

Legislative Assembly.

Thursday, 5th December, 1940.

	PAGE
Questions: Dairymen's Compensation Fund	2612
Education, Claremont school improvements	2612
Copper coins, minting, use of other metals	2612
Pastoral Industry, Commissioner's report, Government action	2612
Bills: Medical Act Amendment, 3a.	2613
Supreme Court Act Amendment, 2a.	2613
Loan, £1,750,000, returned	2614
Electoral Act Amendment (No. 3), returned	2614
Commonwealth Oil Refineries, Limited (Private), returned	2614
Sale of Land (Vendors' Obligation), Council's Message	2614
Street Collections (Regulation), 1a., 2a.	2614
Supreme Court Act Amendment, 2a., defeated	2616
Appropriation, returned	2630
Medical Act Amendment, Council's amendment	2630
City of Perth (Rating Appeals), Council's Message	2630
Street Collections (Regulation), 2a., etc.	2630
Reserves (Government Domain), Council's Message	2635
Bills of Sale Act Amendment, Council's amendment	2645
University Act Amendment, 2a., order discharged	2647
Medical Act Amendment, Council's Message	2647
Street Collections (Regulation), Council's Message	2647
Bush Fires Act Amendment, Council's Message	2648
Growers Charge, Council's amendments	2648
Resolution: Companies Bill, to inquire by Joint Select Committee, Council's Message	2614
Motions: Betting suppression	2638
Agricultural Products Act, to disallow regulations	2643
Railways, free transport for war service personnel	2645
Jehovah's Witnesses	2646
Unemployment, relief work and sustenance	2648
Want of Confidence, common gaming houses and licensed premises	2647
Complimentary Remarks	2648
Adjournment—Special	2650

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

QUESTION—DAIRYMEN'S COMPENSATION FUND.

Mr. McLARTY asked the Minister for Agriculture: 1, What is the amount now standing to the credit of the Dairymen's Compensation Fund, under the Metropolitan Milk Act? 2, What amount of interest has accrued? 3, Has any money from this fund been used to compensate dairymen put out of business by the Board? 4, If not, is it proposed to continue to collect the contributions towards this fund? 5, If so, for what purpose?

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE replied: 1, As at 30th June, 1940—£7,430 13s. 3d. 2, As at 30th June, 1940—£677 8s. 2d. 3, No. 4, Yes. The Act makes it obligatory to do so. 5, For the purpose stated in the Act.

QUESTION—EDUCATION.

Claremont School Improvements.

Mr. NORTH asked the Minister representing the Minister for Education: When is it expected that the improvements to the grounds of the Claremont Infants' Demonstration School will be completed?

The MINISTER FOR THE NORTH-WEST (for the Minister for Education) replied: The whole of the work will be completed before school re-assembles next year.

QUESTION—COPPER COINS, MINTING.

Use of Other Metals.

Mr. SAMPSON asked the Premier: As approximately 27 tons of copper, together with a small quantity of tin and zinc, are necessary for the supply by the Perth Royal Mint of the order recently received for two million pennies, and two million half-pennies, will he, through the Prime Minister, take up with the responsible home authority the question of giving consideration to the use of some other metal or metals for the provision of these coins, thereby making available a quantity of copper urgently required for electrical cable work, and which, viewed from the standpoint of the bronze money needs of the Commonwealth, is absorbing so great a quantity of this essential metal?

The PREMIER replied: In view of the considerable expense and disorganisation which would be entailed in such a change I do not feel justified in making these representations.

QUESTION—PASTORAL INDUSTRY.

Commissioner's Report, Government Action.

Mr. RODOREDA (without notice) asked the Minister for Lands: What action does the Government propose to take in regard to the recommendations of the Royal Commissioner who inquired into the pastoral industry?

The MINISTER FOR LANDS replied: The Royal Commissioner's report has been

in the hands of the Government for a matter of days only, and the Government has not had an opportunity thoroughly to examine either the recommendations or the information upon which they were based. As soon as possible that will be done and full consideration will be given to the matter.

BILL—MEDICAL ACT AMENDMENT.

Read a third time and transmitted to the Council.

BILL—SUPREME COURT ACT AMENDMENT.

Second Reading.

Debate resumed from the 28th November.

MR. NEEDHAM (Perth) [4.34]: In the expiring moments of the 1938 session a somewhat similar Bill to this was ushered into this House by the member for Kataning (Mr. Watts). Its end was very sudden and summary. Little time was spent in discussing it on that occasion.

Mr. Watts: It was not the same Bill.

Mr. NEEDHAM: In the dying hours of the 1939 session another Bill along the same lines made its appearance in this House under the guidance of my esteemed and learned friend, the member for West Perth (Mr. McDonald). Its reception was no more kindly than the reception accorded to the previous measure, its fate being just as sudden and summary. Now we find the Bill before us again in a slightly altered form, this time introduced by my friend and colleague the member for Murchison (Mr. Marshall), and again in the dying hours of the session. I hope it will receive the treatment meted out to its predecessors. The persistence of those people who are endeavouring to amend the Supreme Court Act with a view, in my opinion, to making the path to the divorce court easier than it is, is not altogether edifying and the repetition of their efforts does not make the measure any more palatable. On the contrary, it probably makes the measure somewhat more objectionable.

I listened attentively to the eloquent speech made by the member for Mur-

chison, but I failed to discover any new arguments adduced by him in support of the Bill. No fresh evidence was submitted to this jury sufficient to convince it of the necessity for an alteration to the law. It is suggested that after five years' mutual separation of a man and his wife the marriage tie should be dissolved, no matter what might be the reason for the separation. Irrespective of the reason—whether it be good, bad or indifferent—the simple fact that there has been a mutual agreement to separate and that that separation has lasted for five years, should, it is suggested, be all that is required to bring about a divorce. I am of the same opinion on this matter to-day as I was three years ago. This measure simply means automatic divorce, nothing less. In his second reading speech the member for Murchison said the Bill, if it became an Act, would make divorce more difficult. I fail to see that. If people desire to secure a dissolution of the marriage bond, the law unfortunately already gives them ample opportunity to do so. To my mind it provides too much opportunity. I cannot perceive where any hardship is inflicted to-day. The hon. member said that the first part of the Bill provided further ground for the dissolution of marriages. I contend that his speech was contradictory inasmuch as he told us that if the Bill became law people would have greater difficulty in securing a divorce. But he said the Bill provided further ground for divorce. The grounds advanced for divorces to-day are already numerous enough.

Mr. F. C. L. Smith: Is this ground a good ground? That is the point.

