a number of persons engaged in mining as we propose to give to companies. I will look into the matter, and if necessary have the clause recommitted.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: I would like you to exempt those little mining companies around Kalgoorlie and Boulder.

The PREMIER: That is the intention.

Mr. THOMSON: What is the intention of the proposed second proviso to Subsection 13? It reads—

> Provided also that rates and taxes paid in respect of land held or acquired for sale, and charged by the taxpayer to the capital cost of the land, shall not be allowed as a deduction.

Mr. DAVY: The proviso has given me some cause to think. Firstly, it seems to me that there is difficulty in determining whether a given taxpayer has held land or acquired it so. After that, how is one to say that he has charged the rates and taxes to the capital cost of the land? Whatever charging the rates and taxes to the capital cost of the land may mean, it will not make the land any more valuable, or enable the holder to sell it at a higher price. I do not see how the Commissioner of Taxation could justly say to a man who sells at a profit, "You have charged in your price the rates and taxes you have paid." Further, I fail to see how the proviso could be applied either properly or justly.

Progress reported.

House adjourned at 10.50 p.m.

Legislative Council,

Wednesday, 29th October, 1924.

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

BILL—INDUSTRIAL ARBITRATION ACT AMENDMENT.

Second Reading.

Debate resumed from the previous day.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES (North) [4.33]: Before addressing myself to the Bill, may I be permitted to refer to an incident that occurred yesterday in this Chamber. Unfortunately I was in the country when the Leader of the House moved the second reading of the Bill. Yesterday when Mr. Dodd had concluded his speech, I waited until the last moment to see if any member supporting the Bill would enlighten me as to the object of the measure and the necessity for some of the amendments, before I resumed the debate. When, at the last moment, I moved the adjournment of the debate, the Minister shook his head and one hon. member sitting opposite said: "Why for a day; why not for 12 months?" I have never been, and never will be, a party to holding up the business of this Chamber. I have always preached that this is the time we should deal with legislation. We should do it in cool weather and at a reasonable hour; we should not engage in rush legislation at the close of the session. In order to establish my *bona fides* I will refer hon. members to "Hansard" to show that I was the first member to speak on the Address-in-reply. Another important measure brought before us was the Closer Settlement Bill. I have looked up "Hansard" and I find that I spoke on the second reading of that measure on the 17th September, just six weeks ago. When hon. members opposite accuse me of trying to hold up business and suggest that I would prefer to have the Bill now before us postponed for 12 months, it is not quite fair. It was a fair and reasonable request that I put forward when I moved the adjournment of the debate till to-day. Apart from the Minister who placed the Bill before the House, every member who has spoken has expressed more or less strong opposition to the measure. It is not fair that those supporting the Bill should sit quietly; they should come forward and explain to us why the Bill is before the House and the reason for some of the amendments. The Minister has been out of the House for some considerable time, but he has now assumed the responsibilities of the Leadership of the House. I am prepared to admit that he is doing very well. Too much, however, is left to him by his supporters. The Minister places before us measures that have been dealt with elsewhere and, with the limited time at his disposal, is doing the best he can, and doing it well. We would like to hear further reasons from some of his supporters.

Hon. E. H. Gray: You want us to go first so that you may speak later!

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: We want to know why some of the amendments are proposed. I will leave it at that and proceed to deal with the Bill. I am not opposed to arbitration generally as between parties. That has been a recognised method of dealing with commercial and industrial troubles for generations past. We have encouraged the parties to come together in their endeavours to settle their differences. I am opposed to a court that cannot enforce its awards or judgments. I have taken up that attitude on previous occasions and I cannot see any reason to depart from it now. I do not mean that the Arbitration Court cannot enforce its awards and judgments against unions alone, but against all parties concerned. Consequently, if I had my way, I would abolish the Arbitration Court altogether. I have not got too strong a following on this question but that does not mean that I am wrong in my attitude.

Hon. J. R. Brown: What would you substitute?

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: What the unions use now—the strike.

Hon. J. R. Brown: You would advocate direct action!

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: No. Faced with that position, it becomes my duty to see what I can do to amend the legislation proposed in what I consider the best interests of the country. I shall endeavour to give the court power to enforce its awards. The Minister for Works, when introducing the Bill in the Assembly, the Leader of the House when he placed it before us here, and Mr. Dodd when he spoke yesterday, each said "Some people say they would abolish the Arbitration Court because it cannot enforce its awards. Those people do not say they would abolish policemen or courts because they cannot prevent crimes." That is not the point. Other courts can enforce awards and judgments. If that were not so, I might be in favour of what Mr. Brown has referred to as direct action.

Hon. J. R. Brown: Will not the Bill enable the courts to do that?

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: Unfortunately, the Arbitration Court cannot enforce its judgments. If we could evolve a scheme whereby it could enforce awards and judgments, then my objections to the Arbitration Court would be disposed of. If we are to continue, as I presume we will, the application of the principle of arbitration, then, after careful consideration, I have made up my mind that the court shall be controlled by a president who shall be appointed for life, and that if that president is not to be a judge of the Supreme Court, he shall be one possessing the qualifications of a judge. I propose to eliminate from the bench the partisans who sit there now. The appointment of those partisans has been a mistake.

Hon. A. Lovekin: Hear, hear!

Hon. J. Duffell: Those partisans are supposed to be au fait with everything that comes before them.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: Those partisans are supposed to deal with the evidence and decide on the evidence placed before them.

Hon. J. R. Brown: We have two there now.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: And when we have finished with the Bill they will not be on the bench if I have my way. The proper place for those men is on the floor of the court advocating their respective causes there, not on the bench sitting alongside the president. I believe that if the president were approached for his opinion—I have not spoken to him nor do I propose to do so—he would probably tell us that most of his time is taken up in trying to settle disputes not between people on the floor of the court but between the two partisans behind the scenes when the evidence has been concluded. We can appoint as many boards as we like and give as much representation to the two sides as we may please, but it comes to the one thing—the judge or president is the only person who counts.

Hon. J. R. Brown: Is he non-partisan?

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: The hon. member can scoff as much as he likes. While we may have slippery politicians and slippery business men, I assert that our judges of the Supreme Court bench stand high in the estimation of the public, with their characters untarnished.

Hon. T. Moore: One was a politician and may be liable, for that reason, to slip.

Hon. A. Lovekin: I do not agree that he was a politician.

Hon. T. Moore: Certainly he was not a statesman.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: In any case, whatever may be done, the president is the man whose opinion counts and who decides upon the judgment. In these circumstances, why should we hamper the president by the appointment of partisans?

Hon. T. Moore: Has any president suggested he has been hampered in that way?

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: I do not discuss these matters with judges.

Hon. T. Moore: We want some foundation for your suggestion.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: We do not require to discuss these matters with judges to arrive at any such conclusion; we know what happens between the parties in open court. If such happenings can take place in open court, surely we are justified in assuming what, in all probability, takes place behind closed doors! That is where the delay occurs, owing to the haggling of the parties behind closed doors, and we get back ultimately to the President whose decision prevails. Mr. Dodd referred to the difficulties of getting the decision of a

union on the question of approaching the court. There have been difficulties owing to the routine that unions must observe before they can move, but this Bill proposes to go to the other extreme. It is proposed to take these matters out of the hands of the union as a whole, and place them in the hands of the executive of the union. Generally speaking, the union officials are not the people who find the money; the unionists have to foot the bill, but it is proposed under this measure that the members shall have very little say in the matter of going before the court. I am a firm believer in the principle that the man who pays the piper—in this instance the rank and file of the union—should have some say in calling the tune. The amendment proposed will create a diametrically opposite position. The union officials may start out when they like and where they like to cite a case before the court, and the union members will have no say in the matter beyond finding the funds.

Hon. J. R. Brown: The officials cannot do that unless they possess the confidence of the members.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: I am dealing with the matter from Mr. Dodd's standpoint, and I venture to say the House will accept his word in matters of this kind in preference to that of almost any other member.

Hon. C. F. Baxter: Hear, hear! There is no better authority in this State.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: Mr. Dodd explained the difficulty, and if I can assist to overcome that difficulty I shall do so. I shall not consent to giving to the union executive—not the workers but the parasites—the right to start these cases and call upon the members to foot the bill. I do not say that offensively, but we know what human nature is. The jobs of the executive will depend upon their getting something before the court.

Hon. J. R. Brown: No.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: I do not say that this sort of thing applies to only one side.

Hon. J. R. Brown: The court is a nightmare to the workers.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: It may be, but the complaint has been that they cannot get to the court. I wish to facilitate their getting to the court as speedily as possible, and I suggest that the cases be dealt with on the evidence submitted to the judge, unhindered by the presence of advocates on the bench. There is another objection to the Bill—the power given to the Minister. Right through the Bill it is proposed to give to the Minister power that should not be given to any political head. We must keep the politicians right away from the Arbitration Court. I care not which side of the House they belong to.

Hon. T. Moore: A pity that was not done in the past, for then we would not have had the present judge there.

The PRESIDENT: Order! The hon. member must not refer to judges of the Supreme Court.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: I care not what brand of politics a man may have, the further politicians are kept away from any of our courts, the better. The Bill goes to the other extreme not only in allowing interested or disinterested parties to approach the court, but in setting up a number of tribunals to be approached. There are to be industrial boards, demarcation boards, industrial magistrates and appeal boards, all under the president of the court. We shall have all this paraphernalia from the bottom to the top of the ladder, and when we get there, we shall find ourselves back to the one man, the president, whose decision is final and must be accepted. I do not know whether all these boards will be paid, but a number of them will be paid.

Hon. A. Lovekin: Only one will be paid, according to the Bill—the board to which a dispute is referred by the court.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: If it is necessary for the president to have technical advice on any case coming before him, the existing Act provides for it.

Hon. A. Lovekin: Or the parties may ask for it.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: If we set up all these tribunals, what will happen? The president will have very little to do, and if he is a man of wisdom, as judges generally are, he will sit back and wait until all these little tribunals have dealt with matters and sifted them down to a few main issues, upon which he will then adjudicate.

