ruck is to invest 6d. or 1s. in the hope of securing some kind of prize.

Hon. W. H. Kitson: They will not get it through this Bill.

Hon. C. B. WILLIAMS: That is because the hon. member has not read it. If a man can get £1,000 for 2s. 6d., has he not improved his position? The Bill has been before Parliament for months, and if any hon. member says he has not had time to study it, he should resign. I intend to support the Bill.

HON. E. H. GRAY (West) [9.20]: For many years people have been advocating the introduction of legislation of this kind. Personally I cannot see much difference between a Bill of the kind we have before us, and a proposal to establish State lotteries. The commission it is proposed to set up will better serve the purpose than the appointment of one commissioner which would be the case if we had a State lottery. Experience has taught us that it is better that bodies of this description should be composed of several people. Have we not the Prison Board which recommends the release of prisoners? Have we not the Fremantle Harbour Trust Commission which undertakes big works involving the expenditure of considerable sums of money? Have we not boards controlling institutions such as the Claremont Hospital for Insane, the Old Women's Home, hospitals and other institutions? I have always advocated control by boards. We cannot get away from the fact that at the present time money is needed for the support of many charitable institutions which are absolutely starving for assistance. I have spent a considerable time

in raising funds for charitable institutions, and I know the hard task it has been. There is no doubt that if we can harness the gambling evil, as it has been called—though I would not describe it as such—and divert the funds to good purposes, there will be saved an enormous amount of time, trouble and labour for those who are responsible for the conduct of the various institutions. I cannot understand why the Bill should not be welcome. It is necessary, and I am satisfied that the large majority of the public require it. I do not agree with those who are urging the abolition of newspaper competitions. Many people have received a measure of relief as the result of these competitions, and the load being carried by some families will be lightened during the Christmas season because of the aid they will receive from the competitions. Women in outback areas have received assistance from nurses, the result of funds provided by the newspaper competitions. The "Mirror" newspaper has contributed to a fund that will provide special relief for the unemployed during the Christmas season. The "Mirror" newspaper is contributing weekly to a building fund for the purpose of erecting an up-to-date baby centre in Perth to replace the present unsuitable premises. How then can we agree that these competitions are an evil, as some people try to make out? What harm is there in people investing their 3d. and 6d. in these competitions; even if they lose they derive a considerable amount of pleasure from them. When the Bill is in Committee, it is my intention to move for the deletion of certain words in the definition with the object of enabling the newspaper competitions to be continued. I do not consider those competitions to be an evil, and in my opinion it would be wrong if they were compelled to stop. I do not see why the legislature should direct its attention to this phase of gambling which is harmless, and allow bigger gambling activities to continue. If we oppose one form of gambling, we must oppose the lot. Therefore the best thing we can do is to harness gambling, as set out in the Bill. I should like to draw the Minister's attention to the fact that the unemployment relief committees have practically gone out of existence since the imposition of the 4d. tax. Funds are no longer being provided, and there is nothing now to disburse. I should like the Minister to refer to this

when he replies to the debate. There should be provision in the Bill for a representative body to be advanced funds from the proceeds of some of the sweeps. The unemployment evil will be with us for a long time and, seeing that it is no longer possible to raise funds by public subscription, there should be some provision in the Bill for the unemployment board to receive sums of money from the consultations. I support the second reading of the Bill.

HON. E. H. H. HALL (Central) [9.28]: I shall support the second reading of the Bill, and will reserve to myself the right to vote for amendments in Committee which will have the effect of making the measure what I think it should be. I am sorry the Government were not able to evolve a better method of raising subscriptions for the hospitals and other institutions which it is necessary to maintain throughout the State. The Bill, however, will have the effect of exercising better control over something which I do not think any of us has been keen about. I agree entirely with the sentiment expressed with regard to the duty of members of Parliament to so legislate as to guide the energies of people in the proper direction. We must admit that gambling has been rampant for years past, and seems to be getting worse. The cross-word puzzles are assuming alarming proportions. I am not frequently in the city on Friday afternoons, but on the last two Fridays I have been astounded at the scenes at depots where the coupons are lodged. A vast sum of money is raised weekly and it rather suggests that the Government could have raised more money by means of taxation that would have enabled more work to be provided for the unemployed and additional assistance to primary producers. Although Mr. Cornell complained that he had not had time within which to study the provisions of the Bill, he was able to deliver a speech that extended over three quarters of an hour. While I frequently disagree with his views, I appreciated his speech because he dealt with certain matters that I would like to have discussed at the Committee stage. I hope that one of the temporary chairmen of committees will be able to take the Chair so that Mr. Cornell may deal with the Bill from his seat on the floor of the House. Alterations should be made to the

Bill. For instance, no provision is included to make necessary the examination of accounts by the Auditor-General.

Hon. G. W. Miles: That is provided for.

Hon. E. H. H. HALL: Then I stand corrected. In answer to a point raised by Mr. R. G. Moore, Mr. Thomson stressed the fact that there is no compulsion upon people to take tickets in the lotteries. Those who are averse to their friends patronising the lotteries should exercise moral suasion with a view to getting them to abstain. I do not know that there is much chance of getting an Australian to do that, but the fact remains that there is no compulsion about it at all. People are free to take tickets if they desire to do so, and the great majority of us are fond of having a flutter. Splendid work has been carried out by voluntary organisations in the interests of charity, and I have on previous occasions mentioned the successful efforts carried out at Geraldton. The people there agreed to a voluntary levy of 6d. in the pound in order to raise funds. Some time ago the nursing scheme was in need of funds, and the Mayor convened a meeting to discuss ways and means. As a result, even in these depressed times, we raised £600, and no gambling was permitted in connection with the effort. That demonstrates that money can be raised even in these days. Unfortunately those who take a leading part in such movements are generally the same few and, especially in the metropolitan area, those who are prominent in the work are getting somewhat tired. People themselves are becoming disinterested in the frequent appeals that are made for funds for philanthropic work.

HON. W. H. KITSON (West) [9.35]: I oppose the second reading of the Bill. For many years I have advocated the establishment of adequate control over sweeps and lotteries, and I still believe that is necessary. On the other hand, I cannot approve of the methods suggested in the Bill. If legislation is to be as effective as we desire, it will be necessary for this State to adopt the methods that obtain in Queensland and New South Wales. We should have a straight-out State lottery, and not allow any others to be conducted in Western Australia. By that means we would provide a greater amount of money than will be available as

a result of the passage of the Bill. If it provided for a State lottery, the Bill could prescribe definitely the organisations that would be entitled to assistance. As it is, the Bill really gives preference to certain individuals and certain organisations. In effect, it will make the organising and conducting of lotteries legal regarding some persons and organisations, but illegal with reference to others. To that extent the Bill is not fair. While the Bill provides for the conducting of certain minor sweeps or lotteries, the limitations imposed are such that any efforts made will not prove of great value. On looking through the Bill with a view to framing amendments I desired, I found, mainly because of the absence of time within which to study the clauses, great difficulty in arriving at any satisfactory conclusion. Personally I would be prepared to sit to-morrow and for as many days as necessary in order to deal with the legislation properly, and I am sorry that members are not prepared to grant an adjournment of the debate. If we could postpone the second reading, we could give proper consideration to amendments that are necessary. I have no objection to lotteries being controlled, because I agree that control is necessary, but not the form of control outlined in the Bill. Wide powers are to be vested in the commission. I do not suggest that the men who will be appointed will not carry out their duties fairly and impartially, but the limitations embodied in the Bill will give undue preference to certain individuals and organisations. I would instance the exemptions regarding charitable organisations and religious bodies.

Hon. J. Cornell: Apparently a charitable institution is anything the Minister may determine.

Hon. W. H. KITSON: No organisation apart from those specified in the Bill is to receive more than £250 as a result of any lottery.

Hon. G. W. Miles: That would be out of any one lottery.

Hon. W. H. KITSON: Clause 19 deals with that particular phase, and we cannot assume that the limitation on the amount applies to the contribution an organisation may receive from each lottery. There are to be only 15 State-wide lotteries during the year, and that particular clause deals with lotteries that the commission will permit

to be conducted. I was impressed by the remarks of Mr. Gray regarding the operations of 30 committees carrying on purely charitable efforts in the metropolitan area with a view to raising funds for the unemployed. From my own experience, I know what that means. For two years I have been associated with a committee at Fremantle, and we have handled upwards of £11,000. Our funds will be completely exhausted by the end of the year. No additional voluntary contributions are being received and, in the circumstances, the unemployed will be in a much worse position in the future, notwithstanding the fact that the people are called upon to pay an additional tax of 4½d. in the pound. Consequently the relief committees in the metropolitan area and the Metropolitan Unemployment Relief Committee could reasonably expect to receive some consideration under a measure of this kind. During the last two years many of the committees have raised money by means of small sweeps or art unions, and I have no fault to find with that action. I have very little fault to find with newspaper competitions and crossword puzzles, provided they are properly controlled. They have answered a purpose. As Mr. Gray pointed out, much good has been done with some of the money raised. Generally speaking I object to the organisation of competitions, lotteries, sweeps etc. for private gain, but from newspaper competitions there is no direct gain to the promoters. A percentage of the money received from the entrance fees is returned to the prize-winners, and the balance is distributed amongst charitable organisations. I should like to see regulations introduced to ensure that the competitions will be conducted on fair lines so that everybody might be satisfied that he was getting a fair deal.

Hon. E. H. H. Hall: Do you suggest that they are not being conducted on fair lines?

Hon. W. H. KITSON: No, but competitions might be started by other newspapers that may not be as scrupulously fair as I believe the present newspapers are. There would not be much cause for complaint if such competitions were satisfactorily controlled. On occasions I have heard of unemployed people being in the habit of investing 2s. or 3s. a week in newspaper competitions, and it has been said that, on that account, the competitions should be prohibited.

Some people will always be prepared to spend a little more than they can afford on competitions or gambling. I imagine that the majority of newspaper competitors would not invest more than 1s. per week.

Hon. G. W. Miles: Do you think the newspaper competitions will be continued if this Bill be passed?