Mr. NEEDHAM: There is no good ground for the dissolution of a marriage.

Mr. Marshall: Now we have it. That is the point with the hon. member.

Mr. NEEDHAM: The hon. member said he did not think the marriage tie was entered into to-day for the sake of home and family. I agree with him. Unfortunately the tendency is not in that direction. That is one of the reasons why so many cases come before the divorce court. The marriage tie is entered into too lightly, and for that reason the divorce court has such a heavy list of cases to deal with. With that phase of the hon. member's speech I agree. He also repeated the old saying that we cannot make man moral by Act of Parliament. That may or may not be so, but we should

not endeavour to make man more immoral or less moral by Act of Parliament. That is the trend of legislation of this nature. This Bill also deals with the restriction of publicity. I agree that too much publicity is given to divorce cases. There is unfortunately a tendency with a section of the Press to publish all the sordid details. This is quite wrong. A restriction of publicity could be made effective by legislation without opening still wider the door leading to the divorce court. Members may be inclined to support this measure for the sake of a clause which deals with the restriction of publicity, and the restrictions to be imposed upon those people who will be present during the hearing of divorce cases. Some people revel in listening to the disclosures in cases of that kind. I would not, however, support a measure for the restriction of publicity when it is coupled with a proposal to make divorce easier. The subject has been well debated on previous occasions inside and outside the House. Members are frequently inundated with letters asking them to do this or that when certain questions come before us. In connection with this measure there has been a noticeable absence of such letters. A few citizens have seen me on the matter, but no letters have been sent to us. I think the reason for that is that the title of the Bill is for an Act to amend the Supreme Court Act. There is nothing in that to suggest to the average mind that the divorce laws are being dealt with. Had the Bill been made public as an amendment to the divorce laws, I venture to say every member would have received letters both for and against it. As I see it, the position is that while the law of man in many respects is all right, on this question there is another law, the law of God. I prefer to see the law of God observed rather than help to amend this law, a law of man, and make divorce easier than it is to-day. I oppose the Bill.

On motion by the Premier, debate adjourned till a later stage of the sitting.

BILLS (3)—RETURNED.

- 1, Loan, £1,730,000.
- 2, Electoral Act Amendment (No. 3).
- 3, Commonwealth Oil Refineries, Limited (Private).
Without amendment.

BILL—SALE OF LAND (VENDORS' OBLIGATIONS).

Council's Message.

Message from the Council received and read notifying that it no longer disagreed to amendment No. 2 made by the Assembly.

RESOLUTION—COMPANIES BILL.

To Inquire by Joint Select Committee— Council's Message.

Message from the Council received and read notifying that it had agreed to the Assembly's request, and had accordingly appointed Hon. H. Seddon, Hon. L. Craig, Hon. A. Thomson and Hon. G. Fraser, to confer with the select committee appointed by the Assembly on the Companies Bill; and that it had fixed Tuesday, the 10th December, at 2.30 p.m. at Parliament House as the time and place for the first meeting.

BILL—STREET COLLECTIONS (REGULATION).

First Reading.

Received from the Council and read a first time.

Second Reading.

THE MINISTER FOR THE NORTH-WEST (Hon. A. A. M. Coverley—Kimberley) [4.51] in moving the second reading said: This Bill was introduced in another place by the Chief Secretary and has been transmitted to this House for the consideration of members. The Bill contains only a few clauses, the object of which is to control street collections for patriotic or other purposes and to limit the number of days in the year when such collections may be made. Members will agree that the necessity exists for that measure of control in the interests of both the contributing public and of the organisations participating in such movements. I do not think there will be opposition to the suggestion that that supervision is necessary. The Government has received many suggestions from prominent people and from the police, all indicating the desirability of exercising the proposed control.

At the moment there is no Act on the statute-book that will provide a measure of control apart from the Police Act in so far as

it applies to congested traffic. If the Bill now before the House is agreed to, we will have the advantage of a specific enactment under which street collections may be controlled. The object is to prohibit collections in any public street within the metropolitan area unless the persons or organisations concerned first secure the necessary permit. Since the outbreak of war the number of street appeals for patriotic purposes has increased considerably. Friday is regarded as the most suitable day for such appeals. As time has gone on, the appeals have been more frequent, and the intention now is to restrict the number of days rather than to extend them, and so to limit the appeals to that extent. Since the beginning of April of this year, sixty street appeals have been conducted by various organisations in the metropolitan area. No Government department or any other authority has statutory control over the position. Up to the present the Police Department has issued a permit to any applicant or organisation desiring to conduct an appeal, when satisfied that there will be no obstruction to traffic. Inquiries have elicited the fact that no statutory control of these activities exists in any part of the Commonwealth. In some States street collections are controlled by means of by-laws promulgated by local governing bodies or by regulations made under the local Traffic Acts. In England there is a House to House Collections Act which does not prohibit such collections but controls them from house to house, the object being to prevent the promotion of appeals from which small percentages only are applied to charitable or patriotic purposes.

Under the Bill now before the House, control will be taken over appeals for both charitable and patriotic purposes, and will prohibit any street collection in the metropolitan area unless the required permit has been obtained. Provision is made for the issuing of permits in a form to be prescribed. The forms will set out the object of the collection, the day on which it may be made, and the hours within which on that day the collection may be carried on. There is also a provision which limits the number of days on which permits for collections may be granted. I hope members will understand that the object of the Bill is not to restrict the number of collections or organisations that may participate, but merely the days on which such appeals may be made.

A further provision in the Bill sets out various offences which include the display or use of unauthorised badges or certificates of authority, the forging of any such badges or certificates, and so on. Another clause provides that the Governor may make regulations in relation to all things necessary to carry out the intentions of the legislation. For instance, the type of collection-box to be used can be prescribed, and that applies also to such considerations as the numbering of boxes, the places where the collections can be made, badges or certificates displayed by collectors, and so forth. In fact, the machinery of the Bill will be implemented by way of regulations.

The Bill contains a reference to the War Funds Regulation Act, and this has been deemed necessary to make the position clear; otherwise it might be considered that the War Funds Regulation Act would enable the collections to be made in public streets. Naturally the Bill will apply to collections for home charities as well as for patriotic purposes.