Hon. A. Lovekin: That would be a very fine thing.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: It seems a very round-about way of arriving at a decision. The Minister for Works takes an entirely opposite view as to how matters will be dealt with under the Workers' Compensation Act. Referring to that Act he said—

> Instead of as at present going from the magistrate to the Supreme Court and then to the Full Court and then to the High Court and the Privy Council, we provide for the one appeal from the magistrate to the Court of Arbitration, the decision of which shall be final.

Hon. A. Lovekin: That is exactly what is proposed under this Bill.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: I know Mr. Lovekin is wedded to boards, but the experience of most of us has been that boards are not altogether successful. They are a success in Melbourne, which is a city of secondary industries. The Federal Parliament sits in Melbourne; the newspapers serve out Federal politics every morning of the week and the influence of Victoria over the Federal Parliament is known to all of us. The men associated with secondary industries in Victoria, and in some of the other States too, are strong enough to influence the Federal

Parliament to amend the Customs tariff, with the result that they get perhaps 2s. extra duty on hats and 1s. extra on boots. Having accomplished that, the parties meet in conference and whack up the additional duty between them.

Hon. T. Moore: A mutual benefit society.

Hon. G. W. Miles: Yes, at the public expense.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: That is all right for secondary industries, where the additional impost can be passed on to the consumer, but dealing with primary products such as wheat, wool, and timber that have to be disposed of in the world's markets in competition with the products of other countries, the splitting-up process cannot be applied. While boards may be of some use where secondary industries are strong, they are of no use in a State like Western Australia, which for many years must depend upon primary industries. In all these appeals I suppose points of law will arise, and this will necessitate having a highly trained legal man in the position of president. In that position we also want a man capable of weighing evidence and separating the wheat from the chaff, and above all, we want an unbiassed man who will deal with the facts as presented in evidence. Mr. Dodd referred to the League of Nations agreement and the Minister for Works, in introducing the Bill in another place, spoke of the same matter. The agreement was that the signatories to the League should set out to establish the 48-hour week. Mr. Dodd's remarks appealed to me. If other countries are prepared to set out to secure the 48-hour week, and we, before they attain that object slip down to 44 hours a week, a good many of them will come to the conclusion that it is hopeless to try to keep pace with us.

Hon. J. R. Brown: It is a long time since we got the 48-hour week.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: If they fixed 48 hours as the maximum for a week, there might be something to be said for it, but the League of Nations agreement is being held up to us when the most that other nations can accept is the 48-hour week. I am at a loss to understand why this House should be asked to allow the court to fix everything else, the rate of wages, the conditions, etc., and not allow it to say what the hours shall be. So far as I am concerned, it is not to be either 44 or 48 hours, it is to be a matter that the court shall determine on the evidence before it. We have a court established for the purpose of settling disputes, the rates of wages, the conditions under which workmen shall live, and at the tail-end we say that we will fix the maximum number of hours to be worked. I will not be a party to a court of that description; the court will have to deal with the hours as well as everything else.

Hon. J. R. Brown: The court has expressed a desire——

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: I do not care what the court has expressed. If the court puts the responsibility on some one else, it will not be done with my consent. Will members who are supporting the amendments contained in the Bill say why they wish to give the judge power to deal with everything else, but that when it comes to a question of hours, they take that matter out of his hands. I want members to reply to this, not by way of interjection, but when they speak to the Bill. The politician is not going to be permitted to fix the hours, at any rate not so far as I am concerned. I have always claimed that a country that cannot pay a living wage is not worth living in. We have to remember that the success of the State, so far as I can judge, depends entirely on the development of its primary industries. I have travelled throughout the State perhaps as much as any other member, and have seen vast empty spaces. Only last week I passed by thousands of acres of land that should be growing wheat or oats or feeding sheep. We have not yet begun to produce; we have only scratched the surface, and the wages to be paid will depend entirely upon what an industry can stand. If an industry cannot afford to pay a decent wage, then we shall not produce and we shall go out.

Hon. J. R. Brown: Then go out.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: Then instead of an increase in population we shall have a decrease in population, and instead of being able to provide work we shall have an army of unemployed.

Hon. J. R. Brown: Is an industry to flourish at the cost of the sweat of every man's brow?

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: Our commodities must be produced at a price at which they can be sold in the world's market. Our difficulties in Western Australia have been built up by a high protective tariff. Australia has started by keeping out the products of the world. Our primary products have to be sold in the world's markets at the world's prices. The disadvantage is this—apart from the disadvantage of the exchange which is serious—that the ships that should be carrying goods to us for consumption here are coming out practically empty, and the primary producer has to pay double instead of single freight.

Hon. J. E. Dodd: I draw the hon. member's attention to what the chairman of an industrial board in Bendigo said last week when he was dealing with a miners' claim. He stated that he could not give the wages that were desired because the industry could not carry it.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: We have had only one experience of a wages or a reference board and that was in connection with the Wyndham Meat Works. The Colonial Secretary in introducing the Bill referred to it, and the Minister for Works when submitting the Bill in another place also alluded to it

and remarked how well it had worked. Of course it worked well. The men got all they asked for.

Hon. J. R. Brown: That is not correct.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: It is correct. I know that last year the men refused to go to Wyndham until there was a readjustment of wages. The price of cattle had gone down, but wages had to go up, and before the slaughtering team would leave Fremantle an increase of five per cent. on the wages was paid to a number of the men. I have already explained that cattle owners had been nursing bullocks through four years of difficulties and what they were fortunate enough to be able to put into the meat works after the four years of difficulties for £3 5s. per head, the men who handled them in the yard and at the works got £2 per head. And members refer to the board as one that worked so well! Of course every board will work well so long as there are parties on it that will give and take. This particular board, however, with the Government on one side and partisans on the other, gave everything that was asked for. In connection with the Arbitration Court we all agree that it is the most important court in the State. If evidence of that is wanted I need only quote from Mr. McCallum's speech in moving the second reading of the Bill in another place. Mr. McCallum said—

> The Court of Arbitration practically decides the main activities of trade and commerce in all their ramifications. It takes out of the hands of the employer the right to say what wages he shall pay, and the industrial conditions his employees shall enjoy. The court's decisions also enter into practically every home in the State. The court affects family life and enters into the social existence of our people as no other court does.

It is intended that the president of the court shall be a man without legal training, a man perhaps not capable of marshalling the evidence. I know by looking across the Chamber that there are some who would appoint a politician to the position. You can see it all over their countenances.

Hon. E. H. Gray: At whom are you looking?

Hon. T. Moore: Your party did that.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: No, but when the proposal was before the House, when there was a scheme to appoint a layman on the bench, I stood here and denounced the idea; I said that the boomerang would come back to roost, that if we put a partisan on the bench someone else, as soon as the opportunity arrived, would do the same. The only way in which we can keep the position sweet and clean is by keeping out the politician and appointing a qualified judge. Mr. Dodd, who never says an unkind word about anyone, remarked that he refused to admit that the judges had all the brains in the community. I refuse to admit that, too, but I do claim from what I know of human nature and from the way that things are drifting in this State, that the only man from whom one can get equity at the present time is a judge of the Supreme Court.

Hon. A. Lovekin: That is a reflection on a good many wise men in the community.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: I am not making hats to fit people; if they automatically fit, I cannot help that. Another proposal in the Bill is that which proposes to give preference to unionists. Some members smile, but I wonder what they would say if we put up a proposal for preference to non-unionists? Where is the difference? One party declares that it favours preference to unionists, another wants preference to non-unionists. Is it suggested that a man in this free, democratic, British community should be of a particular brand of politics before he can earn his living? If members who are supporting the Bill want to win votes, their only hope is to put up their case in a proper manner.

Hon. J. R. Brown: Even then you would not believe it. You have the Bill before you; read it.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: We boast that it is good to be British to-day, and we also boast about all this——

Hon. T. Moore: Tripe.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: It might be, from the hon. member's standpoint. All the same, it is good to be British to-day, and that has always been the case. Apart from that, is it fair that a man should belong to a particular brand of politics before he can earn his living. The only argument I can find in favour of preference to unionists, the only one that ever appealed to me, is that they claim that when they agree to arbitration they abandon the right to strike. If they did abandon the right to strike there might be some logic in the proposal of preference to unionists. But they keep on striking and so long as they do that they shall have no preference to unionists from me.

Hon. J. E. Dodd: It only gives the court power to grant preference.

Hon. E. H. Gray: The judge will decide.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: I do not know that it should come within the province of the judge. We do not want to bring him into the political arena and make him decide what particular brand of politics shall be favoured. The question of wages and hours is one thing, but an individual's brand of politics should not be for a judge to decide.

Hon. A. Lovekin: The judge is sworn to do justice by all men.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: The basic wage with its discrimination between married men and single men should not come into the issue at all. It should be what the industry can support. We cannot deal with single men and married men under the Bill; there are other ways of getting at the single

men and assisting the married men. But to ask the court to fix a basic wage, irrespective of whether the industry can stand it, is unreasonable.

Hon. J. R. Brown: There is a good reason for doing that, because in these days they pay the worker only sufficient money to keep his body and soul together.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: Judging from the Bills we are getting some people interested are all body and no soul. I do not see an atom of equity in this Bill. I see only that irresponsible, extravagant aspirants for Parliament made all sorts of promises throughout the country and are attempting to fulfil those promises. I do not blame them for attempting to fulfil their promises; but this goes much farther. If the House pass the Bill in its present shape, the sponsors for the Bill will fall down in a fright.

Hon. T. Moore: Then you will be rid of a section you do not desire to meet here.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: If I thought that would be the only thing that would happen, I would support the Bill; but I am concerned about the welfare of the State. To show their sense of equity, the sponsors for the Bill have bombarded some of us with circulars demanding, not requesting, that we should carry out their views and pass the Bill.