Hon. W. H. KITSON: The Minister in another place anticipates that it will not be possible for them to be continued. If that is so, the Bill should be amended to give the newspapers the right to continue the competitions subject to proper control. I would not object to the method of control being stipulated in the Bill instead of being left to regulation. There are 21 clauses in the Bill and, since it has been circulated, I have endeavoured to understand them. Although I believe I have a fairly good idea of their import, I have not been able to grasp the contents sufficiently thoroughly to enable me to frame desirable amendments. I do not agree with the proposed method of control, but I would approve of a State lottery. As I have not had time to prepare suitable amendments, I shall oppose the second reading.

HON. H. J. YELLAND (East) [9.51]: I do not intend to discuss the virtues of the Bill. I regret very much that a measure of such importance has been brought down at this late hour when it is impossible for us to give it the attention it should receive. However, there is a clause that relieves us of considerable responsibility and that is the last clause limiting the duration of the measure to one year. That means that the measure will have to be presented for re-enactment 12 months hence and, if it is not satisfactory, we shall have an opportunity to deal with it. For that reason we might as well set to work and consider the clauses in Committee, because it is really a Committee Bill. We are not given an opportunity to deal with the ethics of gambling. The only question before us is, Shall we allow gambling to continue in the unsatisfactory condition of our social life or shall we control it? Any right-thinking person must admit that it is better to control gambling than allow it to continue uncontrolled as at present. While I shall vote against the second reading on principle, I shall endeavour in Committee to make the Bill more workable.

THE CHIEF SECRETARY (Hon. C. F. Baxter—East—in reply) [9.53]: I appreciate the support that members have given the Bill. It was only natural to expect a fair number to be opposed to it. I regret that members have had to complain of the lateness of the hour at which the Bill has been presented to them. Still, I do not think that in the history of the Parliament, any measure has been more widely debated. Every member has had ample opportunity to become acquainted with the whole of the ramifications of the Bill.

Hon. G. Fraser: It was passed by another place only this morning.

THE CHIEF SECRETARY: In moving the second reading, I mentioned that the amendments made in another place were not of great importance. In any event, they were recorded in this morning's paper and members who were sufficiently interested could have followed them. I take it that the members who oppose the second reading are quite content to allow the present condition of affairs to continue. They are quite content that our charitable institutions should languish while the people's money is sent to other States for investment in such gambles as the Golden Casket, Queensland, where more than enough money is received from lotteries to maintain the hospitals and build new hospitals.

Hon. G. Fraser: This Bill will not prevent that.

THE CHIEF SECRETARY: If that is the hon. member's opinion, all I can say is that he has not digested the Bill. The most important feature is that the measure is on short trial. It is to have a duration of 12 months only. At the end of that time Parliament will have to determine whether it has been a success and whether it shall be continued. I am astonished at the reasoning of Mr. R. G. Moore. He said that money was needed for the sick and needy and that the Government had a way of getting it, but immediately afterwards he added that he had experienced the greatest difficulty to bring himself to support the 4½d. tax recently imposed. If the Government had presented a Bill to provide the money out of taxation, would the hon. member have supported it? The hon. member is new to this House and I should like to tell him that we cannot continue to tax the people, because they cannot carry additional taxation burdens.

Hon. R. G. Moore: Where is the money coming from now?

The CHIEF SECRETARY: Coming from a source for which there is always a plentiful supply of money, namely gambling. People can always find money for gambling even when they cannot find it for other purposes. For two years the Government fought strenuously against imposing any additional taxation except on luxuries. As members know, the Government were compelled to impose the 4½d. tax. We knew that it would be difficult for the people to bear any further taxation, and the Government regret having been forced to impose it. Yet the hon. member suggests that we might have imposed another tax and that if we had proposed it, he would have supported it. Mr. Cornell said it was remarkable that the definition of lottery in the Bill was the same as the definition in the Criminal Code. That is not correct. The definition reads—

“Lottery” has the same meaning as the term “lottery” in Section 212 of the Criminal Code, 1913, and, further, includes any disposition of property under any scheme or competition which the public or any specified section of the public may or is invited to enter, the nature or conduct of which (though skill on the part of the entrants or competitors is required) is such as in the circumstances of the case to preclude the fair consideration of the answers of the entrants or competitors. The term also includes all schemes or devices for the disposition of property known as art unions, raffles, guessing competitions and the like.

The hon. member spoke in derogatory terms of the additional words. They are necessary, though he contended there was no need for them. In doing so, he set himself up against legal opinion. He said that we could do under the Criminal Code what could be done under this measure. That is not so or the Bill would never have been introduced. Crosswords have been mentioned. They could not be controlled previously, but they would be controlled absolutely under this measure. If the Bill becomes law, the crossword competitions cannot be continued.

Hon. Sir Charles Nathan: They cannot be continued without the consent of the Minister.

Hon. G. W. Miles: And the Minister is not likely to give consent.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: I have my own opinion as to that. That is the position. To use his own expression, he said the additional words were verbiage. Why should

he refer to them in that way? The legal opinion is exactly opposite to what Mr. Cornell stated this evening. Reference was made to the fact that any person who desired to conduct a lottery would be referred by the commission to the Commissioner of Police and Mr. Cornell said that one of the reasons why he opposed the Bill was because the report would be printed. I am not saying I think it is right, when a person's character is reported on by the police, that it should be made available to the commission or to anybody else.

Hon. J. Cornell: It does not matter how it is got by the police.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: That does not matter. The police may have something against the character of a man desiring to conduct a lottery and to make that public would be very detrimental to him. I want to correct what Mr. Fraser said. He referred to Clause 7 and said the final decision should be in the hands of the Minister. It is in the hands of the Minister, but the Minister has to be advised by the commission. No Minister would be in a position to make all inquiries necessary. He would be foolish to attempt to do so.

Hon. G. Fraser: He cannot act against the advice of the commission.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: Of course he can go against the advice of the commission. Mr. Kitson's speech can be summed up in two words—State lottery. The hon. member is in favour of State lotteries because he favours State trading concerns. We are overloaded with those concerns to-day and cannot dispose of them. Neither this House nor another place would agree to State control of gambling. The control should be in the hands of someone outside the public service altogether. To members who have leanings in that direction, I say, “Forget it.” We should not be loaded with another State department.

Hon. J. Cornell: Why have it for a year?

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

Ayes	18
Noes	7
					—
Majority for	11
					—

AYES.

Hon. C. F. Baxter	Hon. G. W. Miles
Hon. L. B. Bolton	Hon. T. Moore
Hon. A. M. Clydesdale	Hon. Sir C. Nathan
Hon. J. M. Drew	Hon. H. V. Piesse
Hon. J. Ewing	Hon. E. Rose
Hon. E. H. Gray	Hon. A. Thomson
Hon. V. Hamersley	Hon. Sir E. Wittenoom
Hon. J. M. Macfarlane	Hon. C. H. Wittenoom
Hon. W. J. Mann	Hon. E. H. Hall

(Teller.)

NOES.

Hon. J. Cornell	Hon. R. G. Moore
Hon. J. T. Franklin	Hon. H. J. Yelland
Hon. G. Fraser	Hon. E. H. Harris
Hon. W. H. Kitson	

(Teller.)

Question thus passed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

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

Clause 1—agreed to.

Clause 2—Definitions:

Hon. SIR CHARLES NATHAN: Would not paragraph (i), in conjunction with Clause 4 (b) and Clause 19, give the Minister the right to agree to the conduct of crossword puzzles?

The CHIEF SECRETARY: The Minister certainly has that right under the Bill.

Hon. G. W. MILES: A clause should be inserted in the Bill prohibiting crossword puzzles, which I consider are a menace to the community, because they are teaching children to gamble. I supported the second reading chiefly because I thought the Bill would stop crossword puzzle competitions. The Chief Secretary now says that the Minister controlling the Act can grant permission to hold crossword puzzle competitions.

The CHAIRMAN: The hon. member can move to amend the Bill, if he thinks fit.

Hon. Sir EDWARD WITTENOOM: I would like to stop bookmakers from betting, but that cannot be done because it would mean the end of horse-racing.

Hon. G. FRASER: Mr. Miles says that crossword puzzles are a disgrace. In what way are they a disgrace? There are forms of gambling more vicious. I would not like to see crossword competitions stopped.

Hon. G. W. Miles: I know that. You ought to be ashamed of yourself.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I would point out that crossword puzzles are not mentioned in the clause

Hon. G. FRASER: That may be so, but we know what is meant. I fail to see that I should be ashamed of myself for expressing the opinion that crossword puzzle competitions ought to be continued. The hon. member can afford to take tickets in a lottery.

Hon. G. W. Miles: I do not.

Hon. G. FRASER: Every section of the community ought to have the right to gamble. There should not be a privileged section. The crossword puzzle is the poor man's lottery, and should be allowed to continue.

Hon. W. H. KITSON: Unemployment relief committees should be entitled to some of the proceeds from these lotteries. Is it under paragraph (i) that I shall have to move an amendment to include such committees?

The CHAIRMAN: The hon. member can achieve his object by moving such an amendment to Clause 17, under which, I take it, subsidiary lotteries may be conducted.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: If unemployment does not come within the definition of charitable objects, I do not know what does. Power is already contained in the Bill to render assistance to these committees.

The CHAIRMAN: Charitable concerns are not defined in the Bill. Such things are left to the discretion of the Minister.

Hon. W. H. KITSON: A lot of argument was required in another place to convince the Minister that he should specially provide for infant health centres. I want to make sure that the metropolitan council of unemployment relief committees is similarly provided for in the Bill.

Hon. R. G. Moore: Does paragraph (h) comprehend the Silver Chain?

The Chief Secretary: That comes under paragraph (i).

Hon. H. J. YELLAND: Any institution that feels it is entitled to receive assistance will no doubt make application in the usual way, and such application will be considered on its merits. I think paragraph (h) would apply to the Silver Chain.

Hon. W. H. KITSON: I move an amendment—

That a new paragraph be inserted as follows:—“Any body organised for the purpose of dispensing relief to the unemployed.”

Unemployment relief committees throughout the State have greatly assisted the Government, and relieved the authorities of a heavy burden. This has applied perhaps more in the metropolitan area, although such towns as Geraldton, Albany and Bunbury have risen nobly to the occasion. After 1st January there will be still greater distress amongst the unemployed, who cannot be relieved, as they have been in the past, because voluntary contributions will have ceased. I should be sorry to think the unemployed would have to go short of many necessities hitherto provided by those committees.