I would like to make it clear that the charitable or patriotic purposes for which recent appeals have been made, are not questioned in any way. It is recognised that they have been conducted in aid of excellent objects. The necessity for control and regulation of such collections will be obvious to members. I hope those who usually object to the inclusion of clauses regarding regulations will on this occasion agree that such a provision is necessary. So much is involved that regulations are essential. For instance, it would be difficult adequately to cover in the Bill such matters as a description of the type of collection-boxes to be used, the markings on such boxes, and so forth. In the circumstances, I hope no exception will be taken to the provision on this occasion. The intention of the Bill is to limit the days on which street collections may be held to 60 per annum. That does not say that more than one collection cannot be made on the one day. For instance, if the people of Fremantle desired to make an appeal on the same day that an appeal was to be conducted in Perth, the Chief Secretary could grant permission for both appeals to be made. I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

On motion by Mr. McDonald, debate adjourned till a later stage of the sitting.

BILL—SUPREME COURT ACT AMENDMENT.

Second Reading—Defeated.

Debate resumed from an earlier stage of the sitting.

MRS. CARDELL-OLIVER (Subiaco) [5.0]: I am amazed at the persistency with which some members have introduced Bills into this House during the last few years. This Bill obviously is a lawyers' Bill. In the last two years similar Bills have been sponsored by lawyers; this Bill, although not sponsored by a lawyer, has plainly been framed by one. It is quite conceivable, however unwilling lawyers might be to acknowledge it, that they must have been influenced by the number of cases of hardship which have come under their notice during their career. They therefore are biased in favour of the Bill. I do not know, Mr. Speaker, whether they ought to be allowed to vote on it. In their endeavour to afford relief to a few, they have not carefully weighed the effect that such legislation would have upon the community as a whole, especially upon the children. This Bill seeks to condone a wrong, to give a guilty party a cheap way out and to victimise the innocent. I am sure that that is not the intention of the sponsor of the Bill; but I hope to prove before I resume my seat that that will be the effect of the measure if it is carried into law. The Bill might be termed a rich man's Bill, as only men in comfortable circumstances will be able to re-marry; and, even when in comfortable circumstances, it would be a strain to keep two homes going as they should be kept. Of course, if it is merely intended that the Bill should free people from the responsibilities of married life, I cannot see anything in the measure. If it is intended that they should merely live apart, they can do so now, and the Bill has clearly lost its point. We have in this State 160,000 married people, of whom 2,000 are living apart.

Mr. Cross: How did you obtain those figures?

Mrs. CARDELL-OLIVER: But as 80 per cent. of the married people, including the separated people, live either on or under the basic wage, it is preposterous to presume that any of them could hope to re-marry. As the majority of those 2,000 who are now living apart are on the lower rung of the

wages ladder, it seems to me the Bill was not designed to help them.

Mr. Cross: How did you arrive at those figures?

Mr. SPEAKER: Order!

Mrs. CARDELL-OLIVER: Of the 2,000 I mentioned, some are in the Fremantle gaol because of their inability to pay maintenance. Some of them do suffer a great injustice, because many of the wives are working and in numerous instances receive higher wages than did the husband when he was working. Again, if a man is unemployed and cannot pay the maintenance due to his wife, he is imprisoned. The Child Welfare Department then attends to the wife and the family, but the debt incurred during the husband's period of unemployment is debited against him, and he must pay it when he comes out of gaol. The man thus becomes hopelessly involved and his one desire is to leave the State. Now, all this is unjust, but this Bill does not seek to remedy it. The Bill will increase married troubles and increase the number of men involved in non-payment of maintenance orders. It will also add to the institutional life of unwanted children. Even with an income of £400 or £500 a year a man could not afford to keep two families, if they were large ones.

We have heard a good deal from the member for Murchison (Mr. Marshall) about the designing woman, but if this Bill becomes law I can assure the hon. member that we will have an increase in the number of such women. It is comparatively easy for a designing woman to break up a happy home; and I repeat that this Bill is an encouragement to such women as the member for Murchison described. If the man or woman happens to be millionaire, such as the Aga Khan or Woolworth—

Mr. Cross: There are not any in Western Australia.

Mrs. CARDELL-OLIVER: —and they are able to give large capital sums to the aggrieved party, then I consider this Bill would be a most suitable one. But men and women with comfortable incomes will become the happy hunting grounds of adventurers of both sexes who are willing to try a few years' respectable companionship under this measure. The Minister is shaking his head, but I think that is so. This Bill gives marriage a five-years' tenure. Remark-

riage is then possible, but who is to say that the second attempt at marriage will be better than the first? I have known a man to divorce his first wife, marry again, divorce the second wife and then re-marry the first.

Mr. Withers: And they lived happily ever after!

Mrs. CARDELL-OLIVER: This Bill will encourage many divorcees. It will encourage those who have never thought of a divorce to obtain one, rather than make an attempt to compose their grievances, as they have hitherto done.

Mr. Rodoreda: They have a five-year plan, you know.

Mrs. CARDELL-OLIVER: The other Bills similar to this have already done considerable harm and they are merely Bills that were introduced. When a Bill similar to this was before the House two years ago, a poor and ignorant man asked me to support it, believing that his responsibility for his wife and nine children would immediately cease if the Bill became law.

Mr. Cross: Who was the man?

Mrs. CARDELL-OLIVER: I explained to him that he would still have to keep his wife and children. His reply was, "Not on your life. I shall be free. I have already been away from my wife for five years and I shall simply get on the train, go East, and lose myself." I said to him, "But you would have to maintain your children." He replied, "Then I shall marry a rich woman and she will do the paying."

Mr. Marshall: If I thought I could manage that, I would have a go myself.

Mrs. CARDELL-OLIVER: Another more serious case was that of an educated man with a very good income. He read that one of the other Bills had passed the Council and he believed—as many people believe—that all legislation originates in this House and is then sent to the Council. Having read at breakfast the news that the Bill had passed another place, he informed his wife that he was leaving her immediately.

Mr. Cross: A bed-time story!

Mrs. CARDELL-OLIVER: This is not a laughing matter. They had always been an extremely happy couple, having been married for over 17 years. They had two boys who were just about to enter the University. The wife naturally thought he was referring to a holiday, and said "I

shall go and pack your trunks." To her horror and bewilderment, he explained that he was taking advantage of the Bill and leaving her permanently. He said, "You will forgive me, I know, but when I tell you I have been living with another woman for three years—

Mr. Rodoreda: They were happily married!

Mrs. CARDELL-OLIVER: —and she is about to become a mother, you, as a good woman, would not have this girl any less respectable than yourself." He added, "This Bill allows me to right a wrong and therefore I am going to do it."

Mr. Marshall: This Bill would not help such a person.

Mr. SPEAKER: The member for Murchison will keep order.