Hon. J. Cornell: They did their damnedest to keep me out.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: I can imagine the mandate that will rest on the president of the court, if he be a layman, with an organisation of that sort, demanding that their views should be put into effect.

Hon. J. R. Brown: They are the views of the people, for members of another place are elected on a more liberal franchise than are members of this Chamber.

The PRESIDENT: The hon. member must not make speeches by way of interjection.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: Mr. McCallum said the provisions of the Bill would reach right into the kitchen. It is provided that an inspector authorised by the president or secretary of a union shall, for the purpose of ascertaining whether the terms of an industrial agreement or award are being observed, have the powers of entry of an inspector under the Shops and Factories Act. We were told yesterday that that was designed merely to deal with Chinese shops. But it is proposed to make it apply to domestics in the house. So an authorised representative of the union may go right into the kitchen, indeed, right into the maid's bedroom to see what is going on there. The only thing the Bill does not provide is that the inspector shall pass in through the window, not through the door.

Hon. A. Lovekin: I would break the inspector's neck if he came to my house.

Hon. J. W. Kirwan: He would require to be a weakling.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: It is not an inspector appointed by the court or by the Government, but an inspector appointed by the president or secretary of the union, and there is no limit to the number of such inspectors. The scheme is apparent: for every job going on in every factory, house or home, there will always be a representative of the union authorised to inspect.

Hon. J. E. Dodd: We shall require to appoint additional coroners to deal with all the inquests.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: The sponsors for the Bill say that the Arbitration Court has a greater effect on human lives than all the other courts puts together. That court, like other courts, has to decide on the evidence. Yet we are told that it is not necessary that the president shall be able to weight evidence! Much as I dislike the Arbitration Court, due entirely to the fact that it cannot enforce its awards against both parties, and much as I dislike the Bill, it will be my duty to endeavour to amend it myself and to consider amendments put up by others, as I will do. We do not want one law for the rich and another for the poor. We must have justice for all. Unless we have that, the Arbitration Court cannot continue to function. Had we not got justice from all our other courts they would not be standing as high in the estimation of the public as they do to-day. The best way to secure justice in the Arbitration Court would be to keep the Minister as far away from the court as we can; and on no account should we attempt to make any political appointments to the court. After all, the president of the court has given all the decisions in the past, and no matter how many tribunals we may appoint, the decisions given will be those of the president. Then why hamper him by the appointment of a number of other tribunals? Let us give the president absolute power to deal with all matters referred to the court. Then the process will be simplified and expense saved. In order to bring that about I should like to see favourably considered a proposal on the lines of that submitted by Mr. Dodd. We should simplify the procedure in order to get before the court. But before doing that I want the bona fide worker to have some say in it, and I want to see the parasites eliminated.

Hon. T. Moore: Who are the parasites?

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: They live in both camps, the men whose jobs depend on creating and maintaining disputes. For my part they will go. Let us get back to the president, leaving everything to him; and if it is too much for him, let us have a deputy president with the same qualifications as the president. Because I view the Bill from that standpoint I am going to support the second reading; but I am endeavouring to make it clear that the Bill as it stands does not appeal to me, and I have indicated the lines on which I think it should be amended.

Hon. T. MOORE (Central) [5.28]: Seeing that at last a member has arisen who confesses that he is against the principle of arbitration, it becomes necessary that something should be said by those who support that principle. It has been said that those of us sitting behind the Government have been keeping quiet. But we have been waiting for some criticism. After all, on second readings we are supposed to discuss only principles. It is during the Committee stage of the Bill that many matters mentioned by Mr. Holmes will come up for thorough discussion. Therefore it is really waste of time that we should go over every clause at this stage.

Hon. J. J. Holmes: I referred to only one clause.

Hon. T. MOORE: All members have adopted the principle of the Bill. Even Mr. Holmes, who is opposed to arbitration, is nevertheless prepared to vote for the second reading. Therefore perhaps I am only wasting time speaking at this stage. But, having had some experience in the industrial life of the State, I say that arbitration has done much for us, irrespective of what Mr. Holmes may think. If, as he suggested, he wishes to revert to the old method of strikes, I am surprised that he has not been taught by the lessons of the past. A man must be almost callous who believes in strikes, and who would suggest a return to the old method of settling our troubles by industrial warfare. I do not care about warfare of any kind, but industrial warfare is as bad as any that men can take part in. It has been suggested that union secretaries wish to bring about trouble. Mr. Holmes says that an organisation should not be allowed to take a body of workers before the court. What harm can occur if we decide that all our disputes shall be settled by the Arbitration Court? Some industrial organisations have their members scattered all over the State, and it would take months to obtain their views by ballot. What harm can there be in an organisation endeavouring to prevent trouble at the commencement by taking the case before the Arbitration Court or the boards of reference? Too often we have allowed troubles to drift, with the result that bad feeling has grown up between the parties, and there has been a stoppage of work which takes a long time to overcome. During the past few weeks the timber workers through the doings of the employers' agent in Melbourne, were prevented from getting before the court, which had delivered an award for a certain section of the industry. A stoppage of work thus occurred. Reference to the Employer's Federation in this State will prove the truth of this statement. The industry was hung up because the employers' agent, by his arguments, prevented the judge from delivering an award for pieceworkers. After the strike, and all the trouble has occurred, the employers have decided to "call off their dog," and allow the judge of the Arbitration Court to deliver an award for pieceworkers.

Hon. A. Lovekin: Some unions refuse to go to the court.

Hon. T. MOORE: Surely members can see no harm in a union being allowed to go to the court. It would be quite different if a union called out on strike a body of workers, for that would be a bad thing. It is not proposed to do anything drastic, or to harm the industries or the workers in them. It is the desire of the unions to abide by the law of the country, and to do what they can to prevent any trouble at the outset. Let me quote the case of a union that may have trouble brewing for it. I refer to the A.W.U., whose members are found in all parts of the State. It would take months to get a ballot amongst them. At Wyndham, for instance, the boat calls only every two months. If there was a body of men on the verge of ceasing work, would members have the union wait until a ballot had been taken? It is to obviate that difficulty and prevent trouble that arbitration is resorted to.

Hon. J. Cornell: The A.W.U. deliberately organise against the arbitration law.

Hon. T. MOORE: I am putting up a case in support of the Bill. The attitude that may be adopted by unions afterwards does not affect it. The Minister for Labour has had much to do with the industrial life of this State, and has been through a number of strikes and lockouts. His endeavour is to stick to arbitration, and bring forward a Bill that will be acceptable to both parties, and give them confidence in the personnel of the court. Congestion exists in the court, and judges are being continually changed, with the result that the workers have no confidence in that tribunal. I for one do not blame them. It was a mistake to take a man from any political side and appoint him president of the court. It is against human nature for any section of men opposed to him politically to accept him and follow him.

Hon. J. J. Holmes: We agree on that point.

Hon. T. MOORE: We agree on a number of points. I do not, however, agree with Mr. Holmes's idea that Supreme Court judges ought to be placed on a pedestal. They are merely human beings, no better and no worse than others. When a man is made a judge, through having led a clean life, through possessing certain qualifications as a barrister, and having had certain experience, it does not place him over other men. There are plenty of men in this State, some of them belonging to a section of politics opposed to the Labour Party, in whom I have the greatest confidence, and who would not tell a lie. They are true blue in every way. The

House cannot believe that a man who is made a judge ought to be placed on a pedestal on that account. I now wish to refer to preference to unionists.

Hon. J. J. Holmes: I promised to help you in regard to the ballot.

Hon. T. MOORE: Perhaps Mr. Holmes will also help me in the matter of preference to unionists. To the pastoralists of this country the A.W.U. has been of material assistance. Some members smile. Every shearer is known to that union. In the Geraldton district there is a man who controls the North-West. No one stands higher in the estimation of the pastoralists and the shearers than the organiser for that district, Vic. Johnson. If a station owner wants shearers, he telegraphs, not to the Employers' Federation, but to the organiser at Geraldton, who does his best to get good and efficient men. Is not this union entitled to some consideration?

Hon. J. J. Holmes: Would it be any use telegraphing to anyone else?

Hon. T. MOORE: The hon. member knows. The A.W.U. keep an office and a registrar, and know where the men are to be found and where the best men are. Surely some quid pro quo should be given to it. If we believe in arbitration there is only one way to act in accordance with our Constitution and industrial laws, namely, through the Arbitration Court and the unions. Is that not a good reason why we should support those who go before the court in a constitutional manner? Would anyone suggest that preference should be given to people who have done nothing to build up the unions? The industrial organisations have followed the laws of the country. The court has settled their disputes, and made industrial awards covering the industries for the years to come. I agree with Mr. Dodd that the non-unionist is a fool. He may also be a knave, a man who has been dismissed from some other organisation. Fully 95 per cent. of our workers are unionists. They go before the court, and do all the battling and the work to bring about the many improved conditions that have been noticed during recent years. The non-unionist sneaks in on their backs and takes that which he did nothing to obtain.

Hon. J. Cornell: He is a parasite.

Hon. T. MOORE: The man who does not join a union is not worth thinking about. He is a fool and a waster. He is prepared to take what others have battled for and worked constitutionally to obtain. I cannot understand anyone saying that unionists should not have preference. The unions and the employers have together done much to bring about the present improved conditions of our industries. On very rare occasions have strikes occurred. I doubt if more than two per cent. of our industrial troubles have led to strikes. I was once concerned in a strike, and would take the same action again as I took then. The timber workers' wages were reduced from 7s. 9d. to 7s. 3d. in 1907 and 1908. We were told that the industry could not be carried on at the old rates. A 14-weeks strike occurred. The wages then went up to 8s. a day, and the industry has worked ever since. The employers have made more profits than ever before. We were perfectly justified in striking. The case was heard by a partisan judge. Everything connected with the strike showed that we were right. We would not have been men if we had not done what we did.