Hon. Sir CHARLES NATHAN: This brings me back to the first question I asked the Minister. If members will look at paragraph (i) they will find that it covers the amendment moved by the hon. member.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: I have previously said that unemployment comes under the definition of "charity." Now Mr. Kitson would say that any small concern which might organise itself as a relief committee should be included in the Bill.

Hon. E. H. Gray: Nothing of the sort.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: Such committees have been formed all over the place. I strongly oppose the amendment.

Hon. W. H. KITSON: I have said there is only one body in the metropolitan area which I would be prepared to name, because that is the recognised body. Then the authorised relief committees in the metropolitan area are official in the eyes of the Government, and act on behalf of the Government. My only aim is to make sure that the organisation endeavouring to relieve the unemployed shall be entitled to a share in the distribution of the money.

Hon. W. J. MANN: I agree with Sir Charles Nathan that paragraph (i) fully covers the amendment. There are scattered throughout the rural parts of the State scores of small relief committees doing exceedingly good relief work. But if the amendment be agreed to, the Minister will be inundated with applications.

Hon. E. H. GRAY: If it is thought that paragraph (i) is sufficient, members must reflect that that paragraph carries a limitation of £250, which to many of these committees would be only a drop in the ocean. The operations of the Metropolitan Council are under the direction of the Government, and if there are any distributions of money statistics are consulted and every unem-

ployed married man receives an equal share of the amount distributed. I have heard objections to relief committees on the score of the money they spend. That is an entirely wrong impression, for I venture to say the cost of those committees in the collection of funds does not exceed 1 per cent. Surely those relief committees should be recognised. They all work under the respective local authorities, which is a guarantee that the money they receive is well spent. I hope the amendment will be agreed to.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: Already there is ample provision in paragraph (i), and so there is no need for the amendment.

Hon. E. H. Gray: But that paragraph (i) means only £250.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: It means the possibility of £250 from each of 15 sweeps in the year, or a total of £3,750.

Hon. J. M. DREW: Wonderful work on behalf of the unemployed is being done by these committees in the metropolitan area, but also a great deal is being done in almost every country centre. If there is to be any distribution under the Bill the country relief committees should not be overlooked. Very many of the lottery tickets will be sold in the country, and if on that score alone it is only right that the country relief committees should participate in the distribution.

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

Ayes	6
Noes	18
					—
Majority against					12
					—

AYES.

Hon. A. M. Clydesdale	Hon. E. H. Gray
Hon. J. M. Drew	Hon. T. Moore
Hon. G. Fraser	Hon. W. H. Kitson
	(Teller.)

NOES.

Hon. C. F. Baxter	Hon. G. W. Miles
Hon. J. Ewing	Hon. R. G. Moore
Hon. J. T. Franklin	Hon. Sir G. Nathan
Hon. E. H. H. Hall	Hon. H. V. Picase
Hon. V. Hamersley	Hon. E. Rose
Hon. E. H. Harris	Hon. A. Thomson
Hon. J. J. Holmes	Hon. Sir E. Wittenoom
Hon. J. M. Macfarlane	Hon. C. H. Wittenoom
Hon. W. J. Mann	Hon. H. J. Yelland
	(Teller.)

Amendment thus negatived.

Hon. W. H. KITSON: I move an amendment—

That after "object" in line 2 of paragraph (i.) the words "including unemployment" be inserted.

This will be an indication to the Minister that unemployment relief is a charitable purpose within the meaning of the Act.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: The words will be superfluous. The hon. member's action savours of an attempt to hold up the Bill.

Hon. G. Fraser: The two words will not overload the Bill.

Amendment put and negatived.

Hon. J. M. DREW: In the definition of "lottery" there seems to be something wrong with the phraseology. The words appear "which the public or any specified section of the public may or is invited to enter. I should say it would be better if the sentence read, "may enter or is invited to enter."

The CHIEF SECRETARY: The words were drafted by the Parliamentary Draftsman and they mean what the hon. member said.

Clause put and passed.

Clause 3—Lotteries commission:

Hon. J. M. MACFARLANE: The life of the Bill when it becomes an Act will be 12 months and yet paragraph (b) declares that the commission shall have perpetual succession.

The CHAIRMAN: In that case "perpetual succession" means that the commission will go on as long as the Act lasts.

Hon. H. J. YELLAND: I move an amendment—

That in paragraph (c) "four" be struck out and "five" inserted in lieu.

Instead of having four members on the commission it would be better to have five. Then there would not be any need for the Chairman to have a deliberative as well as a casting vote.

Hon. A. M. CLYDESDALE: I hope the amendment will not be agreed to. My experience is that four members of the commission are quite sufficient and five would make it cumbersome. Personally I would prefer three members to five members.

Amendment put and negatived.

Hon. G. W. MILES: I move an amendment—

That all the words after "quorum" in line 1 of paragraph (d) be struck out and the following inserted in lieu:—"All questions arising at any meeting shall be decided by a majority of the votes of the members present."

That will get over the difficulty that has been referred to in connection with the deliberative and casting votes of the chairman.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: I am not quite clear about things at this hour of the night, but I can foresee a deadlock arising if this amendment be agreed to. It is provided that three of the four members shall form a quorum. But should four members be present and two vote one way and two the other and the chairman not have a casting vote, what will happen? It is imperative that the business should go on.

Hon. A. THOMSON: The paragraph is satisfactory as it stands and the amendment will merely serve to promote a deadlock. It is customary for a chairman to have a casting vote.

Hon. G. FRASER: If the chairman is to have a deliberative as well as a casting vote, he may make use of both votes and so nullify what should be a majority decision of the commission.

Hon. A. THOMSON: If the chairman did that, he would not be worthy of his position and his fellow commissioners would not allow him to continue.

Hon. R. G. MOORE: The provision in the Bill is satisfactory. The casting vote would be used only in the event of a tie, and not to create a deadlock.

Hon. G. Fraser: I have known the casting vote to be used to equalise the voting.

Hon. R. G. MOORE: It cannot legitimately be done.

Hon. H. J. YELLAND: My object in moving for a commission of five was to relieve the chairman of the necessity for exercising a casting vote.

Hon. A. M. CLYDESDALE: If there were five members, and only four attended, the same position would arise.

Amendment put and negatived.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: I understand that paragraph (j) was struck out in another place but was inadvertently retained in the reprint. I move an amendment—

That paragraph (j) be struck out.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: If the paragraph should not appear, the Bill is not the one passed by another place.

The CHAIRMAN: I have a certificate that this is a fair print of the Bill passed by another place.

Hon. E. H. Harris: Then the paragraph is in the Bill.

The CHAIRMAN: So far as we are concerned, it is in the Bill.

Hon. G. W. MILES: Can you assure us that the Bill contains no other clauses that should not appear?

The CHAIRMAN: That is for the Minister to say.

Hon. G. W. MILES: More care should be exercised when sending Bills to this House. I read in the newspaper that the paragraph had been deleted in another place.

Hon. E. H. Gray: That paper was right.

The CHAIRMAN: Why labour the question? The Bill, including paragraph (j), is before us. It would be much better if no reference were made to what occurred in another place.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: I understand that a Bill, to become law, must be passed by both Houses, and here we have a Bill before us that has not been passed by another place.

The Chief Secretary: You do not know that.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: The Minister himself said the paragraph should not be in the Bill, and therefore this is not the Bill passed by another place. I submit that the Bill is wrongly before us.

The CHAIRMAN: The Minister stated, in reply to a remark on the second reading, that paragraph (j) had been left in the Bill in another place.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: I have moved to strike out the paragraph.

Hon. E. H. Harris: Why do you wish to strike it out?

The CHIEF SECRETARY: Because it is not necessary.

Hon. G. W. Miles: The "West Australian" reported this morning that it had been struck out.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: Do you, Mr. Chairman, rule that this is the Bill passed by another place?

The CHAIRMAN: I rule that as the certified copy of the Bill passed by another place contains paragraph (j) it is properly before the Committee. If the paragraph is considered unnecessary, the Committee may strike it out. If it be struck out, the Bill will be returned to another place with the amendment, and then the argument can

arise in another place as to what happened there.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: We have been told that until a Bill is passed by another place, it is only a scrap of paper. This Bill has not been passed by another place.

The CHAIRMAN: There is nothing to indicate that paragraph (j) is not in the Bill, other than the statement made by the Minister.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: Let us be sure of our ground. This afternoon I presented a petition in opposition to the Bill, and it contained the signature of a reverend gentleman who had conducted a lengthy discourse with a Minister in another place. I can understand his claiming that this Bill has not been passed by another place. The Committee may do as they like, but my contention is that the Bill is a scrap of paper until it has been passed by another place and has been introduced here.

The Chief Secretary: The hon. member is wrong.

The CHAIRMAN: Our business is to deal with the Bill as it appears in the certified copy, and amend it as we think fit. We should not be side-tracked by ex parte statements of what occurred in another place.

Hon. G. FRASER: This shows the disadvantage of rushing legislation through.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: I contend the Bill is in order.

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

Clause 4—Powers of commission:

Hon. G. W. MILES: I move an amendment—

That the following proviso be added to the clause:—"Provided that cross-word puzzle competitions run by newspapers or others shall not be permitted."

One of the main reasons for the introduction of the Bill is to prevent the continuance of crossword puzzles, which are a disgrace to the community. They should be stopped.

Hon. W. J. MANN: I oppose the amendment. Much has been said about the popularity of newspaper competitions, but can anyone say they have resulted in any great harm? The competitions should be conducted under the control of the board.

Hon. A. Thomson: They should be conducted for charitable purposes only.

Hon. W. J. MANN: They are now.

Hon. G. W. Miles: But they result in increased circulation of the newspapers.

Hon. W. J. MANN: One newspaper has had to employ, on account of these crossword puzzle competitions, no fewer than 17 additional people. That is the "Sunday Times." In addition, news agents have had to employ extra runners. Again, the Treasury derive revenue from them by way of stamp duty. The cheques sent out by the "Sunday Times" for prizes carry a duty of £7 for each competition, and, in addition, the Government derive revenue from the stamp duty paid on the receipts.