Mrs. CARDELL-OLIVER: She asked her husband whether she had any claim upon him for the maintenance of herself and her children. He admitted that they had claims but added, "So has the girl." In a way, he was generous. He gave his wife the house they were living in, made her an allowance of £250 a year, and also gave her the income from a shop that was bringing in £3 10s. a week. He left. After six months the allowance ceased. I am telling members this so that they may know what might happen if the Bill passes.

Mr. Cross: Give us the name.

Mrs. CARDELL-OLIVER: After six months the allowance ceased. This was not the fault of the man; his business fell off and he could not afford to keep two homes going. The shop which brought in £3 10s. a week was closed, and even though the rent was reduced to 25s. it remained vacant. The wife was forced to mortgage the home; the two boys, whose education had not been finished, went into business and, after suffering great hardships, managed to make a living. On the first occasion when the wife came to me she begged that I would not support the Bill, that is, the Bill introduced two years ago, as she was sure her husband would return to her. On the second occasion she begged me to support the Bill, because the children then hated their father for the wrong that he had done her and them. The tragedy is this: the woman is still fond of the man—I want members to take this seriously—and she

realises that while he is good, he is also weak. Physically and morally this woman was one of the finest characters I had ever met. This Bill will not tend to create that type of woman. What it will do is to make many women harder and many men weaker.

I wish now to speak of the children. Who is to take care of the children? Under the present law that is obviously the duty of the father, but if he re-marries, the new wife might not want the children, and if he does not want them, who is to undertake the care of the family? The Bill pre-supposes that the deserted wife may and will keep the children for whom she would receive maintenance.

Mr. Cross: I guarantee that she would do so, too.

Mrs. CARDELL-OLIVER: But will she want them? She might realise that she is still young and that her chances of getting employment, when she has, say, three young children, would be remote. The maintenance she would receive would be meagre for a wife and three children; in the case of a man on the basic wage, it would be about £2 a week at most. Out of that she would have to pay 15s. for rent, and thus would have 25s. on which to clothe and feed four people. She might be able to earn more than that if she took a job, and the children would have to go to an institution. Of course the husband would have to pay the Child Welfare Department. The point is that we would be condemning those children to institutional life because of what, in my opinion, would be rotten legislation. Russia tried to do on a more exaggerated scale what the hon. member is trying to do, with the result that there were so many State children in a few years that the marriage law had to be tightened up, just as we are beginning to relax it. I have previously stated in this House that there was in Russia a man—I did not meet him—who had had 60 wives. Under this Bill a man could marry eight times, starting at 23 and finishing at 63, and could have two children by each wife. This Bill deliberately sets out to take away from the child its natural heritage. We might argue that, because a woman is the mother of children, she will naturally wish to keep them, but why should she wish to do so any more than would the father?

Mr. Cross: I have never yet seen a mother who would turn her children down.

Mr. J. Hegney: I have.

Mr. Cross: Never!

Mr. J. Hegney: Yes, I have.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order!

Mrs. CARDELL-OLIVER: If the Bill is passed, the standard of parenthood will be lowered and when the cancer of irresponsibility towards the young sinks into the character of a nation, gradually that nation loses its finer sensibilities which have been built up through aeons of civilisation in which the responsibility of parenthood has played the greatest part. From an economic point of view, if the Bill becomes an Act, women will seek economic employment after marriage, and that will be a safeguard to their insecure position, their possible desertion and the reduced standard of living which they will naturally face through their husbands leaving them. Further, this Bill will be the greatest factor in birth control that has yet been devised. Why should women bear children with the prospect of a short tenure of married life, with no security about the home, no security for the children and with a mere pittance of maintenance in view? A woman who would bear children under those conditions would be unjust to future generations. In one breath we say we must have natural-born Australian children; we want population. In another breath we endeavour to pass a Bill of this sort which, after five years, will leave children motherless or fatherless. All we can offer them is a decent State home perhaps, with no responsibility on the parent, except to pay for the upkeep of the children. This Bill purports to give relief to persons who cannot agree, but in reality it provides that no matter what guilt attaches to either party, he or she shall go scot-free, and further that such people shall be rewarded for their misdeeds by being enabled to free themselves of any responsibility in marriage. It has been said that all contracts may be broken and why not the marriage contract? This Bill does not seek to mutually dissolve marriages; it seeks to unilaterally revoke marriages. There is one party that can walk out. It is not a mutual affair. When people find themselves unsuited in marriage—there are many such people—they might take a lesson from France where, although marriages are made

from convenience rather than from affection, there is no country in the world where family life is, as a family, more contented and cared for by the parents. Both husband and wife centre their affection on the children. Divorces and desertions are not common. Fathers must by law leave the bulk of their money to their wives and children. Therefore this is an incentive for the wife to help her husband in his financial commitments. I ask members, under the conditions proposed in the Bill, how could wives and husbands centre their affections upon another man's children, especially when the family might consist of children belonging to three or four different men? Further, when the man or woman remarried, who would keep the children—father No. 1, father No. 2, father No. 3 or father No. 4, and to whom would he send the payments?

This is an anti-religious Bill. The two churches of this State have decided views upon the question. The Church of England has set itself not against divorce but against the remarriage of the divorced. The Roman Catholic Church is definitely against divorce. Why should we, never having canvassed the people upon the question, have the arrogance, the colossal audacity, to force our views upon the great body of religious people in this community?

Mr. Watts: There is nothing in the Bill to compel re-marriage.

Mrs. CARDELL-OLIVER: No, but before we pass legislation of this sort we should at least consult the people, because this is legislation that affects the community.

Mr. Marshall: Taxation affects the people. Consult them on that and see how many Governments you will have.

Mrs. CARDELL-OLIVER: Why should we pander to the weaknesses of human nature by the suggestion of companionable marriages of five years' duration because a few wish to be relieved of unhappy conditions? Only a few people in the community want the Bill. We already have nine counts upon which divorce may be procured. I agree that there are a few people who may not come within the orbit of these conditions, but I am particularly concerned about those who have been separated for many years and have no children or whose children have reached manhood. I do not think it would be difficult for a

court of domestic relations to be set up to arrange relief that would be agreeable to both parties. I would not oppose such a Bill if all concerned—husband, wife and grown-up children—wished for a divorce. I think something might be done along those lines. But I add a proviso that adequate provision should be made for the wife and family, not upon a mere maintenance basis, but upon a standard commensurate with that to which the parties have been accustomed.