Hon. F. E. S. Willmott: Why a partisan judge? The award was given on the evidence.

Hon. T. MOORE: The evidence was ignored. Not only were the wages low, but the housing accommodation was filthy. Men with their wives were huddled together in little humpies that they had to build themselves. One man built a humpy and managed to exist there with his wife and children. When he left, Millars' combine, which were good enough to supply waste timber and iron for the shacks, charged the next man rent for the premises. To get to another phase: we are constantly told that it is wrong to shorten the hours of work. However, there are in this State industries which can bear shortened hours and still show huge profits. The 44-hour week granted to the timber workers by the Federal Award was taken away from them by partisan judges, three of a kind, put on the Federal bench specially to override the Federal Arbitration Court. And then we are told judges are strictly honourable! Is it any wonder we regard judges as just ordinary men, no better than anybody else? And these are recent happenings. With regard to shorter hours, Mr. Holmes quoted one industry, the agricultural industry.

Hon. J. J. Holmes: I mentioned the pastoral industry as well.

Hon. T. MOORE: The hon. member referred to the great number of acres not being used to-day, but which would be suitable for either agriculture or sheep. However, it is not the wages paid to the unfortunate farm workers that keeps those industries back. Just recently it has been found possible to raise the wages of agricultural workers from 25s. per week to 30s. Therefore, the wages paid have not prevented those lands from being used.

Hon. J. J. Holmes: I did not say it was the wages.

Hon. T. MOORE: Neither was it the hours worked. Agricultural labourers have been worked long enough hours, in all conscience. As Mr. Holmes suggests, progress has not been made. However, we are, after all, only a very few people; and there has been a lot done in this State. Probably there will be a bit left to be done when Mr. Holmes and I depart from this sphere.

Hon. J. J. Holmes: I said this was a country of primary industries, which had to sell its products in the world's markets.

Hon. T. MOORE: Quite right. The farmers, because they pay their men low wages and work them long hours, do not get, and cannot expect to get, good men. Good men will not work for the farmers. I know the country districts just as well as Mr. Holmes knows them. I would not mind if it were only the farmers on the bottom rung, who did not pay good wages and did not give good accommodation; in many cases they would be unable to do so. In our agricultural areas, the employees have to live in pretty poor places, and they are unable to bring their wives and children with them, but must keep them elsewhere, which is a deplorable state of affairs. If the wages in the industries in question could be raised, it would be better for both parties. Actually, the rich man in our country districts often does less than the struggling farmer for his men. I could give a case in point, but it is not necessary to mention the name. In the days of long hours here, 52 hours a week, when I first came to this country, I heard one of our Western Australian-born tell a tale. It was at Karridale, and he said, "Things are changed here wonderfully as compared with the old days. Then we used to have to say our prayers of a night, and one of the prayers was, 'God bless Mr. Davies, who gives our daddy work.' Undoubtedly he gave us a lot of work, and allowed us 12 solid hours to do it in. We got 2s. a day for the 12 hours." That is how things were in those days. Since then the workers have advanced through political and industrial action. Mr. Dodd mentioned that much of the credit for the improvement in our industrial laws can be claimed by men not attached to the Labour Party. That refers to the very early years of this century. I care not who gets the credit as long as the improvement is made; but I say that no set of politicians in the past have ever done anything more than the industrialists forced them to do at the point of the bayonet. Those politicians always had to be pushed along. It is only by industrialists in a position to push, that good results have been achieved. There are key industries in which the workers can command any pay within reason.

Hon. J. J. Holmes: This Bill will push everybody through the window.

Hon. T. MOORE: I wish the hon. member could be pushed through a window, but it would need to be a big window. It has been questioned whether the unfortunate domestics should be brought within the scope of the Bill. What is the difference between a man and a woman for the purposes of the present argument? It is difficult for ladies to get domestic servants, simply because they treat their servants so badly. Girls will not go in for domestic work, and one cannot blame them for their unwillingness. Ask any girl who has spent some time in domestic service and then obtained other work, whether she would prefer to work for a woman who keeps her employed all hours, or for an employer who works her the hours fixed by arbitration awards. Why should an unfortunate domestic be debarred from having her case heard by the Arbitration Court, the same as a man? That is what the Bill asks.

Hon. A. Lovekin: It goes a good deal further than that.

Hon. T. MOORE: That is a position which this House has never yet allowed to be established. The domestic and the insurance canvasser and a few others, have always been thrown out of Arbitration Bills. When it comes to a division, are members prepared to sit here and declare that a domestic servant shall not have her case heard and her grievances investigated and her hours of work fixed by the Arbitration Court?

Hon. G. W. Miles: We are prepared to keep the inspector out of the home.

Hon. F. E. S. Willmott: Will you set up another court that will remedy the grievances of the poor missis? She has the worst part.

Hon. T. MOORE: In common, I presume, with other members, I have received a letter from the president of the Western Australian National Council of Women, the International president of which is the Marchioness of Aberdeen and Temair, the Western Australian patroness of which is the Hon. Lady Newdegate, the president being Mrs. C. H. E. Manning, and the vice-presidents Mrs. James Cowan—who is supposed to have done much for women, but only supposed—Lady James, O.B.E., and Mrs. Ferguson-Stewart. The letter reads—

> The National Council of Women wish to bring before your notice the following resolutions, which they dealt with at a special meeting, and trust you will give them your sympathetic consideration:—1, That this council depreciates—

I presume "deprecates" is intended

> strongly the inclusion of household workers in the Arbitration Act now before Parliament, as we feel that its application will undermine the home life of the community, lower the birth rate—

Let hon. members mark that—

> and greatly disturb the building up of the family, the home, and the nation.

I wonder have members ever had a more absurd series of statements submitted to them. What has the servant girl to do with the birth rate? I have been trying to figure out what the communication means, and I can only come to the conclusion that the ladies want these unfortu-

nate slaves not to have their wages and conditions of employment investigated by the Arbitration Court in the same way as other workers, but want them kept out, kept in the dark, and not permitted to air their grievances. Possibly these ladies mean that they would not be able to bring up large families without considerable domestic help. But the largest families in this State are being reared by the industrialists. I defy contradiction.

Hon. F. E. S. Willmott: I will back the South-Western cocky against any industrialist!

The PRESIDENT: Order, please!

Hon. T. MOORE: The birth rate is much higher amongst the industrialists than it is in the homes of these people who have written to me. They are the very people who are making protests in respect of other matters, to which I shall refer on a future date. I want these haughty dames——

The PRESIDENT: You might refer to them in civil language.

Hon. T. MOORE: I think I am right in referring to them in Parliamentary language. I believe "haughty" is Parliamentary.

The PRESIDENT: It is not intended to be Parliamentary on your part, I suppose.

Hon. T. MOORE: I speak in my own tone, Mr. President. I cannot speak in yours. However, I bow to your ruling. These society people—I will say them—must have something to hide, something they do not wish the Arbitration Court to learn, regarding the conditions of domestic service; otherwise they would not send to members of this House such letters as they have sent. I want the unfortunate domestics in particular to obtain relief by this Bill, and consequently to be treated as human beings. I want to say to these society people that possibly if their ancestry was traced back, it would be found that some of their mothers were domestic servants. Of course there would be nothing wrong with that. In this connection I urge that the House, if for no other reason than that of taking exception to these leaders of fashion——

Hon. J. J. Holmes: Do they demand, or do they request?

Hon. T. MOORE: They request; they respectfully request. However, that is only another way of putting it. Workers in the key industries of this State can demand things to-day. They hardly need a union. They can get things without the aid of the Arbitration Court. But domestics are not in that happy position, and too often they are treated badly. It is only fair that we should give domestics the same rights as are possessed by other unionists, and I do hope the House will do that one thing. I support the second reading of the Bill.

On motion by Hon. H. Stewart, debate adjourned.

BILL—INSPECTION OF SCAFFOLDING.

In Committee.

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

The CHAIRMAN: Progress was reported on Clause 25, which was partly considered.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: I have an amendment on the Notice Paper and it will be necessary to alter it in consequence of the decision to confine the operations of the Bill to the metropolitan area. The proposed Subclause 1 in my amendment reads: "The regulations in the schedule to this Act shall have effect and the force of law in such parts of the State as the Governor shall, by Order in Council, constitute and define as districts for the purposes of this Act." I propose to strike out the word "such" and to insert in lieu the words, "the metropolitan area and in such other."

The CHAIRMAN: I understand the amendment is similar to the one dealt with last night.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: Yes, except for the alteration I have indicated.

The CHAIRMAN: The proposed amendment is a direct contradiction of the amendment carried to Clause 1 of the Bill. That decision can be reversed only in the event of the Bill being recommitted. I cannot accept the amendment at the present stage.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: The amendment will bring the Bill into conformity with Mr. Lovekin's amendment restricting the operations of the Bill in the metropolitan area. I will deal with the amendment on the recommittal of the Bill.

Hon. F. E. S. Willmott: In view of the decision to confine the Bill to the metropolitan area, why the inclusion of the words "in such other"? That will have the effect of extending the operations of the Bill to districts outside the metropolitan area.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: I propose to deal with that point when the Bill is recommitted. I intend to move an amendment permitting the extension of the Act by the Governor in Council to other parts of the State by means of an Order in Council, which, however, will become operative only after remaining on the Table of the House for 14 days.

The CHAIRMAN: At any rate, that matter cannot be dealt with at the present stage.

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: Paragraph (a) provides that the Governor may from time to time make regulations for "regulating the powers and duties of inspectors." It would be all right to deal with the duties of inspectors by means of regulations, but

the powers to be vested in their hands should be dealt with in the Bill and not by way of regulations. I move an amendment—

That in line 1 of paragraph (a) the words "powers and" be struck out.

The Colonial Secretary: I have no objection to that.

Hon. J. CORNELL: It is impossible to define comprehensively the powers of an inspector in an Act of Parliament. Similar provisions exist in other Acts and, generally speaking, this has not led to an abuse of the powers vested in inspectors.