Hon. R. G. MOORE: I cannot see how crossword puzzles can be included in the Bill, because only 15 lotteries will be permitted.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: The Bill would make it very difficult for any newspaper to run a crossword puzzle competition, on account of the many restrictions imposed. I refer members to Clauses 10 and 11 of the Bill.

Amendment put and negatived.

Hon. R. G. MOORE: I would like the Minister to explain the words "provided that preference of employment shall be given to returned soldiers, sailors or nurses."

The CHIEF SECRETARY: Those words were not in the Bill as originally drawn. They were inserted by another place. All things being equal, preference of employment will be given to the persons mentioned.

The CHAIRMAN: The words "all things being equal" are not included in the Bill.

Hon. A. M. CLYDESDALE: What would be the position of the persons who are employed in connection with these competitions at the present moment? Would they be dismissed and returned soldiers employed in their place?

The CHAIRMAN: It is a matter for the Committee to decide whether they will qualify these words.

Hon. W. H. KITSON: If the words remain without qualification, the commission will be unable to employ a person under the age of 32 years. A returned soldier must have been 18 years of age in 1918. We should either qualify the words or delete them.

Hon. E. H. GRAY: I move an amendment—

That after the words "provided that," the following words be inserted:—"all things being equal."

On second thoughts, I will withdraw my amendment.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Hon. Sir CHARLES NATHAN: I move an amendment—

That after the words "provided that" in the proviso the words "all things being equal" be inserted.

Hon. R. G. MOORE: I support the amendment. If it is not carried, no one but returned sailors, soldiers and nurses will get a job on this commission.

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

Clauses 5 to 7—agreed to.

Clause 8—Restriction as to number of State-wide lotteries:

Hon. E. H. HARRIS: Why are these lotteries restricted to 15 in each year? Is it expected that a certain amount of money will be brought in by that number?

The Chief Secretary: The commission will not necessarily conduct 15 sweeps, but these would all be run by it, if they are so conducted.

Hon. E. H. HARRIS: Perhaps it is thought that number will cover the gambling instincts of the public.

Hon. Sir Charles Nathan: I take it the commission can authorise as many district lotteries as may be deemed desirable.

Clause put and passed.

Clauses 9 to 11—agreed to.

Clause 12—Indemnity clause:

Hon. E. H. HARRIS: If anyone unwittingly subscribed to a sweep that has not been authorised, it would seem that a penalty may be imposed upon him. The person who conducts the illegal sweep should be the one to be held responsible.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: The clause exonerates any person from a penalty if he subscribes to an illegal lottery. I do not know of anything in the Bill that penalises purchasers of tickets.

Hon. J. M. DREW: The implication is that there is a law whereby a person is liable to punishment in the circumstances set out in the clause. It was once my duty to control lotteries, amongst other things. I was informed by the Crown Law Department and the Commissioner of Police that there

is no offence connected with the purchasing of tickets or in the selling of them; that the offence commences when the drawing takes place.

Clause put and passed.

Clauses 13 and 14—agreed to.

Clause 15—Accounts and audit:

Hon. E. H. HARRIS: I submit that the auditor in this case should be appointed by the Minister, and not by the permit holder. I am disposed to move as an amendment that in line 1 of paragraph (b) the words "permit holder" be struck out and "Minister" inserted in lieu.

12 o'clock midnight.

The CHAIRMAN: Surely the onus to appoint the auditor is on the permit holder?

Hon. E. H. HARRIS: But there should be a Government auditor to audit all sweeps conducted under permit. Perhaps the Minister will agree to put up an amendment such as I desire.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: Certainly not, because the proposed amendment is unnecessary. It is for the permit holder to appoint the auditor, who must be approved by the Minister. It would be impracticable for the Minister to appoint the auditor.

Clause put and passed.

Clause 16—Offences:

Hon. R. G. MOORE: I do not agree with this penal clause providing for imprisonment for three years or a fine of £300. Why cannot it be left as it is in the Criminal Code?

Hon. W. H. KITSON: Referring to paragraph (iii.), will the sale of Tattersall's tickets be interpreted as conducting an illegal lottery? The definition of "illegal lottery" includes "foreign lottery." One member of the Chamber associated with the existing sweeps committee states that we have been receiving substantial money from the Eastern States for our sweeps. Under the Bill, of course, it will not be possible to send money away for Eastern States lotteries.

Hon. A. M. Clydesdale: There is nothing to prevent one sending direct to the sweep office in the Eastern States.

Hon. W. H. KITSON: Once the Bill becomes law it will be an offence to buy or sell

a ticket in an Eastern States lottery. I think the penalty here provided is altogether too high.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: If the hon. member will look at paragraphs (vii), (viii.) and (ix.) of this clause, he will find they cover the position about which he is concerned.

Hon. W. H. KITSON: I ask whether an agent who has been in the habit of selling Eastern States lottery tickets will be fined if he be caught selling them after the passage of the Bill? The penalties for that and for conducting an illegal lottery are altogether too high.

Hon. G. FRASER: How can a person selling a ticket in a foreign lottery be charged with conducting a foreign lottery? The selling of a ticket is not conducting a lottery, yet only by selling a ticket in a foreign lottery can a man be charged with conducting a foreign lottery.

Hon. E. H. HARRIS: The Australian Labour Party and the Druids conduct lotteries annually. They issue tickets of admission to their gatherings which entitle the holders to participate in a lottery. Would those lotteries come within the scope of the Bill?

The CHIEF SECRETARY: The hon. member knows well that they would.

Clause put and passed.

Clause 17—Exemptions in case of church, etc. bazaars:

Hon. E. H. HARRIS: There is no definition of "charitable organisation" in this clause. I should like to know what will be likely to happen in the event of there being a change of Ministry. Will this cover such games as crown and anchor, housey-housey, and the chocolate wheel, which are all popular at sports gatherings?

Hon. E. H. GRAY: I move an amendment—

That after "organisation" in line 2 the words "or any unemployed relief committee recognised by the Minister" be inserted.

Hon. R. G. Moore: My interpretation of the clause is that it gives power to the Minister to do just as he likes.

Hon. W. H. KITSON: I hope there will be some reference made to unemployment relief, because next year I fear will be worse than the present year. Unless we

can secure money from some source or other, there will be a great deal more trouble experienced in the coming year.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: I have already pointed out there is provision in the Bill to meet the hon. member's wishes.

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

Ayes	6
Noes	16
—					
Majority against	10
—					

AYES.

Hon. A. M. Clydesdale	Hon. W. H. Kitson
Hon. J. M. Drew	Hon. T. Moore
Hon. G. Fraser	Hon. E. H. Gray
	(Teller.)

NOES.

Hon. C. F. Baxter	Hon. G. W. Miles
Hon. L. B. Bolton	Hon. R. G. Moore
Hon. J. Ewing	Hon. Sir C. Nathan
Hon. J. T. Franklin	Hon. H. V. Piesse
Hon. E. H. H. Hall	Hon. E. Rose
Hon. V. Hamersley	Hon. A. Thomson
Hon. J. M. Macfarlane	Hon. C. H. Wittenoom
Hon. W. J. Mann	Hon. H. J. Yelland
	(Teller.)

Amendment thus negatived.

Clause put and passed.

Clause 18—agreed to.

Clause 19—Limitation of distribution moneys in case of certain charitable purposes:

Hon. W. H. Kitson: Why the limitation of £250?

The CHIEF SECRETARY: This is an increase on the amount that was originally stated in the Bill. It is unnecessary to allocate a larger sum than this. The clause does not say how often these sums may be given.

Hon. W. H. KITSON: The explanation does not satisfy me. I move an amendment—

That the words "two hundred and fifty" be struck out and "five hundred" inserted in lieu.

It may be desired to give a larger sum than £250. The commission will not be obliged to give as much as £500, but should be in a position to do so if necessary.

Hon. E. H. GRAY: I support the amendment. Some unemployment relief committee may be in urgent need of funds owing to an increase in the number of unemployed. Of what use would £250 be in such a case? The same principle may apply to other organisations.

Hon. G. Fraser: Perhaps the Chief Secretary will say whether he accepts the amendment or not.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: A maximum of £250 is quite sufficient, because that amount may be distributed half a dozen times in the year.

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

Ayes	4
Noes	17
—					
Majority against	13
—					

AYES.

Hon. E. H. Gray	Hon. T. Moore
Hon. W. H. Kitson	Hon. G. Fraser
	(Teller.)

NOES.

Hon. C. F. Baxter	Hon. W. J. Mann
Hon. L. B. Bolton	Hon. G. W. Miles
Hon. A. M. Clydesdale	Hon. R. G. Moore
Hon. J. M. Drew	Hon. Sir C. Nathan
Hon. J. Ewing	Hon. H. V. Piesse
Hon. J. T. Franklin	Hon. E. Rose
Hon. E. H. H. Hall	Hon. A. Thomson
Hon. V. Hamersley	Hon. C. B. Williams
Hon. J. M. Macfarlane	(Teller.)

Amendment thus negatived.

Clause put and passed.

Clauses 20, 21, Title—agreed to.

Bill reported with amendments, and the report adopted.

Third Reading.

Read a third time and returned to the Assembly with amendments.

BILL—SECESSION REFERENDUM.

Assembly's Message.

Message from the Assembly received and read notifying that it had agreed to the amendments made by the Council.

BILL—RESERVES.

Assembly's Message.

Message from the Assembly received and read notifying that it had agreed to the amendment made by the Council.

BILL—METROPOLITAN WHOLE MILK.

Assembly's Message.

Message from the Assembly received and read notifying that it had agreed to the amendment made by the Council.

BILL—WHEAT POOL.*Recommittal.*

On motion by Hon. J. Cornell, Bill re-committed for the further consideration of Clause 15.

In Committee.

Hon. W. H. Kitson in the Chair; the Chief Secretary in charge of the Bill.

Clause 15—To establish and maintain wheat pools:

Hon. W. J. MANN: The position has materially altered since the Bill was last before the Committee and if agreed to, Subclause (3) of Clause 15 will provide all the powers that have been specifically refused in the Legislative Assembly under the Bulk Handling Bill. In times like the present, the wheatgrowers depend largely on the goodwill of the commercial community to assist them in their operations.