An argument used in favour of a similar Bill last year was chivalry. The sponsor said that some man wishing to give a name to an unborn child had married the girl but with no intention of living with her. I have yet to see where chivalry enters into such action. Since 1911 ante-nuptial conceptions have decreased in a most extraordinary manner, mainly due, in my opinion to the use of contraceptives, and divorces have increased in an extraordinary manner due again, in my opinion, mainly to the use of contraceptives, which tend to lessen the sense of family responsibility. The use of these things in married life, I presume, is partly due to economic conditions and partly due to unwanted responsibility. It has been stated in favour of the Bill that New South Wales and New Zealand have a similar law, but a perusal of those Acts shows that there is a considerable difference, and I cannot see why this State should follow Eastern States' legislation blindly. Our conditions here are different.

I would like for a moment to look upon the life of a child. The child's parents have been divorced. In its early years at school such a child is ridiculed and ostracised by other children. Such a child becomes bitter in character. It realises that it has not a father and a mother as other children have, and the slur thus cast upon its parents is deeply felt by the child. Is it to be thought for one moment that such a Bill as this, which would mean a multiplicity of divorces, could ease the burdens that are cast upon the young child? It could do so only by making divorce so common that children will all think alike, and that step-mothers, step-fathers and institutions will be taken for granted, and real home life made quite unknown. Now, in their teens children begin to realise the main reasons for divorce.

If they have remained with the divorced mother, they are either consciously or unconsciously taught to despise the father—mostly unconsciously. If, on the other hand, they have remained with the father, they grow up with a want of that respect and that reverence for mother which is necessary to the well-being of the nation. A child's nature is extremely sensitive, proud, easily hurt; and children readily become warped in character if their environment is not congenial. One may argue that it is better to take a child away from a home where the parents live an unhappy life; but I do not agree with that, because at an early age a child is concerned only with its own life. So long as both parents are good to the child, the parents' tiffs and wranglings and quarrels hardly concern the child. In adolescence it is quite different. The child criticises the parents' actions. It probes the reasons for divorce. That subject is talked about in schools. The incompatibility of the temperaments of the parents to which the children have become accustomed does not seem to them sufficient ground for losing one of their parents. They begin to wonder why the parents should be separated. In that wonder the respect for marriage and for the sanctity attached to parental life becomes more or less impaired. That is all to the detriment of the race, for one cannot take away the natural heritage of the child—that is, the home and the natural respect for parents—without hurting the character of the child, who is the future citizen.

Now for just a little longer I would like to continue this study. We must further take the young married man and the young married woman. Some hon. members who may be students of psychology, will realise what a great force "thought" is. "As a man thinketh, so he is." We can imagine the effect of this Bill, if enacted, upon a young couple and upon an unborn child. A mere tiff, some disagreement, may have caused a separation; and in their anger the thoughts of the parents would naturally turn to this measure, if in force. Their thoughts will be, "In five years I shall be free." That thought hammers itself into the brain of the youth. And "In five years I shall be deserted and desolate" is the thought that hammers itself into the brain of the young wife. "Five years, five years" will become

the most constant thought of the lives of both the woman and the man. In his anger the man may seek companionship with another girl, whom he will promise to marry as soon as the five years expire. But who will want the companionship of the wife? Remember her condition. The knowledge that five years will end everything must be terrible for her. It may drive her to desperation. And the class of nervous child that will be born from such a mother can be imagined.

These are exceptional cases, I grant; but the reason for the Bill is to legislate for exceptional cases. We also have the case of soldiers, who may not be heard of for five years after this war. They may return to this country to find what? Their wives re-married. There is the case of engineers. I know of engineers in this State who have been away for seven years and then have returned. I would like to call this a "Shipwrecked Mariner's Bill." Take the case of a sailor who returns to Western Australia after an absence of over five years and, when he does return, finds a cuckoo in his nest.

Mr. Marshall: You are talking about the present law, not the Bill.

Mrs. CARDELL-OLIVER: If the Bill is passed, it will prove the death warrant of that which has made this nation great. Britain and her Dominions have endeavoured to give women security of home, have endeavoured to give them an honoured place in the land. If a woman does want to take her place in public life, it is because she wishes to share the burden of man. How few indeed have entered this sphere in the British Empire? They have been content to leave the destiny of their homes and children in the hands of the sons they bore. You cannot, you dare not betray them, and thus lower the standard of those who gave you birth, and impair the sanctity of the home in which you were reared. If women have not shared with you the burdens of your financial or public lives, it is not because they are not fitted to do so. I know of no country in the world, including America, where women are more able to share those burdens, than here. Our dreary desolate farms have shown that our women are able and willing to share financial and

physical burdens in order to build a home. Ruskin said—

The home is a place of peace, a refuge from all injury, doubt, division, terror.

This Bill seeks to weaken those sentiments, and fill the home with suspicion, doubt and division; and mild and innocent friendships between the sexes will create doubt and division.

I trust that members of this House will allow neither personal friendships nor individual hardships to influence their votes, but that they will vote for the welfare of the community as a whole, and not for the benefit of a small section of it, remembering always that marriage is sacred. Marriage is the mother of the world. It preserves kingdoms. It fills cities. It fills churches, fills Heaven itself. It makes a real home. It has been said that home should be "an oratorio of memory singing to all our after-life melodies and harmonies of well-remembered joys." What joy will be remembered by those whom we seek to harass by doubt, to hurt by suspicion, harden by divorce, hound by ridicule? Such melodies and harmonies will only be heard from homes where the status of woman has been jealously guarded and the standard of home made as perfect as man can make it. And it is man's task to make home perfect.

MR. HUGHES (East Perth) [5.42]: The hon. member who has just resumed her seat feels strongly on this question. I could agree with everything she has said if the picture that she has drawn really existed. But of course the hon. member has conjured up in her mind a creation that is without actual substance. After all said and done, many of us here have been sons and husbands and fathers, and still are. Can it be imagined for a moment that we have all decided to make a sudden onslaught on women?

Mr. Rodoreda: No. You have to wait five years before doing that.

Mr. HUGHES: Have we all decided that we will attack the womenfolk? I do not yield to the member for Subiaco—and there are 78 members besides me in this Parliament who will refuse to yield to her—in point of respect for women. The hon. member has not greater respect for women than we men have. No one in the Par-

liament of Western Australia has not the utmost respect for women. How could it be otherwise? All the men in Western Australia are not going to say to their wives in the morning, if this Bill passes "Well, good-bye. In five years' time I will be back with divorce papers."

Mr. J. Hegney: A sailor's farewell!

Mr. HUGHES: Yes, a sailor's farewell.

The Minister for Mines: What is that?