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: I object to legislation by means of regulations and to extending drastic powers in that way to inspectors.

Amendment put and passed.

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: There are two consequential amendments in the clause that will, I presume, be made automatically.

The CHAIRMAN: That is so.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: The paragraph provides power for prescribing by regulations the qualifications of inspectors and requiring that before appointment they shall give, by competitive examination or otherwise, satisfactory evidence of their competency. In view of the earlier decisions regarding this matter, the words "or otherwise" are unnecessary. I will move an amendment to delete those words.

Hon. H. STEWART: Before that amendment is dealt with, I would like to raise the question of the competitive examination. There is no necessity for a competitive examination, for it is more a matter of qualification. For instance, there may be one candidate only and there would be no competitive examination necessary. I move an amendment—

That in line 8 of paragraph (a) the word "competitive" be struck out.

Hon. A. J. H. SAW: There is no necessity for the amendment. If there is one candidate only, it will be a walk-over.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: In all probability there will be no competition required; someone in the office of the Chief Inspector of Factories may be appointed. In that case there would be no competitive examination, hence the necessity for the words "or otherwise."

Hon. F. E. S. Willmott: But why provide for competitive examinations?

Hon. J. Ewing: Why not?

Hon. F. E. S. Willmott: Because competitive examinations are the curse of the world to-day. They are ridiculous.

Hon. H. STEWART: Power is given to prescribe the qualifications of inspectors and the Bill also provides that before those inspectors are appointed, they shall, by competitive examination or otherwise, give satisfactory evidence of their competency. That evidence will be established without the necessity for competitive examinations.

Sitting suspended from 6.15 to 7.30 p.m.

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

Ayes	11
Noes	14
Majority against ..	3

Ayes.	
Hon. J. Cornell	Hon. G. Potter
Hon. J. A. Greig	Hon. H. A. Stephenson
Hon. J. J. Holmes	Hon. H. Stewart
Hon. A. Lovekin	Hon. H. J. Yelland
Hon. G. W. Miles	Hon. A. Burvill
Hon. J. Nicholson	*(Teller.)*

Noes.	
Hon. C. F. Baxter	Hon. W. H. Kitson
Hon. J. R. Brown	Hon. J. M. Macfarlane
Hon. J. M. Drew	Hon. T. Moore
Hon. J. Duffell	Hon. H. Seddon
Hon. E. H. Gray	Hon. F. E. S. Willmott
Hon. V. Hamersley	Hon. J. Ewing
Hon. E. H. Harris	*(Teller.)*
Hon. J. W. Hickey	

Amendment thus negatived.

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: I move an amendment—

That the words "or otherwise" be struck out.

If the words be retained the clause will be meaningless, because the Committee have already decided in favour of competitive examination.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: Having decided upon competitive examination we should retain the words "or otherwise." A man in the service might be qualified other than by competitive examination, but the Government would have to call for applications.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: Had we struck out "competitive" it would have simplified the matter. Having decided upon competitive examination, the words "or otherwise" should be struck out.

Hon. A. J. H. SAW: The original phraseology should have been "by examination, competitive or otherwise." If we strike out the words "or otherwise" the examination, if there is more than one candidate, will be competitive, but if there is not more than one candidate he will have a walk-over.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: At present there is no need for competitive examination but in ten years' time we may have to call for applications, and a competitive examination might be necessary.

Hon. H. STEWART: The Committee have decided in favour of competitive examination. Years hence it may be found advisable to adopt examination in conjunc-

tion with other things. The Minister apparently wishes to legislate for a particular case. It would have been better had we struck out the word "competitive."

Hon. W. H. KITSON: By the deletion of the words "or otherwise" we shall be tying the hands of the Government. If the examination is to be competitive only, it will be presumed that the individual who succeeds will get the position.

Hon. G. W. Miles: Is that not what we want?

Hon. W. H. KITSON: At the same time there may be other circumstances which may render it unnecessary for a competitive examination to be held.

Hon. G. W. Miles: It is as necessary in the one case as it is in the other.

Hon. W. H. KITSON: It seems to me that there are members here who move amendments for the sole purpose of mutilating the Bill.

The CHAIRMAN: The hon. member must not say that. He must withdraw the remark.

Hon. W. H. KITSON: I will withdraw it.

Hon. J. CORNELL: It can be ascertained by a competitive examination only whether a man is competent or not, and if an individual does submit himself for a competitive examination he will not suffer any hardship. As I understand that Mr. Kitson is a student of English, I ask him if the words "or otherwise" are included, whether some persons from outside cannot be appointed without an examination.

Hon. T. Moore: Nothing of the kind.

Hon. J. CORNELL: Why is the clause punctuated if the words are not intended to stand by themselves?

Hon. T. Moore: I think you had better take another lesson in English.

Hon. J. CORNELL: I will take it from you to-morrow.

Hon. J. DUFFELL: The question is very simple and a lot of time is being wasted over it. Suppose that it is required to appoint an inspector, and one of those men responsible for the erection of the scaffolding around the Town Hall tower was an applicant, would it be necessary for him, a man of such practical experience, to have to undergo an examination? The clause is logical, and whether the qualifications of the inspector be proved by examination or by practical experience, what does it matter?

Hon. A. J. H. SAW: I happened to be passing a building in course of erection the other morning and there were men engaged in erecting scaffolding. Knowing that there was a Scaffolding Bill before the Council, I stopped to exchange a few words with the men so as to get their opinions. Incidentally one of the men said, "There will be a good job going; I think I will put in an application for it, but I expect they will give it to some bloke who knows nothing whatever about it, but who is in favour with the powers that be." When the Bill is recommitted, I intend to move that the words be altered to read "by examination, competitive or otherwise."

Hon. G. POTTER: If the sentence means anything at all, it means that an examination must be held, and that somebody must be proved by examination to be qualified to carry out the duties required of him by the Bill. The meaning of a word will vary with the relation of that word to other words used in conjunction with it. I think with Dr. Saw that what we have before us is a little error, possibly a typograpical error. However, it is quite clear that an examination is contemplated, whether it be collective or individual.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: Mr. Cornell expressed the opinion that the low fees charged would not cover the cost of administration, which therefore might become a charge on Consolidated Revenue. A few months ago I said it was not intended to make any special appointment under the Bill, that we have in the service an officer who can take on this work without increased emolument. If the clause be not passed as it stands, a new appointment will have to be made, and the time of the new officer will not be more than half occupied.

Hon. H. STEWART: I hope Dr. Saw will bring forward his proposal on recommittal, for it will certainly solve the difficulty. It is desirable that the Committee should clearly indicate its intention in all legislation.

Hon. J. CORNELL: The Minister quoted me as referring to the fees. The point I took was that the fees might prove inadequate and that if so, there was only one other source from which to draw the cost of administration, namely Consolidated Revenue. The Bill is designed for the better protection of life and limb, and therefore the question of cost should not come in. In operation the Bill will be analogous to the Mines Regulation Act, which is largely for the protection of the men working in the mines. Under that Act inspectors are required to have five years' practical experience of underground mining and to pass an examination prescribed by the Minister. There is no "or otherwise" there. If the provision in the clause were on all fours with that in the Mines Regulation Act, there could be no objection to it.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: The Bill has won a lot of support on the score that it is intended to protect life and limb. But the Minister now says the officer to be appointed to deal with all the scaffolding cannot pass a competitive examination.

The Colonial Secretary: I did not say so.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: That was the inference. If the intended officer can pass an examination, where is the objection to striking out "or otherwise"? When we were voting on the "competitive" amendment we knew that the next amendment

would be to strike out "or otherwise." By all means let us have an officer appointed by competitive examination.

Hon. T. MOORE: Some members seem inclined to follow Dr. Saw's suggestion that on recommittal the clause be amended in a way to suit all parties. I suggest that the clause be passed in its present state and subsequently be recommitted for further action.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: I do not want it to go forth that the Committee is following Dr. Saw in this. The officer to be appointed should be able to pass a competitive examination. Dr. Saw proposes to amend the clause to read, "Examination, competitive or otherwise." That will still leave the thing indefinite. Let us be more definite.

Hon. H. STEWART: I suggest that we support Mr. Lovekin's amendment. Let us first pass the amendment, and the Bill can still be recommitted at a later stage.

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

Ayes	.. .. ..	13
Noes	.. .. ..	10
Majority for	..	3

Ayes.

Hon. J. Cornell	Hon. G. Potter
Hon. V. Hamersley	Hon. A. J. H. Saw
Hon. J. J. Holmes	Hon. H. Seddon
Hon. A. Lovekin	Hon. H. A. Stephenson
Hon. J. M. Macfarlane	Hon. H. Stewart
Hon. G. W. Miles	Hon. F. E. S. Willmott
Hon. J. Nicholson	(*Teller.*)

Noes.

Hon. J. R. Brown	Hon. E. H. Harris
Hon. A. Burvill	Hon. J. W. Hickey
Hon. J. M. Drew	Hon. W. H. Kitson
Hon. J. Duffell	Hon. T. Moore
Hon. J. Ewing	(*Teller.*)
Hon. E. H. Gray	

Amendment thus passed.

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: I move an amendment—

That paragraph (d) be struck out.

There is no need to prescribe any more fees, because they are already provided for on page 7 of what is to be the schedule. The fees are stiff. They amount to a quarter per cent. on the estimated cost of a building, structure, lift, boat or other work in connection with which scaffolding is used. The charge is to be the same in the case of alterations, repairs and additions.

Amendment put and passed.

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: I move an amendment—

That paragraph (e) be struck out.

Page 9 of the schedule sets out the mode of procedure before magistrates, and in 14 paragraphs covers the whole position. We do not want any new regulations put up that may conflict with these.

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

Ayes	.. .. ..	15
Noes	.. .. ..	8
Majority for	..	7

Ayes.