Hon. E. H. H. Hall: And the commercial community depend on the wheatgrowers.

Hon. W. J. MANN: The wheat merchants have about £2,000,000 worth of credits in the wheat belt at present. Evidence tendered before the select committee that dealt with the Bulk Handling Bill showed that the pool had erected bulk handling experimental plants at five sidings last year, and at those sidings the wheat merchants were practically precluded from buying. In that way, what I regard as a monopoly was established. The wheat firms cannot be expected to extend credits where they are unable to trade. If bulk handling operations, which are said to have been conducted so far illegally, are to continue, then the farmers can expect to lose the goodwill of the merchants who have assisted them so much in the past and have enabled them to continue in the industry. In a statement made the day after the bulk handling scheme of the Wheat Pool was rejected in the Legislative Assembly, the chairman of the pool trustees said that whether the Bill was agreed to or not, the pool trustees intended to extend bulk handling facilities to other sidings. I do not think that is desirable. Parliament should say whether or not bulk handling should be carried on. A very definite reply on that point has been given by the Legislative Assembly. Obviously, it is the intention of the pool to extend bulk handling facilities to the larger sidings, leaving to the wheat merchants the smaller sidings where wheat

acquisition is relatively unprofitable. I do not think the Committee will agree to such a condition of affairs, which I regard as wrong.

Hon. E. H. H. Hall: You grow a lot of wheat down your way.

Hon. W. J. MANN: That shows how much the hon. member knows about it, and his statement is on a par with many other opinions he has expressed regarding the South-West. I recognise the difficulty and it may be that if some protection is not afforded the pool, the trustees may be confronted with litigation for having carried out operations illegally. I propose to ask the Committee to delete Subclause (3) and if that course is adopted, I shall move to substitute another subclause setting out that no action shall lie against the pool in respect of their experimental operations during last year. That will not permit the pool to continue in the future. I move an amendment—

That Subclause (3) be deleted.

Hon. H. V. PIESSE: I oppose the amendment. We should allow the private enterprise of the Wheat Pool to be continued. It will be of advantage to the producers and the Lord knows we want the wheatgrowers to have some advantage to encourage them to carry on. If the trustees of the Wheat Pool decide to continue the construction of bulk handling sheds at other sidings, it will be of assistance to the wheatgrowers, and will lower the cost of production. The Assembly had an opportunity to pass legislation dealing with bulk handling but rejected the measure.

One o'clock a.m.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: I hope the Committee will not agree to the amendment, for Subclause 3 is necessary to legalise an expenditure which has been incurred in all good faith.

Hon. V. HAMERSLEY: This corporation are asking only what is reasonable, namely to be put in the same position as the other firms operating in wheat. The amendment asks us to deny the corporation the right to do what other firms can do. No monopoly whatever is required, but merely the same treatment for all the various firms.

Hon. J. M. DREW: At first I saw no harm in granting the powers asked for by the Bill. It seemed to me that if the cor-

poration wished to start bulk handling on a voluntary basis with their own money, there was nothing wrong with it, for they could not go far without having to come to Parliament. But it must be remembered that the farmer will be deeply involved. Subclause 7 provides that the corporation may, with the authority of the growers, borrow money for marketing wheat and for other purposes. What are those other purposes? The provision of bulk handling, and in order to secure the money borrowed and raised the corporation may exercise such securities as are required by the lenders and do various other things. In view of this the farmers may be canvassed and induced to enter into certain contracts and in the end may find that three-quarters of their crops have gone in costs.

Hon. A. THOMSON: I hope the Committee will not agree to the amendment. I am somewhat amused at Mr. Mann's anxiety that the farmers should maintain the goodwill of the merchants who have stood by them in the past. It seems to me that if the farmers desire to come under the provisions of the voluntary pool, those who come in will merely sign an interim contract applying for one year only. If a farmer considers it would be more advantageous to deal with other firms who, if they desire, may erect a container at any country siding, surely there is nothing wrong in this company asking for the same privilege. The corporation requires the right to stack their wheat in bulk at country sidings. That is all. Rather than move this amendment, the hon. member ought to have tried to defeat the Bill on the second reading. The Westralian Farmers Limited have no control over the voluntary wheat pool. If this meant a compulsory wheat pool, one could understand the alarm of some members who apparently have not a very complete knowledge of what is actually going on. Surely the Committee will not deny the farmers the right to erect bulk handling plants at the various sidings in an endeavour to reduce the cost of production. I am afraid there are other interests trying to prevent the accomplishment of the pool's desires. If the privilege is denied, I shall oppose the third reading.

Hon. J. CORNELL: I am endeavouring to find the nigger in the woodpile. Subclause 3 is designed to give the proposed corporation the right to establish and maintain a scheme for the handling of grain in bulk.

The wheat pool have established a system of bulk handling embracing five or six sidings, and I understand they received the permission of the Commissioner of Railways to try out the scheme. I have no objection to that. Is that scheme to be continued by the pool, incorporated or unincorporated and without being legalised? Another place has refused to legalise bulk handling.

Hon. A. Thomson: That decision was against granting a monopoly.

Hon. J. CORNELL: Bulk handling has been rejected by another place again and again.

Hon. E. H. H. Hall: In certain circumstances.

Hon. J. CORNELL: In all circumstances. Is it desired by the pool to enlarge the present scheme?

Hon. V. Hamersley: Yes.

Hon. J. CORNELL: Then it is desired to get bulk handling by fair means or foul. The system cannot be extended without the consent of the Commissioner of Railways because he has to grant permission to erect storage bins and to provide transport facilities.

Hon. A. Thomson: They are paid for.

Hon. V. Hamersley: It was a business arrangement.

Hon. J. CORNELL: That does not matter. The nigger in the woodpile is that, despite what has happened since the joint select committee presented their report, the pool desire to continue the establishment of bulk handling by a sort of peaceful penetration.

Hon. A. Thomson: This Bill has been passed by another place.

Hon. J. CORNELL: But the nigger in the woodpile was there all the time.

Hon. H. V. Piesse: You are the only one to find him.

Hon. J. CORNELL: We shall not be doing our duty if we pass the subclause, as we cannot be privy to the pool or anyone else erecting a bulk handling system throughout the State. A co-ordinated system is required, because its success is dependent on the railways.

Hon. T. MOORE: Mr. Thomson has appealed to us to give the proposed corporation the rights and privileges enjoyed by merchants. He inferred that greater rights were not asked for the proposed corporation.

Hon. A. Thomson: That is so.

Hon. T. MOORE: What does Clause 7 say? It does not give the merchants the right to take the farmers' wheat and erect

bulk handling facilities. The hon. member did not state the position clearly. The pool have no Act of Parliament entitling them to use the wheat of the farmers.

Hon. V. Hamersley: What nonsense!

Hon. T. MOORE: If we are going to have bulk handling, it should be established on a proper basis. One man has said that his scheme will be adopted or no scheme at all. He has an axe to grind. It is stated that the pool, whether they have the right or not, will go on. I suppose they will select all the big sidings in one zone and cater for them. They will thus get peaceful penetration and I do not stand for that. If bulk handling is to be installed, it should be on the basis of a State-wide scheme, and not by any hole-and-corner method such as this. Bulk handling has been defeated in another place. The select committee agreed that a scheme could be installed for £500,000, and when that was turned down, the Government presented a scheme to cost £1,500,000. What an inglorious exhibition of want of logic! Attempts are being made to force bulk handling on the farmers. They have never asked for it.

Hon. L. B. Bolton: What nonsense!

Hon. T. MOORE: I meet more farmers than do other members.

Hon. H. V. Piesse: I have my doubts.

Hon. T. MOORE: None of them is wrapped up in the bulk handling scheme. We know how salesmen were sent out by the same company to advise farmers to get rid of their horses and buy tractors, and thus carry on their farming by up-to-date methods. We knew what that has cost the country. I say advisedly it would be wrong to allow the company, who have said they will have their scheme or no scheme, to pick the eyes out of the country by selecting the biggest sidings and so gain control and carry bulk handling into effect in a way to suit themselves. A letter was published recently in the Press which was written by a thoroughly capable farmer, expressing his disapproval of the bulk handling scheme.

Hon. L. B. Bolton: What is his name?

Hon. T. MOORE: He did not sign his name to the letter, but I can satisfy the hon. member of the writer's bona fides. I oppose the clause.

Hon. Sir CHARLES NATHAN: There has been much talk of currents and cross-currents, but I desire to deal with and vote on this question on its merits. At present

I am neither for nor against the clause which gives the corporation power to establish a system of bulk handling. The corporation could not, however, possibly establish such a system without the consent of the Government of the day. If the Government felt that it would interfere with their plans, then they might withhold their approval. It seems to me to be necessary for the Government to legalise the work that has already been done in connection with bulk handling. Mr. Drew has raised a particularly interesting point and it becomes necessary now to review the position in view of his remarks on Clause 7. There is nothing to compel the farmer to send his wheat to the pool. He may be financed by some other firm, who might say to him, "If you send your wheat to the bulk handling scheme we will not continue to finance you." Another point: The Bill certainly gives the scheme the right to hypothecate, charge, mortgage or pledge the wheat delivered to the pool. The scheme will have the right to do that despite any prior lien on the wheat. The Agricultural Bank or the creditors of the farmer may have advanced him money to put in and take off his crop, and I can see endless complications arising from the taking of legal action. Perhaps the Minister can enlighten us on that point. The statement that merchants have the power to instal a bulk handling system is not correct. Merchants could not do so without the consent and approval of the Government. I desire to be clear in my mind on these points before deciding to vote for the retention or the striking out of the words.

Hon. E. H. H. HALL: The statement has been made that the farmer is being forced to do something with his wheat that he does not want to do. That is entirely wrong. The comparison which has been made between the Bulk Handling Bill which has just been defeated and this measure is worthless, because this is a purely voluntary scheme. Members know that an election was conducted recently for the growers' council and that council will have an opportunity to consider these matters. There is nothing compulsory about the proposal and I want to give the wheat-growers an opportunity to do what they consider is in their own interests.