Mr. SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. HUGHES: Just try to conjure up the prospects of any man who lives happily with his wife and children deciding, because of the prospect of this Bill passing to put an end to the marriage state in five years, when he will be able to get a divorce. The gentleman who has been referred to as living happily with his wife and two children and having a mistress with a child well on the way I do not regard as a fair example of the conduct of husbands.

Mr. Rodoreda: A fair example of "happily married!"

Mr. HUGHES: The member for Subiaco has quoted the family life of France. But in France it is quite common to have a mistress in addition to a wife. The view taken of the matter in France is different from the view taken in Australia. I was told by a Frenchman that in Western Australia we were very peculiar people. If a man stands for Parliament and he has a mistress, the people will not elect him and, the man added, "In my country if a man stands for Parliament and he has no mistress, the people will not vote for him."

Mr. Rodoreda: Vive la France!

Mr. HUGHES: It is not necessary to go to France to find out all about what they do there. Any number of people who were in the habit of going to Paris, would spend a few hours there walking about the main streets and, on returning, of course knew all about it.

Mrs. Cardell-Oliver: You know nothing about it.

Mr. HUGHES: Whether the hon. member thinks I know nothing about it or not, I can say that Paris has lived on its vice for years.

Mrs. Cardell-Oliver: On other people's vices.

Mr. HUGHES: I defy the hon. member to contradict me.

Mrs. Cardell-Oliver: Paris was made so by foreigners.

Mr. HUGHES: No.

Mrs. Cardell-Oliver: Yes.

Mr. HUGHES: Coming back to the Bill, one member said that there was the law of God. What is the law of God? We find that man creates certain offences and under the sanction of severe penalties, he is prohibited from committing them. Theologians, under pain of severe consequences in the Hereafter, prohibit the same offences, but sanctions do not prevent man from doing that which is prohibited. A marked illustration is, that for committing perjury, one is likely to be sentenced to a heavy term of imprisonment in this life and be subjected to severe penalties in the Hereafter. But that does not stop people from committing perjury. It all shows the material we are dealing with, and we know that according to our ethical and moral standards, the committing of adultery brings severe consequences to people and subjects them to more severe consequences in the Hereafter. But that does not stop them from committing adultery.

Mr. J. Hegney: That is one reason. They can either do it of their own free will or not do it, and you know that as well as I do.

Mr. HUGHES: I do not agree with the hon. member that they have a free will to do it or not to do it.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member must address the Chair. Never mind about the interjections.

Mr. HUGHES: I believe we are all subject to impulses that we cannot control. I would be delighted if I could convince myself that I was someone who always acted on cold, logical reasoning and was never subject to impulses that I could not control.

The Minister for Health: It would not be much of a life under those conditions.

Mr. HUGHES: Not many of us are not subject to impulses, and some of them are hereditary and the result of environment as well. Many people do things which are the result of impulse. What about the man who commits murder in a paroxysm of temper? Is he acting under a free will? If on being provoked he loses his temper and commits murder, is he acting under free will?

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member had better get back from murder to the Bill.

Mr. HUGHES: Very well, Mr. Speaker. The law recognises that if a person is charged with assault, it is a good defence that he committed the assault under provocation to the extent that he lost control over himself. That is a good defence for murder. As far as the question of free will is concerned, I submit that nowhere is it more forcibly exercised than in the realm of sexual relations. But coming back to the Bill, the member for Subiaco declared that it was a lawyer's Bill, and that lawyers were influenced by cases of hardship that had come under their notice. If the lawyers are influenced by existing laws, and the hardships and havoc that come under their notice as a result of working day by day in their sphere, then I say that they are speaking from experience, and when they recommend a Bill to the House, they are doing so as a result of that experience, gained from the law as it exists to-day. That is the kind of advice we would expect, advice based on experience. What is the alternative? Advice based on prejudice. You must either form your opinion as a result of information and experience or you must form it as a result of prejudice unless, of course, you have some inspiration whereby you can form a judgment without the facts. So if the lawyers recommend this Bill—and I think the lawyers generally do so—they recommend it as a result of their experience, in some cases the experience gained over a lifetime.

Mrs. Cardell-Oliver: They get paid for it.

Mr. HUGHES: The hon. member says that they get paid for it. Well, that is a very difficult charge to refute. The suggestion is that if this Bill goes through, there will be more divorces and more costs for the lawyers. I think we can answer that by saying that every piece of legislation that goes through this House makes work for lawyers. Frequently when Bills are designed for the purpose of simplifying the law, the statute law is such that it makes more work for the lawyers. In fairness to the lawyers in this House it can be said that during this session they repeatedly opposed legislation that would have created, without doubt, additional legal work. I do not think they will be very much influenced by the fact that there may or may not be a few more divorces. After all, divorce

work forms a very small part of a lawyer's practice, and if there should be an increase of 10 or 15 per cent. in the number of divorcees, it will not matter very much to the lawyers. I cannot share the view of the member for Subiaco that everybody is going to decide, the moment the Bill goes through, to lay the foundations of a five-year plan to secure a divorce. In some cases it would be too late; some of the people will not live that long.

Mr. Lambert: Do not be too rough on the member for Subiaco.

Mr. HUGHES: One member also said that this was a rich man's Bill. I venture to say that if it is amended in Committee, as I wish it to be amended, it will be a woman's Bill.

Mr. Marshall: Most bills are.

Mr. HUGHES: Why should we keep a woman tied up unnecessarily because the man she married did not turn out all that she expected him to be? The member for Subiaco would have done well to read a quotation from this book I have. Twenty years ago the author tried to liberalise the divorce laws in England in the interests of women. Really, every attempt to liberalise the divorce laws has been in the interests of the female. I am going to quote from Churchill's "Great Contemporaries," pages 180 to 189. If the book reveals anything, it reveals Churchill's great pugnacity and the author writes in plain and unmistakable language—

The statesman and the generous, warm-hearted man were again revealed in Birkenhead's speech in the Upper Chamber on the Matrimonial Causes Bill. His son regards it as "the finest speech of his life," and others have expressed a similar judgment. Its sustained eloquence, depth of feeling and vigour of thought and argument recall the great days of parliamentary oratory and the giants of debate.