Hon. A. Burvill	Hon. G. Potter
Hon. J. Duffell	Hon. A. J. H. Saw
Hon. V. Hamersley	Hon. H. Seddon
Hon. J. J. Holmes	Hon. H. A. Stephenson
Hon. A. Lovekin	Hon. H. Stewart
Hon. J. M. Macfarlane	Hon. F. E. S. Willmott
Hon. G. W. Miles	Hon. J. Ewing
Hon. J. Nicholson	(*Teller.*)

Noes.

Hon. J. R. Brown	Hon. J. W. Hickey
Hon. J. Cornell	Hon. T. Moore
Hon. J. M. Drew	Hon. W. H. Kitson
Hon. E. H. Gray	(*Teller.*)
Hon. E. H. Harris	

Amendment thus passed.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: I move an amendment—

That the following proviso be added to the clause: "Provided that no regulation made under this section shall come into force until it has been laid on the Table of both Houses of Parliament for a period of 14 days."

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: I suggest the addition of the words, "and has not been disallowed." This follows the Interpretation Act. It is not sufficient for us to say that regulations shall be laid on the Table for 14 days, but we require that they shall not have been disallowed before being put into operation. Without the addition of these words we shall have no power to disallow them.

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: I suggest that after the word "Provided" there should be added "notwithstanding anything to the contrary contained in the Interpretation Act, 1918." We want to safeguard the position. However, the Colonial Secretary has said that he will introduce a subclause which will practically nullify the Interpretation Act so far as this measure is concerned. Under that subclause, the regulations would not take effect until they had been laid on the Table of the House; and they could not be laid on the Table of the House until the House was sitting.

Hon. A. J. H. SAW: I do not think that either Mr. Lovekin's amendment or Mr. Nicholson's suggested amendment is necessary. Under the Interpretation Act we have power to disallow a regulation within 14 days of its being laid on the Table of the House; and the Colonial Secretary's suggested subclause says that a regulation shall

not come into force until it has lain on the Table of the House for 14 days.

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: It seems to me, reading the amendment in the Bill and the Interpretation Act together, that the amendment in the Bill would for the present occasion supersede the Interpretation Act. Section 36 of that Act, dealing with regulations, rules, and by-laws, provides—

> (1) When by any Act it is provided that regulations may or shall be made, and (i) it is provided that such regulation may or shall be made by the Governor; or (ii) it is not provided by whom such regulations may or shall be made, any regulation made under, or by virtue of, such provision (a) shall be made by the Governor: (b) shall be published in the "Gazette": (c) shall, subject to Subsection 2 hereof, take effect and have the force of law from the date of such publication, or from a later date fixed by the order making such regulation. . . .

If the amendment does anything, it obviously repeals this section of the Arbitration Act. The section goes on to say that after a regulation made in this form has been laid upon the Table, it may be disallowed by the House within 14 days. But I want to make sure that we maintain the right of disallowance; and if there is any doubt, there can be no harm whatever in adding the words I propose, "and has not been disallowed." If a clause of the Bill can be considered to be a repeal by implication of that section of the Interpretation Act, we have lost the right to disallow.

Hon. H. STEWART: I will continue reading the section where Mr. Lovekin stopped, proceeding to give us a condensation. That will show the position to be absolutely protected. The section continues—

> (2) Notwithstanding any provision in any Act to the contrary, if either House of Parliament passes a resolution disallowing any such regulation, of which resolution notice has been given at any time within 14 sitting days of such House after such regulation has been laid before it, such regulation shall thereupon cease to have effect, but without affecting the validity, or curing the invalidity, of anything done, or of the omission of anything in the meantime.

Hon. A. Lovekin: That refers to regulations mentioned in the preceding part of the Act.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: I discussed the matter with Mr. Sayer, and he drafted this subclause to meet the position. I understand from Mr. Sayer that it is impossible to take away the power of disallowance enjoyed by either House of Parliament, except by a specific amendment of the Interpretation Act. Mr. Lovekin's addition is quite unnecessary. Mr. Nicholson's is informative. The latter might, therefore, prove to some extent helpful.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: I am afraid Mr. Lovekin's amendment limits our jurisdiction instead of enlarging it. Under it, not only must notice be given within 14 days, but the disallowance must ensue within the 14 days, or else the regulation takes full effect.

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: We wish by this clause to contract ourselves out of the Interpretation Act.

Hon. A. Lovekin: That is it.

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: In order to do that we must show clearly in this additional provision moved by the Colonial Secretary that we are seeking to take this power to ourselves with regard to any regulations passed under this measure, notwithstanding the clear provisions of the Interpretation Act. To do so we must insert the words I suggest in order to make the position perfectly clear. The addition of the words suggested by Mr. Lovekin would have the effect Mr. Holmes has indicated, and would seriously limit our powers. Then, again, the amendment refers to "fourteen days." That should read "fourteen sitting days," otherwise the Bill would be contrary to the wording of the Interpretation Act.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: I cannot understand why the inclusion of the words "notwithstanding anything to the contrary in the Interpretation Act 1918" is necessary.

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: Under the provisions of the Interpretation Act, regulations passed under any Act take effect from the date of publication in the *Government Gazette*, but they may be disallowed at any time within 14 sitting days from the time the regulations are laid on the Table here. The intention is to prevent regulations being framed and having the force of law while Parliament is in recess.

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: I cannot follow Mr. Nicholson's argument at all. By the inclusion of the phrase "notwithstanding anything to the contrary in the Interpretation Act, 1918," Mr. Nicholson's proposal will mean that regulations laid on the Table for 14 days will have the force of law, because we will have repealed the provision enabling us to disallow those regulations.

Hon. J. Nicholson: It would never do to agree to your amendment.

Hon. J. M. MACFARLANE: When experts differ, how can ordinary laymen decide? I suggest the Minister should report progress in order to have inquiries made regarding Mr. Lovekin's proposal. In view of the different views expressed to the Committee, I do not feel inclined to vote unless the position is cleared up.

Hon. H. STEWART: The proposition put forward by the Minister is the best. From their remarks hon. members have indicated that Mr. Lovekin's proposal is dangerous and will have the opposite effect to that which he desires, while we have also indicated that Mr. Nicholson's proposal is dangerous, too. To avoid doubt in the

matter, Mr. Nicholson should agree to his amendment being altered to read "notwithstanding anything to the contrary in paragraph (c) of sub-paragraph (2) of Sub-section 1 of Section 36 of the Interpretation Act." That will make the position perfectly clear.

Hon. A. J. H. SAW: I will repeat myself. I do not think that either amendment is necessary and I agree with the Colonial Secretary. Mr. Holmes brought down Mr. Lovekin with the left barrel and Mr. Stewart has brought down Mr. Nicholson with the right barrel and it only remains for the dogs to gather up the birds and eat them. There is no necessity to further discuss either amendment.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: Mr. Nicholson wishes to overcome the difficulty of publishing the regulations in the "Gazette." It is an advantage to have the regulations published in the "Gazette" at about the same time as they are brought before Parliament, because it tends to obviate regulations slipping through without members knowing they are before us. When it is proposed to bring in the Interpretation Act and limit our powers, I cannot agree with members. Why not lay the regulations on the Table and leave the rest to the Interpretation Act?

Hon. J. EWING: Regulations cannot be gazetted until they have been laid on the Table for 14 days. Under the Interpretation Act regulations are immediately gazetted and put into operation. The Government say they do not wish to govern by regulation and are prepared to place the regulations on the Table and allow 14 days to elapse before they have the force of law. There is no necessity for the amendments suggested by Mr. Lovekin and Mr. Nicholson. I support the Minister because I consider any interference would be disastrous.

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: Mr. Nicholson's suggestion offers a way out of the difficulty. Instead of providing "notwithstanding anything contained in the Interpretation Act" he wishes to limit the repeal by providing "notwithstanding anything contained in sub-paragraph (c), paragraph 2, Subsection 1 of Section 36." Then the power of disallowance will stand and we shall have dispensed only with the publication in the "Gazette" and with the regulation receiving the force of law until it has been tabled.

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: I shall move my amendment on the Colonial Secretary's amendment as follows:—

That the following words be inserted at the beginning of the proposed proviso: "Notwithstanding anything to the contrary contained in sub-paragraph (c) of paragraph (ii) of Subsection (1) of Section 36 of the Interpretation Act, 1918."

Hon. H. STEWART: The position is fully dealt with in the Interpretation Act.

Hon. A. Lovekin: We only want to preserve the position.

Hon. H. STEWART: If Mr. Nicholson wishes to obviate publication in the "Gazette" he should also include sub-paragraph (b), but there is no necessity for that.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: This position has arisen through a proposed departure from the procedure by which regulations come into force. If we make a departure, it may be necessary to deal similarly with the regulations under every measure sent up to us. We may evolve something from this discussion, but it may lead to complications.

Hon. A. Lovekin: I understand the Government intend to amend the Interpretation Act.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: We do not want to come to any hasty conclusion that may be wrong. We seem to require more intelligence than has been brought to bear on the discussion to-night.

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

Ayes	8
Noes	16
Majority against	8

AYES.

Hon. J. Cornell	Hon. H. A. Stephenson
Hon. V. Hamersley	Hon. H. Stewart
Hon. A. Lovekin	Hon. H. J. Yelland
Hon. G. Potter	Hon. J. Nicholson (*Teller.*)

NOES.

Hon. J. R. Brown	Hon. W. H. Kitson
Hon. A. Burvill	Hon. J. M. Macfarlane
Hon. J. M. Drew	Hon. G. W. Miles
Hon. J. Ewing	Hon. T. Moore
Hon. E. H. Gray	Hon. A. J. H. Saw
Hon. E. H. Harris	Hon. H. Seddon
Hon. J. W. Hickey	Hon. F. E. S. Willmott
Hon. J. J. Holmes	Hon. J. Duffell (*Teller.*)

Amendment on amendment thus negatived.