Hon. J. CORNELL: What does Mr. Hall mean when he refers to the wheatgrowers acting in their own interests? The subclause

under discussion will enable the corporation to establish bulk handling facilities, but in whose interests? In the interests of the farmers or of the Wheat Pool? If we agree to this, it will enable the pool to extend the bulk handling system where they may consider it advantageous. If they cannot get the necessary permission, how can they do it? They will have to get the permission of the Commissioner of Railways and if that is not forthcoming, what can they do?

Hon. A. Thomson: They can erect the plant on private land and put in a private siding.

Hon. J. CORNELL: How could they put in a private siding unless with the permission of the Commissioner of Railways? If the corporation chose to erect the plant on private land without having first obtained the consent of the Commissioner of Railways, they would then have to go to the Commissioner and beseech him to grant permission for the construction of a private siding, otherwise they would be unable to transport their wheat to the port.

Hon. G. W. Miles: Do you think any business firm would embark upon the scheme without first having secured the private siding?

Hon. J. CORNELL: Although illogical some of the advocates of the scheme suggest that they would do so.

Hon. E. H. H. HALL: I would remind Mr. Cornell that the references to private companies do not apply to the trustees of the Wheat Pool, which is a co-operative concern, and entitled to the utmost assistance from members. I am surprised at the tactics which have been adopted this evening.

Hon. A. THOMSON: When Mr. Cornell referred to the clause, he omitted to deal with the final proviso. This limits the power of the corporation to voluntary schemes and systems that it may be authorised to engage in. The hon. member suggested there was a nigger in the woodpile. The Bill was introduced here on the 29th November, which shows that the suggestion of its being put through in an underhand manner is without foundation. No wheat can be stacked at any siding without the consent of the Commissioner of Railways. I regret the attempt to misrepresent the intentions of the Wheat Pool. Why raise all these objections to an undertaking which has been successfully carrying on the wheat business for many

years? No farmer will be compelled to use any bulk handling scheme that may be instituted by the corporation.

Hon. J. M. DREW: I am not satisfied that any of the points I have raised have been replied to. If the farmers desire to go on with a voluntary scheme of the sort indicated, they should be afforded every assistance to do so. It has not been stated how the finances are to be provided. Apparently the corporation is to raise the money, and the farmers are to provide the security. That has not been disputed. If the corporation did re-embark upon bulk handling it would be a big gamble. The Government would be bound to come into the business through the necessity for providing rolling stock! For many months the corporation would find itself up against a dead-end.

Hon. G. W. Miles: This is a co-operative concern, and they would not go in for it unless they wanted to.

2 o'clock a.m.

Hon. J. M. DREW: I have had sent to me resolutions, all worded alike, and passed by farmers in various parts of my electorate, but I am given to understand there were very few present at the meetings.

Hon. E. H. H. Hall: The trustees could not make these arrangements without the approval of the growers.

Hon. J. M. DREW: They could soon get the approval of the growers. My desire is to protect the growers from a big gamble.

Hon. T. MOORE: This subclause should have been deleted when the Bulk Handling Bill was defeated in another place. The subclause in its concluding paragraph prescribes that the provisions of the Bill shall be subject to any qualifications imposed by any statute relating to bulk handling passed during the present session of Parliament. The farmers themselves are not so anxious for bulk handling as is a certain section of the people in the wheat business. I honestly believe that bulk handling will come in due course, but the time is not yet ripe for it.

Hon. V. Hamersley: I have been waiting for it for 30 years

Hon. T. MOORE: In the United States and in Canada, where they have bulk

handling, they are infinitely worse off than are we

Hon. A. Thomson: Probably they would be still worse off if they had not got it.

Hon. T. MOORE: I hope the subclause will be deleted and so put an end to the peaceful penetration that is going on.

Hon. H. V. PIESSE: Mr. Moore has spoken for the farmers of his district, who he says are not unanimously in favour of bulk handling. I can say that 90 per cent. of the farmers in my district want bulk handling right or wrong.

Hon. T. Moore: I suppose they are all shareholders of Westralian Farmers Ltd.

Hon. H. V. PIESSE: I am not a shareholder of Westralian Farmers, nor have I ever put a bag of wheat into the pool. If the pool are prepared to find money with which to build these sheds and silos, let us give them our blessing. I should be sorry to see the Committee turn down this Bill, because we should give the pool every chance to carry on the good work.

Hon. G. FRASER: I am seeking information. Is there any statute under which the pool can establish bulk handling? If not, why all the discussion on this clause?

Hon. W. J. MANN: I have listened carefully to the discussion, but I have not heard anything to convince me that the amendment should not be carried. I spent some time investigating bulk handling in Canada, as the result of which I am confident we cannot profitably undertake bulk handling at the present time. I was struck with the frank way in which the Hon. T. Moore stated the opinion of the farmers in his province. I am going to speak for the St. George's-terrace farmers, because it is at the suggestion of some of those really big farmers that I am taking this action. The action has been perfectly open and there has been nothing underhand about it. Had I been in the Chamber when the clause was previously considered, I would have taken action then.

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

Ayes	7
Noes	13
				—
Majority against	6	
				—

AYES.

Hon. J. M. Drew	Hon. W. H. Kitson
Hon. G. Fraser	Hon. W. J. Mann
Hon. E. H. Gray	Hon. T. Moore
Hon. E. H. Harris	(Teller.)

NOES.

Hon. C. F. Baxter	Hon. H. V. Piesse
Hon. L. B. Bolton	Hon. E. Rose
Hon. J. T. Franklin	Hon. A. Thomson
Hon. E. H. H. Hall	Hon. C. H. Wittenoom
Hon. V. Hamersley	Hon. H. J. Yelland
Hon. G. W. Miles	Hon. R. G. Moore
Hon. Sir C. Nathan	(Teller.)

Amendment thus negatived.

Clause put and passed.

Bill again reported without further amendment and the report adopted.

Third Reading.

Bill read a third time and returned to the Assembly with an amendment.

BILL—APPROPRIATION.

Third Reading.

Read a third time and *passed*.

BILL—CRIMINAL CODE (CHAPTER XXXVII.) AMENDMENT.

All Stages.

Received from the Assembly and, on motion by Hon. A. Thomson, read a first time.

Second Reading.

HON. A. THOMSON (South-East) [2.19] in moving the second reading said: This measure was introduced in another place by the member for Perth (Mr. H. W. Mann) and seeks to insert a new clause to make the unauthorised use of vehicles defined in the Traffic Act a misdemeanour. Section 378 of the Criminal Code provides that if a man steals or uses a horse (possibly worth £5 or £6) he shall be liable to imprisonment for seven years, but a man who removes or steals a motor car which may be worth several hundred pounds is, under Section 53 of the Traffic Act, only liable to a fine of £100 or imprisonment for one year. It is no use fining the type of men who steal motor cars, because usually they have no money. The owner of the car, however, is frequently put to considerable expense for repairs to his car after he has recovered it. The Bill empowers the court to inflict a penalty of imprisonment for a

term not exceeding three years. The present penalty, 12 months imprisonment, is insufficient. Many crimes are committed by men who steal motor cars. We know what has happened in the Eastern States, where men steal cars, proceed to the country, commit burglaries and then return to the city. During the past 12 months in this State 344 motor cars, 30 trucks and 82 motor cycles have been stolen. If members desire further information on the matter, I would refer them to the speech made by Mr. H. W. Mann, which will be found at page 637 of "Hansard" (No. 6). Members will there see what it has cost the various owners after their cars were returned to them. I shall not labour the matter further, but will leave it to members, feeling confident that they will agree to the Bill. I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

Remaining Stages.

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

Read a third time and *passed*.

BILL—TENANTS, PURCHASERS AND MORTGAGORS' RELIEF ACT, 1930 (No. 2).

All Stages.

Received from the Assembly and, on motion by Hon. E. H. Gray, read a first time.

Second Reading.

HON. E. H. GRAY (West) [2.25] in moving the second reading said: This short Bill explains itself. A defect in the Act has been discovered. A woman who owns a home and whose husband is unemployed is not entitled to the relief which can be obtained under Section 8 of the Act. It has been ruled that a woman is not to be deemed to be unemployed if she owns a house. It is but right that the Bill should be passed. The amendment applies also to a widow who owns a home and is dependent upon her son or her daughter for maintenance. I do not wish to take up the time of the House

further. I commend the Bill to members. I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

HON. J. CORNELL (South) [2.30]: The Bill is hardly as harmless as Mr. Gray would lead us to believe. The principal Act does not define unemployment, but the Bill does so in respect to women. Unless a man can satisfy the commissioner that he should receive protection by reason of unemployment, he cannot get that protection, whereas a woman will be able to do so. There may be instances of women being in a much better position than many married men. Even though she may not be wholly without some income, a woman would be able to get relief where a man would not.

Hon. E. H. Gray: That is not so.

Hon. J. CORNELL: Does this mean that the woman must have no income whatever?

Hon. E. H. Gray: That is for the commissioner to say:

Hon. J. CORNELL: I can see a difference between the position of a woman who is unemployed and that of a man who may be unemployed and may have a wife and a couple of children. If legislation is to be passed to deal with exceptional cases, we shall be on poor ground. There cannot be much substance in the Bill because, if any harsh treatment had been meted out to persons, the Government would have introduced legislation to relieve the situation. This is a private member's Bill, and on the grounds I have indicated, I do not feel inclined to support it.

HON. W. H. KITSON (West) [2.35]: I hope no objection will be taken to the Bill. If a house should be in the name of a wife, the magistrate has ruled that relief cannot be extended to her, although her husband may be unemployed. I do not think those people should be penalised in such circumstances.

HON. G. FRASER (West) [2.36]: I would point out to Mr. Cornell that there was no opposition to the Bill in the Legislative Assembly. If it had the effect he thinks, that phase would have been mentioned during the debate in the lower House.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

Remaining Stages.

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

Read a third time, and *passed*.

BILL—AUCTIONEERS ACT AMENDMENT.

All Stages.

Received from the Assembly and read a first time.

Second Reading.