"I, my Lords," he said, "can only express my amazement that men of saintly lives, men of affairs, men whose opinions and experience we respect, should have concentrated upon adultery as the one circumstance which ought to afford relief from the marriage tie. Adultery is a breach of the carnal obligations of marriage. Insistence upon the duties of continence and chastity is important; it is vital to society. But I have always taken the view that that aspect of marriage was exaggerated and somewhat crudely exaggerated in the Marriage Service. I am concerned to-day to make this point by which I will stand or fall, that the moral and spiritual sides of marriage are incomparably more important than the physical

side . . . If you think of all that marriage means to most of us—the memories of the world's adventure faced together in youth so heedlessly and yet so confidently, the tender comradeship, the sweet association of parenthood, how much more these count than the bond which nature in its ingenious telepathy has contrived to secure and render agreeable the perpetuation of the species."

"What," he asked, "is the remedy open to a poor woman who, when she married, gave up the pitiful pursuit by which she had made her living until her marriage and, relying on marriage, is left penniless, and is left for the whole of her life unable to identify her husband, unable to obtain the slightest relief from the law? She is neither wife nor widow; she has a cold hearthstone; she has fatherless children for the rest of her life. . . .

"We are told that such a woman as I have described is to remain chaste. I have only to observe that for two thousand years human nature has resisted in the warmth of youth these cold admonitions of the cloisters, and I do not believe that the Supreme Being has set a standard which two thousand years of Christian experience has shown that human nature in its exuberant prime cannot support.

"Those who have spoken in opposition to the present proposal say with the best motives, but with malignant results: 'We deny you any hope in this world. Though an honest man loves you, sin shall be the price of your union, and bastardy shall be the fate of your children.' I cannot and do not believe that society, as it is at present constituted, will for long acquiesce in a conclusion so merciless."

Thus he convinced the House of Lords. But the House of Commons, under organised pressures, had other views. To-day, after 18 years, this question, with all its consequences to public morality and private happiness, has reached a solution on the lines he boldly traced.

So for 18 years the House of Commons held up the reform he advocated but finally upon logical grounds was brought to reason. As he said, the woman "has a cold hearthstone; she has fatherless children for the rest of her life." I do not think we should be swayed altogether by isolated examples. But let me point out what the member for Subiaco, with the best of motives, but as Lord Birkenhead put it. "with malignant results," wants to perpetuate. A young woman, 19 years of age, married a foreigner and there was one child of the marriage. Within 12 months she found that from sheer incompatibility she could not continue living with her husband. There was the usual difference of opinion following which she left her husband and sued for a separation. In her indignation she said she did not want anything for herself. She said that she could

keep herself and he could pay for the maintenance of the child. At her request, made in the heat of temper, the court made an order for a separation and the payment by the husband of a small sum per week for the maintenance of the child. The woman is now 28 and for nine years the husband has paid about 10s. a week towards the child's upkeep. The woman cannot obtain a divorce because by order of the court she is separated from him. She has no obligation to live with him nor he to live with her. He pays maintenance for the child but will not give his wife her release. She has met somebody with whom she considers she might settle down in life; but what do we say? We say, "If you want that man, go and live in adultery with him. If you want to have a child, it will have to bear the stigma of bastardy."

There is, of course, an alternative. For the purpose of obtaining a divorce, a woman can commit adultery in such a way that it comes to the knowledge of the husband. In this case, however, what does he say? He says he will not sue for divorce. "If I cannot have you," he declares, "nobody else will. So long as I live you will never get a divorce. You may commit adultery if you like but I will not take advantage of the fact and sue for divorce." When she was 19 years of age, this young woman made the mistake of marrying the wrong man. Are we going to be so barbarous as to say, "Because of your mistake you shall not live as a human being, and will not have the rights that other women have. You made a mistake and there is no redemption"? In many instances the parties act more reasonably. When they decide there is no longer any likelihood of their coming together again, they provide grounds for a divorce. They deliberately commit adultery for that purpose. People who are rich enough are able to do that, but often folk are too poor to be able to secure release even in that way.

What is likely to have the worst effect on the morality of the community? To have people commit adultery who do not want to do so, in order to obtain relief from an intolerable position; or for us to face up to human nature as it is, to stand four square to the circumstances of the case as they are, to deal with the position as it exists and with human beings as human beings—people

of flesh and blood with all their deficiencies and shortcomings? We would do more for the race and more in the interests of morality if, instead of forcing a girl like that into the position of having to commit adultery, and thus carry with her the stigma of being dragged through the court in order to obtain relief from an intolerable position, we provided her with relief in a reasonable, decent way. Here is a man who has not contributed a penny to her upkeep for nine years, and adopts a dog-in-the-manger attitude, saying, "I will not let you marry and I will not contribute anything towards your maintenance. You can keep yourself."

Mrs. Cardell-Oliver: Can she not have the order reversed?

Mr. HUGHES: She cannot get the order reversed or varied. She is tied for the rest of her life and there are many similar cases. There are men who receive small incomes. They find themselves in disagreement with their wives. In consequence, a separation order is made by the court. Because of the paucity of the man's income—he may be out of work at the time—the court makes an order for him to pay a shilling a week to reserve the wife's right. He can go on paying that sum for all time or until she can prove that his circumstances have improved. In many instances for the wife to prove that the circumstances of her husband have improved is impossible. Consequently, by virtue of the order for a small payment the woman has to go out and earn her own living, and frequently she has to work to maintain her children. Moreover, she can never obtain a divorce. The man has her tied up. If that had the effect of keeping him from entanglements with some other woman, there might be some virtue in it, but what happens is that such men put their hats on their heads and disappear, turning up later on, sometimes having induced other women to marry them in the belief that they were single. Some of these men have provided illegitimate children which they leave to the care of the State. A woman separated from her husband, however, may be tied forever. Someone with whom she feels she can mate comes along and offers her a chance to make a second marriage, but we say "No. You were unlucky; you married a waster who has not kept you and who makes you work for yourself and your children, but so long as he makes a nominal payment to you,

he can hold you for all time and deny you the real birthright of every woman, namely, adequate male companionship." That is the kind of thing the present law permits. It is suggested that there are 2,000 people living apart. That may be so; I believe it is. I do not believe that the success of the marriage tie depends on any theological principles. It depends upon the compatibility of two people to live together in peace and harmony, on their ability to give and take and share both good and bad luck.

Mrs. Cardell-Oliver: You will not get church people to take advantage of this measure.

Mr. HUGHES: If that is so, it is to be supposed that deeply religious people who are married according to the rites of the Church would not be affected by legislation of this kind. Yet we know that where they were married makes no difference.

Mrs. Cardell-Oliver: They do not get divorces in the Church.

Mr. HUGHES: If the hon. member watches the divorce proceedings in the various courts, she will find that divorces are sought just as much by people married according to the rites and ceremonies of the Church as by those married in registry offices. It does not make the slightest difference whether they are married inside or outside a church.