Hon. J. CORNELL: From my reading of the Interpretation Act and the clause in the Bill relating to regulations, I am of the opinion that notwithstanding the insertion of the clause in the Bill a regulation may be framed by the Government and put into operation in the ordinary course of events. We are now about to do something that means a departure from a well-defined order of procedure. I submit that it is quite possible under the proposal to do as has been done before, put up a regulation and let Parliament disallow it. In the whole of my experience in this Chamber extending over a

period of 12 years, I have never known a similar course to be taken.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: I remember quite well about a dozen years ago a provision was inserted in the Interpretation Act to the effect that a regulation could not be disallowed except by the action of both Houses. The late Mr. Cullen was the first member to introduce an amendment to the effect that either House of Parliament should have the right to disallow a regulation. Since then the Interpretation Act has been amended, but previously a provision was inserted in each Bill giving to either House the power of disallowance.

Hon. J. Cornell: Can you point to one piece of legislation passed in the last 12 years containing a similar provision?

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: I can point to numerous Acts that have been passed wherein a departure has been made from the Interpretation Act.

Hon. A. Lovekin: Recent Acts have omitted it because the provision is contained in the Interpretation Act.

Hon. F. E. S. WILLMOTT: This is certainly a departure, and one in the right direction. Some members have said it means we shall be whittling away the rights of this House, rights given us under the Interpretation Act. I cannot see that. But even if it be so, we have at least 20 hours in which to go into this matter, and when the Bill is recommitted if there be any danger we can take action.

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: I move an amendment to the proposed proviso—

That after "fourteen" in line 4 "sitting" be inserted.

Amendment on the amendment put and passed.

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: So convinced am I that by the adoption of the clause we shall do away with Section 36 of the Interpretation Act, giving us the power of disallowance of regulations, that I propose to draft the clause in another form that will preserve Section 36, except paragraph (c) of Subsection 2. The drafting of my proposed amendment will take a little time. Therefore I ask the Minister to report progress and so afford me the necessary opportunity.

Progress reported.

BILL—STATE LOTTERIES.

Second Reading.

Resumed from the previous day.

Hon. H. SEDDON (North-East) [9.38]: I cannot support the Bill. One recognises the urgent need for action in respect of hospital finances, but I am not at all convinced that the measure will effect any improvement in those finances. The Bill appears to me to be, not so much an attempt to assist charity, as to legalise sweeps. The present method of financing hospitals and charitable institutions is very unsatisfactory, being both casual and unfair. According to the report of the Medical Department, some 19 hospitals are managed by the Government, while 26 others are subsidised institutions, and many are run entirely on voluntary contributions. Such a mixed-up state of affairs appears to demand remedy. The Hospitals Bill of a couple of sessions ago had, at any rate, the idea of putting things on a standard basis. To that extent the Bill deserved support. There is nothing along those lines in the Bill before us. The attempt is merely to meet the deficiency in hospital maintenance expenditure by the proceeds of lotteries. Had the Government brought down a scheme to systematise the financing of hospitals they would have met with a great deal more support than they have done. Had they made provision to finance the equipment of our hospitals and generally to provide all that is necessary in the establishment of hospitals by one method, and then endeavoured to meet maintenance charges by another method, such a proposal would have commended itself to members more than does the present Bill. On the Minister's own figures, the running of sweeps will not meet the existing deficiency. According to the 1922 report of the Medical Department, the hospitals were costing £180,000 per annum, while the money raised by voluntary donations and other means represented only £18,000. The Minister said it was estimated that they would not receive more than about £30,000 clear from the proposed sweeps. Therefore there will be a very serious deficiency left. It is to be remembered, too, that in the running of these sweeps the Minister will have to compete with existing lotteries, with Tattersall's and with the Golden Casket. So there will be nothing to specially recommend State lotteries to the public, except the sentimental appeal to support them as against lotteries run in other States. Had the Government been able to introduce some proposal calculated to successfully compete with other lotteries, it might have had a better chance of success. Members have referred to the issue of premium bonds in operation on the Continent. If the Government had framed a proposal on those lines it would have been more effective in dealing with the capital expenditure of our hospitals. The proposal of premium bonds has been explained. The idea is to float a loan in the form of small denomination bonds. The loan would have a currency of 10 years. Portion of the interest is pooled, and is then cut up into a series of prizes similar to those provided under the Golden Casket system. One per cent. of the interest is retained. When the bonds are retired at the end of 10 years they are retired with the addition of the 1 per cent. per annum, which has accumulated during the 10 years. The idea is that the principal shall be available

to the man who has speculated in these bonds, and at any time during the 10 years he has a chance of drawing a prize. He is thus able to get the benefit of a sweep as well as have his capital sum safeguarded.

Hon. H. Stewart: That is a lottery.

Hon. H. SEDDON: Yes, but the capital sum is reserved.

Hon. A. Burvill: He is gambling on his profits.

Hon. H. SEDDON: He is gambling on the interest. This system has more to commend it than straight-out sweeps. A bond can be redeemed at any time by being discounted during the 10 years. Another argument may be advanced against the running of sweeps. I am inclined to think the proposal will actually reduce the revenue contributed by donors to our hospitals. I have heard it said by these donors that they will consider, if the sweep system is adopted, that funds for hospitals will be raised by that means, and that they will be relieved from any further obligation in the matter. Again, most people who contribute to sweeps and lotteries are working people. This will mean that the workers will be bearing the greater proportion of the expense of maintaining our hospitals without any guarantee of benefits from those institutions should they fall sick at any time. The provision that was introduced in the Hospitals Bill whereby a man who was receiving a wage of under £4 a week was entitled to free hospital treatment, was a very valuable one, and is not found in the Lotteries Bill. From that point of view the working man will be bearing an increased proportion of the contributions required for hospital expenditure without receiving any corresponding benefit. If it were intended to use the money raised from gambling for the support of hospitals and charitable institutions I am surprised the Government did not consider the advisability of increasing the totalisator tax. The tax is now in the region of 6 per cent., and last year it produced £54,000 as a contribution to revenue. If it were increased to 15 per cent. the revenue would jump up to something like £136,000, which would not cost any more money to raise.

Hon. G. Potter: Would the investments be made in the same ratio as they are now?

Hon. H. SEDDON: We could allow for the ratio, and could still argue that the money derived would be sufficient to meet the deficiency in our hospital expenditure. To run lotteries will require a considerable staff, and will mean the employment of a number of unproductive workers. Already too many people are engaged in occupations that are not directly reproductive, who should be engaged in reproductive industries. This is another argument against State lotteries. If we wish to compete against other gambling institutions we must offer better terms than they offer. Gambling is certainly established in this State. Workers often say, with a considerable amount of truth, that under our present economic system it is almost impossible for them to get out of the groove they are in. If they indulge in a little speculation of this kind, and if they are lucky, they will make a sum of money that will help them out of the rut. No doubt that is the motive underlying a good deal of their speculation in this direction.

Hon. A. J. H. Saw: What are the probabilities?

Hon. H. SEDDON: I am not dealing with that point at present. That is also probably one of the reasons why people bet on horse racing. I was sorry to hear the reference of the Leader of the House to public men and hypocrisy. I rather think he has been harsh in making that statement. High standards and high ideals have been put forward as the aims and objects of Governments. Whatever our varying views may be with regard to the methods of improving our social system, we do aim at and try to establish high ideals. The introduction and recognition of gambling is certainly a departure from that high standard and to that extent the Government are unwise to countenance anything of the kind, apart from the question of its desirability or otherwise. From the point of view of a high standard in public life it is a retrograde step I should be sorry to see. To argue that because these things exist we should recognise them is scarcely sound. If we admitted that standpoint we should refrain from trying to improve things in any way. If we cannot obtain the high ideals we desire, we should keep on trying. It is easy to fall back, and when there is a falling back from the high standard of public life, it is bad for the country. Perhaps I can explain the idea that is conveyed by the term hypocrisy. Many public men may recognise an evil, but because they are endeavouring to deal with more important problems they are content for the time being, to pass it over. They are not shutting their eyes to it and deliberately binding themselves, but they feel that other problems demand more of their attention. That is the attitude of many public men on questions of this kind. I cannot see that this Bill will have the desired effect and bring in the revenue that is expected of it. It is not a desirable course of action for any Government to take. It is a retrograde step from the high ideals we have been taught to aspire to, and which we have been trying to attain even though we have not been entirely successful. Had the Government brought forward a sound businesslike proposal, placed their financial position before us, and put up a scheme for contributions to hospitals from Consolidated Revenue, it would no doubt have been better received than the present Bill. I cannot support the second reading.

Hon. J. R. BROWN (North-East) [9.55]: I support the Bill. I am surprised

the Government did not inaugurate lotteries and sweeps years ago. Other people have been allowed to run sweeps. Thousands of pounds go out of the State annually to Queensland and Tasmania to sweeps there, and we are deprived of the benefit of that money. It has been said that the lotteries are not going to be run for the raising of funds for hospitals, but that the Bill is merely designed to legalise lotteries. That is not the intention of the Government, because lotteries and sweeps are legalised today. Thousands of sweeps have been conducted in this State.

Hon. J. Cornell: You have run several.

Hon. J. R. BROWN: Yes, most successfully.

Hon. H. Stewart: To whom?

Hon. J. R. BROWN: Others have done the same. Sweeps are necessary at times for the raising of money. It is no use saying we can raise money by other means. People will not take anything on unless there is a bit of a gamble in it; they will have their gamble in spite of the law. Those persons who have been writing sheafs of letters complaining about sweeps are the biggest gamblers of all. We see them on the racecourse rushing and pushing to get to the totalisator or the bookmaker's bag. They get the best of information too, and are generally on the winner. These are the people who are talking against this Bill.

Hon. J. Nicholson: Is Archbishop Riley included in that category?