THE CHIEF SECRETARY (Hon. C. F. Baxter—East) [2.40 a.m.] in moving the second reading said: This Bill amends the Auctioneers Act, 1921. Under the Act the holder of a license must advertise in a newspaper his application for a renewal of such license. The Bill, however, provides that by giving notice to the magistrate, the auctioneer can have the application posted in a prominent place in the court house for a certain period before it is granted. The Bill also provides for the payment of the license fee in two moieties. If an auctioneer has received his first license, he should not be put to the expense of advertising the application for a renewal. If he has contravened the Act he will have been dealt with under the Act. In that respect the existing legislation is cumbersome. In ordinary times the cost of an auctioneer's license is heavy as it has to be paid in one sum, but in the present times the payment of the whole amount at once becomes burdensome. This is all the Bill contains. I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

Remaining Stages.

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

Bill read a third time and *passed*.

BILL—LOTTERIES (CONTROL).

Assembly's Message.

Message from the Assembly received and read notifying that it had agreed to the amendments made by the Council.

BILL—WHEAT POOL.

Assembly's Message.

Message from the Assembly received and read notifying that it had agreed to the amendment made by the Council.

MOTION—'GOLDEN EAGLE' NUGGET.

Debate resumed from 16th December on the motion by Hon. G. W. Miles as follows:—

That, in the opinion of the House, notwithstanding anything contained in Section 4 (3) of the Financial Agreement Act, 1923, the Government should transfer the purchase price of the "Eagle Nugget," £5,438 4s. 2d., to the credit of loan funds as suggested by the Auditor General on page 37 of his annual report for 1932.

HON. J. M. DREW (Central) [2.48]: Mr. Miles is to be congratulated on bringing forward this motion. It seems to require some slight amendment. It is an unsound method of finance which permits of borrowed money being used in the purchase of an article, and when, some few months later that article is sold, the proceeds being permitted to go into Consolidated Revenue. By the employment of such a method, the finances can be juggled in such a way as to deceive the taxpayers. A Treasurer finding himself in a difficulty with regard to keeping down his deficit could dispose of some big undertaking established out of Loan Funds, and square his ledger in the eyes of the public by this unorthodox means. In the case of the "Golden Eagle" nugget there was no intention to sell it when it was bought, and it was therefore quite proper to buy it out of Loan funds. When it was sold the money received should have been credited to Loan Funds if ordinary accountancy methods had been adopted. The Government were influenced by Subsection (3) of Section 4 of the Financial Emergency Act, which directs that all proceeds of sales of Government property shall be paid into a special account to Consolidated Revenue. I encountered this provision when I was studying the Financial Agreement Act in 1928. I sent for the Under Treasurer, who had been attending the Premiers' Conference when the agreement was under consideration. I asked why it was proposed to take into revenue money that had come from property which had previously been purchased, or from work

constructed out of Loan Funds. He said the reason was that a sinking fund had been established and that in process of time the undertaking would be paid for. On a further study of the clause, I came to the conclusion that as the money had to go into a special account of Consolidated Revenue and not into the ordinary account, Parliament would necessarily be given an opportunity to deal with the matter. I am now convinced that the framers of that portion of the Act intended that the money should be dealt with similarly to the way in which such funds had been treated before the Financial Agreement became law. It will be noted that the money had to go into a special account of the Consolidated Revenue Fund. That is exactly what was done for 24 years before the Financial Agreement Act came into operation. Until the 1st January, 1904, all receipts from Government property sales were credited in the Treasury returns to the loan expenditure for the previous financial years, but after that date they were appropriated annually under an Act of Parliament and used for purposes for which loan funds could be legitimately employed. In 1907 it was decided to introduce legislation to deal with the question. The Government Property Sales Act was placed on the statute-book. I wish to give a few quotations so that members will understand the trend of the measure. Sections 2, 4 and 5 provide—

The proceeds of sale (a) of all land, buildings, rolling stock and other property vested in the Minister for Railways under the provisions of the Government Railways Act, 1904; and (b) of all other Government materials, appliances and other chattels and structures, if the original cost was debited to the General Loan Fund or the Consolidated Revenue Fund prior to the financial year in which the sale is affected, shall be placed to the credit of a trust account to be kept at the Treasury and called the Government Property Sales Fund, hereinafter referred to as the said fund.

Moneys received in respect of damage to Government property, the original cost of which has been charged to General Loan Fund or Consolidated Revenue Fund shall be dealt with as follows:—(1) The cost of repairing such damage shall be credited to the vote or votes or trust account to which the expenditure has been charged; and (2) The balance, if any, shall be credited to the Consolidated Revenue Fund under such headings as the Treasurer may direct, except when it is connected with railway expenditure, when it shall be credited to railway receipts.

No moneys shall be paid out of the said fund until estimates are submitted to Parlia-

ment and payment of the amounts shown therein are authorised by an Appropriation Act.

That was sound accountancy. In cases in which revenue had been spent in the purchase of works or articles, it would be expended on something that was usually paid for out of revenue. It was mostly used for the erection of schools and police stations and works of that kind. Some of it came from revenue. Perhaps a large number of motor cars that had been purchased out of revenue would be sold by the Government. Subsequently that money would be appropriated for some works for which the proceeds came from revenue under ordinary circumstances, and so on. Full information was given every year in the last few pages of the Estimates concerning the appropriation of the money, and Parliamentary authority had to be obtained for the appropriation. From what I have said it will be seen that there was, for years, a special account at the Treasury in connection with the proceeds of sales of Government property. Under the Financial Agreement, that is precisely what we are required to do. The manner of the expenditure of the money is for the State Parliament to decide. If we say it shall be used to relieve loan expenditure, who can object? Are the Commonwealth authorities likely to object if we use it for its proper purpose? I wish to point out that the Financial Agreement does not enter into the question at all. In the Financial Agreement Act each State has an introduction peculiar to itself. We had the sales of Government property and a special sinking fund and consequently these words were included in the ratification clause, not in the agreement, but in the Act—

All proceeds of sales of Government property thereafter shall be paid to a special account of the Consolidated Revenue.

Further there is power to alter that, if necessary. This power reads—

All Acts of the Parliament of Western Australia, whether passed before or after the commencement of this Act, so far as they relate to matters or things provided for or contained in this Act or the said agreement, shall be read and construed as subject to this Act and the said agreement, and shall, with such alterations, modifications, substitutions, additions and omissions as are necessary, have effect accordingly.

There is power to make any amendments desired so long as they do not conflict with the

Financial Agreement, which is a separate proposition. If the Golden Eagle precedent could be regarded as complying with the rules of sound finance, there would be nothing wrong in a future Government disposing of large assets created out of loan funds and putting the money into revenue, thus giving a deceptive and fictitious colour to the finances of the State. The asset would have gone; nothing would remain in its stead, and for 58 years the present and future generations would be contributing to the sinking fund established under the Financial Agreement in order to cover the cost of a work that had been sold and the proceeds of which had been paid into revenue.

Hon. V. Hamersley: And the Commonwealth would be paying as well.

Hon. J. M. DREW: Yes, the Commonwealth Government would have to find half the money during the whole 58 years. There would be a difficulty in crediting the amount involved to loan, but there would be no difficulty at all in allowing the money to remain in the special account of Consolidated Revenue and submitting the item later on to Parliament for appropriation. It is not intended to cast any reflection on the present Government. What they did in connection with the purchase of the Golden Eagle was bona fide. Subsequently it was decided to sell the nugget, probably on account of the premium. Then the paragraph I have quoted was encountered in the ratification clauses and the Government came to the conclusion, no doubt advised by the Under Treasurer who advised me, that the proper destination of the money was Consolidated Revenue.

Hon. G. W. Miles: Does the proposed amendment meet with your approval?

Hon. J. M. DREW: The amendment proposed to be moved by Sir Charles Nathan does meet with my approval. Hon. members will understand there is nothing of a party character about this matter. Another Government may be in power after the next general elections. In any case, in the interests of the country, I do not wish to see this repeated, because it would establish a precedent that any Government could follow.

Hon. G. W. Miles: And a dangerous one.

Hon. J. M. DREW: An extremely dangerous one.

HON. SIR CHARLES NATHAN (Metropolitan-Suburban) [3.2]: At this early hour of the morning I do not propose to elaborate upon the sound arguments that have been adduced by Mr. Drew in support of the motion. The motion, as worded by Mr. Miles, however, hardly meets the position. I therefore move an amendment—

That all the words after "House," in the fourth line, be struck out and the following inserted in lieu:—"The Treasurer should transfer back to the Special Account of the Consolidated Revenue, at the Treasury, established under Section 4, Subsection (3), of the Financial Agreement Act, 1923, the amount of the purchase price of the 'Golden Eagle' nugget, £5,438 4s. 2d., for appropriation by Parliament for some purpose for which Loan Funds are usually expended."

I believe the amendment and the principles underlying it will be acceptable to the House. It is a very late hour of the session at which to bring the amendment forward, but it is highly desirable that the matter should be dealt with this year because, as Mr. Drew has said, a precedent might be established. There have been many discussions during the present session upon the methods adopted not only by the present Government, but by past Governments, methods which would not meet with the approval of any commercial or financial house. As Mr. Drew has pointed out, the money was definitely taken from Loan Fund and paid back to Consolidated Revenue. If the amendment is carried, it will necessitate the money being transferred to a special account, and used for purposes for which Loan Funds are usually expended. In those circumstances, it would merely mean that after liquidating one asset, the fund would be used for the creation of another asset, and the money would be paid into Consolidated Revenue, as was done in this case. Mr. Drew has dealt with the matter on the broad principles of sound finance. I hope the motion will be taken as an indication of the feeling of the House that no matter what Government may be in power, they must realise that this House stands for sound book-keeping methods, and they must not challenge that feeling by attempting to repeat these methods.

HON. G. W. MILES (North—in reply) [3.5]: I thank Mr. Drew for having gone so thoroughly into this matter, and I also thank Sir Charles Nathan for having suggested his amendment, which achieves the

object I have in view, if the House will carry the amendment and the motion.

Amendment put and passed: the question, as amended, agreed to.

BILL—TIMBER WORKERS.

Second Reading—Defeated.

Debate resumed from the 16th December.

HON. W. J. MANN (South-West) [3.7]: There has been no request made by people in the timber industry for this amendment. During the past week, I was associated for three days with a number of men engaged in the timber industry.

Hon. W. H. Kitson: Sleeper hewers?

Hon. W. J. MANN: Yes. They were some men who were recently concerned in a dispute. They did not make any request for legislation of this description. The Bill will establish a principle which I do not think is in the best interests of the industry. If I read the Bill aright, I think it strikes a fatal blow at contract work. It gives the man who takes a contract from another and then takes off his coat, the right to say, "I am performing this contract and am doing the manual work." It places him in this position—I do not speak in a disparaging way—that he is an employer for the purposes of the Masters and Servants Act and a worker for the purposes of the Industrial Arbitration Act. As a worker under the latter Act, he can claim certain advantages. On the other hand, if the other party to the contract takes his coat off and does some of the hard work, it makes no difference because he is the contractor just as if he were far away from the scene of operations. In the absence of any indication from the men employed in the industry in my province that they desire this legislation, I shall oppose the Bill.

HON. R. G. MOORE (North-East) [3.11]: I oppose the Bill, which will have far-reaching effects. It is comprehensive, though brief. It will simply mean that the man who takes a contract, however small, will have to shoulder the burdens that will be enforced upon him as a result of the passage of the Bill. If he should take a contract to cart some timber, the Bill will bring him under the provisions of the Masters and Servants Act and the Industrial Arbitration

Act, and he may become responsible for compensation payments and so forth. There is too much heads-I-win, tails-you-lose about the Bill. Moreover the Bill will apply to every part of the State where timber cutters are working, and it would be unwise to agree to the measure. The Bill is retrospective in respect of contracts made before the commencement of the Act, and we do not know how far its application will extend in that respect.

HON. G. W. MILES (North) [3.13]: I moved the adjournment of the debate to enable Sir Edward Wittenoom to deal with the Bill. He is not well, and naturally cannot attend the House at this early hour of the morning. I shall cite just a few reasons why we should not pass the Bill. They are as follows:—(1) These are days when the aim of legislation is to decrease, if possible, the burdens on industry: the Bill will increase the burdens; (2) the men who would be thus brought under industrial awards will not be subject to control. They need not work hard or for long hours. The sawmiller will, generally speaking, have no possibility of supervising their labours, nor can he keep a record of their hours; (3) these same men will, though not supervised or controlled, be able to claim workers' compensation if injured, though they may be working under concurrent contracts with different sawmillers; (4) the Bill hits at freedom of contract and at this one industry; (5) it seeks to upset existing satisfactory arrangements, satisfactory in that a piece-worker or contractor, if energetic or even ordinarily industrious, earns good money; (6) there is even a possibility of retrospective liability under awards. For these reasons I oppose the second reading of the Bill.

HON. W. H. KITSON (West—in reply) [3.15]: I have been surprised to hear the arguments advanced against the Bill. Some of those advanced by Mr. Miles do not apply at all. I explained the position fully when I moved the second reading of the Bill. I indicated that all parties concerned considered that sleeper hewers were covered by the definition of the term "worker" under both the Masters and Servants Act and the Industrial Arbitration Act. Owing to the decision of the Supreme Court it was found that they were

covered by Arbitration Court awards which provide for their payment at so much per load.

Hon. T. Moore: The timber workers have been operating under the provisions of the Arbitration Act for the past 25 years.

Hon. W. H. KITSON: They are not paid by the hour, but by the load. Owing to the economic situation to-day the timber workers have had to accept work at rates of pay that hardly allow them to make a living. In the event of their employers defaulting, they have no redress at law, and, in the event of an accident, they cannot claim compensation. That position arose in consequence of the Supreme Court decision I have referred to. I have before me a copy of the so-called contract which commences with the words, "I beg to advise that I have purchased from you a quantity of hewn or sawn jarrah sleepers at prices, terms and conditions as hereunder." One of the clauses in the contract provides that no person not being a natural born or naturalised British subject shall be employed on a contract or subcontract unless the services of British subjects are not available. The next clause provides that in the carrying out of the work under contract preference shall be given first to returned soldiers and sailors and secondly to financial members of the union. Mr. Mann said he had heard nothing about this matter. Nevertheless it has been on the boards for about four months. Many months ago the union to which these men belong endeavoured to secure an award of the Arbitration Court, but the Court decided that so long as the decision of the Supreme Court stood, it was a question of interpretation of "Workers" and unless that could be got over the Arbitration Court could not assist them. In 1923 Sir James Mitchell brought in an amendment of the Workers' Compensation Act simply to provide for this class of labour. Hundreds of men in the South-West have been defrauded of their wages after months of hard work.

Hon. T. Moore: And the storekeepers could not be paid for the same reason.

Hon. W. H. KITSON: That is so. The storekeepers have suffered more perhaps than anyone else. They have stood by the men for years, but if the men did not get their wages they could not pay. The only remedy we can give those men is this Bill.

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

Ayes	6
Noes	13

Majority against .. 7

AYES.	
Hon. J. M. Drew	Hon. T. Moore
Hon. G. Fraser	Hon. C. B. Williams
Hon. W. H. Kitson	Hon. E. H. Gray
	(Teller.)
NOES.	
Hon. C. F. Baxter	Hon. R. G. Moore
Hon. L. B. Bolton	Hon. H. V. Plesse
Hon. J. T. Franklin	Hon. E. Rose
Hon. V. Hamersley	Hon. A. Thomson
Hon. E. H. Harris	Hon. H. J. Yelland
Hon. W. J. Mann	Hon. C. H. Wittenoom
Hon. G. W. Miles	(Teller.)

Question thus negatived; Bill defeated.

MOTION—LEAVE OF ABSENCE FOR PRESIDENT.

On motion by the Chief Secretary, leave of absence granted to the President for six months from the 1st January next.

CLOSE OF SESSION.

Complimentary Remarks.

THE CHIEF SECRETARY (Hon. C. F. Baxter): On the eve of our adjournment, I desire to congratulate you, Mr. President, on the able manner in which you have carried out the duties and upheld the traditions of the position you occupy, and to thank you on behalf of hon. members, and myself as Leader of the House, for your unvarying patience, courtesy and help to us during the session. I desire also on behalf of members, to express my sincere thanks to Mr. Cornell, the Chairman of Committees, for the care that he has exercised in his onerous duties, and the services he has rendered. He has done much in his capacity as Chairman to expedite the business of the House. I desire to tender him my personal thanks also for guidance and advice that have greatly assisted me in my work. I can not let this occasion pass without referring to the efficient and loyal service rendered by the Staff. The Clerk of Parliaments, Mr. Grant, has been very helpful and has discharged his duties in a capable manner and has earned the esteem of all members. The

Usher of the Black Rod, Mr. Leake, also merits praise for the efficiency and ability he has displayed, and the manner in which he has satisfied the requirements of members. Mr. Sparks is another officer who has earned our special thanks. He has had a busy time in ministering to our wants, and has carried out his work in a cheerful and efficient manner. I must also record my appreciation of the work carried out by the Chief of the "Hansard" staff and his officers. As usual the work has been efficient and reliable, and we have been served with accurate reports of the discussions. I must say that they seem to possess the happy knack of making our speeches and remarks appear much more coherent in print, than we think they are when uttering them. I desire to tender our best thanks to them for the courtesy and kindness at all times shown to us. I must also record my appreciation of the services rendered by the reporters of the Press. Although at times their reports may have been brief, they have always been fair and accurate. The junior officers and House staff have also rendered cheerful and efficient service. I sincerely hope that the whole of the Staff will enjoy their holidays and on behalf of members I wish them all the compliments of the season. The session has been a strenuous and trying one on account of the crisis through which we are passing. Despite the bad times which we are experiencing, I feel sure that there is no need for undue pessimism; in fact it will be better for everybody to cultivate a habit of cheerful optimism. After all we have cause to be optimistic, for this State is the possessor of immense natural wealth, which must eventually assist us to surmount our difficulties. It may take some time to do so, as the present depression is world wide, but I am confident that we will eventually regain the path of prosperity. I desire to thank all members for the consideration they have always extended to me: their help and co-operation have assisted me considerably. Although at times we may not have been able to view matters from the same standpoint, it was because we were each endeavouring in our own way to do what we considered was in the best interests of the State. Yet, through all our deliberations the spirit of good fellowship has prevailed. In conclusion I desire to extend to all my best wishes for a Happy Christmas and I trust that the coming year will usher in a tide of prosperity and success for all.

Hon. J. CORNELL: Before the curtain is run down on the session, I desire to thank the Chief Secretary for his kind remarks, and you, Sir, for the assistance you have rendered to me. I also thank members generally for the tolerance and consideration they have exhibited towards me. I thank the Clerk of the House and the "Hansard" staff. We recognise that "Hansard" actually makes the speeches for us, and we have much to thank that staff for. I am also indebted to the officers and the staff generally. I hope you, Sir, will enjoy your trip abroad, and will return full of health and vigour. I also trust the Chief Secretary may come back as Leader of the House. It will generally be admitted that he has made a good job of the position he occupies.

The PRESIDENT: I thank the Chief Secretary for his kindly references to me, and members for passing the motion giving me leave of absence. I hope to be back a considerable time before the expiration of that leave, and only extraordinary circumstances which I cannot foresee would induce me to remain longer away. I wish to thank the Chief Secretary for the kindly references not only to myself but the officers of the House for the way in which they have carried out their work. It is to me a great pleasure to preside over a Chamber the members of which, without exception, are jealous of its reputation, are keenly desirous of strictly observing the Standing Orders and rules of Parliament, and can discuss questions of a controversial nature temperately and without heat. As they themselves are well intentioned, they are ever ready to give to others from whom they may differ credit for being equally well-intentioned. I sincerely hope that members and the officers and all associated with Parliament House will have a happy Christmas, and that during the New Year there will be evidence of a renewal of that prosperity which we enjoyed in the past.

ADJOURNMENT—CLOSE OF SESSION.

THE CHIEF SECRETARY (Hon. C. F. Baxter—East) [3.42]: I move—

That the House at its rising adjourn till the 20th January, 1933.

Question put and passed.

House adjourned at 3.43 a.m. (Thursday).