Hon. J. R. BROWN: I think so. The Minister estimates a revenue of about £30,000 a year, but I think that is rather low. On the goldfields we have run small sweeps that have returned a profit of £1,500. If the State had a monopoly, the income would be very large. People have only to get the sanction of the Commissioner of Police in order to run sweeps. Permission is always given so long as there is a touch of charity attached to the tail-end of the request. In this way sweeps become legalised. The Government are granting to other people the right that they are now asking should be given to them.

Hon. J. Nicholson: Why should not the Government get authority from the Commissioner of Police?

Hon. J. R. BROWN: They could do so if the Bill were rejected, but I think there is enough sporting instinct amongst members to carry it. In the city there are many wowsers and hypocrites who are opposed to this kind of thing, or to anything connected with gambling. I see nothing wrong with the Government running sweeps. It will do away with a lot of the street collections that now go on. There would be a registered office where people could buy their tickets, and the effect would be to minimise gambling. If a man wanted a drink on Sunday, he would be inclined to walk a mile to get it, whereas he would not walk a quarter of a mile to do so on Monday.

Hon. A. J. H. Saw: Where do you find it by walking a mile?

Hon. J. R. BROWN: I said a man would be inclined to walk that distance on a Sunday. It has been argued that Western Australia could not compete with Tattersall's and the Golden Casket; but if there is an inducement here to people to make a rise out of a sweep, they will not need to go to Queensland for the chance. They would prefer to keep the money within their own doors.

Hon. J. Nicholson: How are you going to keep it?

Hon. J. R. BROWN: By not sending it away. Premium bonds have been suggested, but that system is too slow: it is something like a man insuring his life, he has to wait until he dies before he gets the prize.

Hon. J. W. Kirwan: Does he get it then?

Hon. J. R. BROWN: In the case of a sweep one knows that on the following Monday the results will appear in the newspapers. Further, it has been suggested that the sweeps will become a burden on the poorer people; but it is poor people who patronise Tattersall's sweeps.

Hon. J. Nicholson: Are the people kept poorer or richer as a consequence?

Hon. J. R. BROWN: It depends on their luck. Members have pointed out that the totalisator tax could be increased. The totalisator is another means of gambling permitted by the Government. Why make two bites at a cherry? Let sweeps be legalised, and let them be run by the Government on proper lines. The Bill is short, and does not afford much scope for Mr. Lovekin to suggest amendments; I do not think the hon. member can move 38 amendments on six clauses.

Hon. F. E. S. WILMOTT (South-West) [10.4]: This question of lotteries seems to have stirred up a great many people and to have brought to light many interesting facts. During the 40 years I have been in Australia, I have invested in sweeps, and it has always been my hope that I would hold the winning ticket in Tattersall's sweep on the Melbourne Cup. I am not one of those who surreptitiously go to a certain place to invest their 6s. I do not mind who sees me go: It is my money, I have earned it as honestly as most people earn money, and so long as I do not hurt anybody else I have a perfect right to invest that money as I think fit. Quite an uproar has been raised against the proposed State lotteries. Yet we learnt the other day, in reply to a question, that over 500 lotteries have been run by permission. As the last speaker said, a great many have been run without permission. We are a most extraordinary people. The Parliament of Australia says that lotteries are illegal, and the Commonwealth Post Office will not deliver a letter addressed to Tattersall's; but if one wins a prize, the Commonwealth Government say, "We must have so much of your prize."

We are not paradoxical in that regard alone. Public opinion is paradoxical at every turn from the cradle to the grave. If a man does not succeed in his calling, he is pronounced a failure; if he makes money, he is called a profiteer. If he goes to Church on Sundays, he is a hypocrite; if he does not go, he is a sinner. If he gives away money in charity, he only does it for advertisement; if he does not do it, he is stingy. If he rides in a Rolls-Royce he is extravagant and encourages socialism; if he rides in a Ford car, he is a joke. If he is a pessimist, he wears a belt as well as braces; if he is an optimist, he wears neither. A man with a sense of humour never yet started a revolution. What we want in these times is more industry, more economy, and painless taxes. When we have reached that stage, the millennium will have arrived. Surely we are straining at a gnat and swallowing a camel when we permit the tote to be run and hold up our hands in holy horror at lotteries. I myself hope that these lotteries will not be continued indefinitely. I have at the back of my head the advisability of the Government immediately starting the issue of premium bonds in conjunction with lotteries. I suggest starting the lotteries immediately in order to get money, but adopting the premium bonds principle so that in five years, if thought fit, the lotteries can be dropped, thanks to the accumulation of money from the issue of premium bonds. Unlike Mr. Seddon, I would not make these bonds redeemable in ten years, but would have them like British Consols running on for ever. British Consols are securities negotiable through any stockbroker, but the Government never redeem them. The interest on Consols never fluctuates, but the price may be 84, or, as happened during the war, may drop to 48. Yet who would say that a man investing in Consols was gambling? The bulk of British Trust funds are in Consols. The rate of interest on premium bonds would be low, one and a half or two per cent., according to the interest rate governing loans at the time. A certain amount of money having been accumulated, it is drawn for by the holders of the bonds, but the winners are paid in bonds, and not in cash. They are given something which has a definite value, which is a negotiable security, and at the same time their chances in the next drawing are improved. Such is the system adopted in France, and I have yet to learn that it is looked upon as immoral. We have been told that for hospital purposes money should be made available outside the Consolidated Revenue. We know what the last proposal was—a hospital tax. What is done to-day? Take the case of the timber workers. They pay 6d. per week per man.

Hon. T. Moore: One shilling a week.

Hon. F. E. S. WILLMOTT: They pay an additional 6d. to meet the cost of hospital and doctor. Many farmers in the timber districts have recognised the advisability of that arrangement, and are contributing in like manner.

Hon. A. Burvill: Why should we not have a tax of that kind?

Hon. F. E. S. WILLMOTT: We had a proposal to raise by taxation £140,000 annually for hospitals. It was interesting to members representing country electorates or provinces to observe how it was intended to cut up that money. We had the spectacle of the secretaries of the various hospitals and charitable institutions in the capital cutting up the whole amount and a little bit more, cutting up the money in such a manner that there was not even enough to go around the metropolitan institutions, let alone leave anything for the country institutions. In the metropolitan area are fifty per cent. of the population and all the wealth of the State. Many residents of the metropolitian area are opposed to this Bill, but it would be more to their credit if they put their hands a little deeper into their pockets and helped the charitable institutions in their midst. If they did as much to help the hospitals and kindred institutions in the metropolitan area as is done by the country people, and especially the timber workers, it would be infinitely more to their credit. Those of us who belong to a religious denomination are aware how funds are raised to support parsons who are necessary to keep one on the straight road. Even if one puts his hand in his pocket and brings out £5 or £10 for that purpose, one is not exempt from further exactions once he gets inside the doors of the room where a bazaar is being held. A man can contribute as much as he can well afford towards the maintenance of his parson, but he will still be called upon to "Give, give, give." So it will always be.

Hon. J. Nicholson: What has that to do with the Bill?

Hon. F. E. S. WILLMOTT: A great deal, because we find a large percentage of people object to giving to the hospitals, churches, or to anything else in these days. It was different in ancient times when they collected tithes.

Hon. J. Nicholson: Do you want a Bill to tax people to pay for your parsons?

Hon. F. E. S. WILLMOTT: I do not want anything of the sort! It is certain that if people will not contribute money for the support of their parsons, they will not provide money for charities.

Hon. H. J. Yelland: You are not forced to go to church bazaars, for instance.

Hon. F. E. S. WILLMOTT: How do you know that? I can tell hon. members that money cannot be obtained by direct giving to keep our institutions going. We will not get sufficient for that purpose by means of lotteries. In the past we have not raised sufficient by begging at every

street corner. There are many people who hold the same opinion as I do. They would have been prepared to put their hands in their pockets and give their mites towards the Perth Hospital fund, had the nurses employed at that institution been treated as I consider they should be.

Hon. H. Stewart: Always some excuse!

Hon. F. E. S. WILLMOTT: Perhaps on the part of the hon. member; it is an accusation on my part! I will not give a penny towards the Perth Hospital while the nurses are worked such long hours. If those nurses worked shorter hours and were treated decently, there are many besides myself who would be prepared to increase the amounts we give to the institution. I support the Bill. I cannot understand how it can be opposed by any hon. member who goes to a racecourse, takes a fly in a gold mine, goes fishing, or does many another thing that amounts to a gamble. How can they possibly say they will vote against a Lotteries Bill and contend it is immoral to run lotteries? If that is so, then it is immoral to do the various things I have mentioned. If hon. members seek to prevent those things, then they will take away one of the little pleasures in life left to us to help us through this dreary world.

On motion by Hon. H. A. Stephenson debate adjourned.

BILL—FREMANTLE MUNICIPAL TRAMWAYS.

Assembly's Message.

Message received from the Assembly notifying that the Council's amendment had been agreed to.

House adjourned at 10.20 p.m.

Legislative Assembly.

Wednesday, 29th October, 1924.

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

QUESTION—EDUCATION, DRIVING ALLOWANCE.

Mr. LINDSAY asked the Hon. S. W. Munsie (Honorary Minister): 1, Has the driving allowance for children living more than three miles from school been reduced? 2, If so, why?

The Hon. S. W. MUNSIE replied: 1 and 2, Yes. It is considered that the reduced amount is adequate.

QUESTION—RAILWAYS, PASSENGER SERVICES.

Mr. E. B. JOHNSTON asked the Minister for Railways: In view of the increasing competition of motor vehicles, is it the intention of the Railway Department to expedite the passenger services between Narrogin and Perth, particularly the day trains?

The MINISTER FOR RAILWAYS replied: This question was gone into some time ago, and provision has been made in the summer time-table—which operates from the 1st December—for a faster day service. The running time will be reduced by 1½ hours.

BILLS (3)—FIRST READING.

1, Albany Loan Validation.
Introduced by the Minister for Lands.

2, Bunbury Electric Lighting Act Amendment.
Introduced by Mr. Withers.

3, Carnarvon Electric Lighting.
Introduced by Mr. Angelo.