Sitting suspended from 6.15 to 7.30 p.m.

Mr. HUGHES: It is regrettable that religion has been introduced, and that the Bill has been declared an irreligious one. The introduction of religion into the discussion brings up an unsavoury topic from the point of view of the debate, for it is an aspect that people do not like to attack. I do not agree with the suggestion about the policy of the churches. That policy is one of toleration, and has been so since the dark middle ages. The policy of the churches, and of those who speak from the most influential positions connected with them, is that there shall be toleration of other people's views. The day is past when any religious institution endeavours to dragoon people into thinking as it wishes them to think. It lays down rules and precepts which it asks them to abide by, but does not say to those who do

not belong to the faith, "You shall be coerced into modelling your life on the precepts we lay down."

English history indicates that the first form of divorce was introduced by the church under the title of "Separatio à mensa et thoro." Until 1858 only the ecclesiastical courts dealt with divorce. The first attempt to remove jurisdiction in divorce from the ecclesiastical to the civil courts was in that year. Prior to that time the churches dispensed divorce. Although the church enjoins upon people that when they marry they shall live together, human nature, as pointed out by Lord Birkenhead, was unable to live up to the high standard required for compliance with its dictum. The churches found that through the standards laid down they condemned men and women to lives of intolerance, to lives they could not expect any human being to endure. So it was that they instituted divorce which relieved persons from the obligation of living together for the rest of their lives. The church found itself face to face with human nature and its weaknesses. It dispensed divorce and relieved people of the obligations to carry out their marriage contract. Bills were introduced in Parliament to provide for divorce. It was recognised in 1858 that the civil law had to take cognisance of the inability of married people to live together, because of faults on the one side or the other. Divorce jurisdiction was then taken over by the civil courts. When this country was established the civil court was given jurisdiction in divorce: although judges are obliged to follow the principles laid down in the old ecclesiastical courts. I do not agree with the hon. member who said that churches were opposed to divorce. Churches can only exist by toleration. No matter what provisions we make for the granting of divorce, no person is obliged to take advantage of them. No one who, through religious scruples does not wish to take advantage of them, is obliged to do so.

Hon. C. G. Latham: What about the innocent party?

Mr. HUGHES: If the innocent party, because of his theological views, does not wish to take advantage of the divorce laws, he must make his own decision. If the theological urge is the

stronger he will take no action, but if his other views are the stronger, he will obtain the relief the law gives him. The guilty party will, however, be prevented from obtaining relief in any case. No church has anything to say about the views of another church on the question of divorce. People say, "If you allow a father to get a divorce he will not maintain his children." A man can only be compelled to maintain his children if he is willing to do so. If any member can devise a way of making a husband provide the maintenance ordered by the court, he will confer a wonderful benefit not only upon the Treasury but upon the womenfolk concerned.

Hon. N. Keenan: That is all right if the man has any assets.

Mr. HUGHES: A man may be charged with an offence under the Married Women's Protection Act and ordered to pay maintenance for his children. The difficulty then arises of how to make him pay. If he is a wealthy man and his assets can be seized, well and good. Ninety per cent of such men have no assets, and 50 per cent. have no regular income upon which a charge can be made for the maintenance of the children. We hear a lot about the attitude of men towards women. The Act to which I have just referred is for the protection of married women only. There is no Married Men's Protection Act. No matter what a woman does, whether she neglects her husband, nags him into a state of imbecility, does things that irritate and goad him, and neglects to carry out her obligations reasonably and fairly, he has no redress. If a man commits an act of cruelty towards his wife, if he leaves her without adequate maintenance or sustenance for the children, if he deserts her, and does other things, she can immediately apply to the Court of Petty Sessions for an order for separation and maintenance. So long as that man lives he is committed to live apart from his wife and pay the maintenance required by the court. In many cases that come before the court the man is not in the wrong, but there are faults on both sides. The woman may irritate her husband, do many things to annoy him, and neglect her duties, but if the husband in the course of an argument, in which offensive remarks are made concerning him, loses his temper and

smacks his wife's face, she can charge him before the court with cruelty.

Mr. Cross: And yet she can hit him over the head with a poker.

Mr. HUGHES: Or a rolling pin. No man can get a separation from his wife on the ground of her cruelty. When a man has the same cause for complaint against his wife, as in other instances, the wife may have against her husband, he can get no separation order but is required to put up with the situation. In many of these cases disputes occur through incompatibility of temper. Ultimately the husband walks out or does something that gives the wife the right to take him before the Married Women's Protection Court. He says, "Oh well, we cannot live together; I do not want to evade my obligations. I will agree to maintain my wife and children." He consents to an order being made against him. Frequently he does not desire publicity nor does he wish his domestic affairs to be dragged through the Press. He agrees to a separation, hoping frequently that matters will be re-adjusted later on. If he is a decent man and has separated under those conditions, stands up to his obligations and pays the maintenance regularly for the well-being of his wife and children, for all time he is precluded from an opportunity to secure a divorce. Neither could the wife divorce him if she wished to.

It frequently happens as time goes on that the wife may form fresh associations and feel she would like to be married again. It may be that her husband may have a similar experience and desire to marry again. Being people of commonsense, they discuss the position and the wife may say, "If the necessary provision can be made to fulfil requirements, I do not mind if you get a divorce." The problem then arises that the man, having complied fairly and squarely with all his obligations, has to consider how the divorce can be obtained. There is only one way. One of the parties must commit adultery. Almost invariably the man accepts the odium. If both parties agree that in the interests of everyone concerned they should be divorced, the man will not ask the woman to accept the odium arising from adultery. On the contrary, he says, "I will have to commit adultery in order to secure relief." He adopts that attitude not because he desires to commit that offence, but in order to afford relief to his wife and him-

self. Thus adultery must be committed in order that the spouses may secure release from their marital obligations. On the other hand, some of those concerned will be "wasters." If a man neglects his wife, ill-treats her, does not maintain his children properly and neglects his obligations, the wife has to take him before the Married Women's Protection Court and secure an order for separation and maintenance. Being a waster, the husband does not care. When the order is obtained against him, he does not pay the maintenance. He simply puts his hat on his head and walks off. He has no sense of responsibility and does not care whether his children live or die. In such circumstances, all the wife can do is periodically to have the husband arrested and made to serve a term of imprisonment, which wipes out the arrears of maintenance.

If the women's organisations of Western Australia wish to render a public service and assist women-folk generally, they should take an interest in those unfortunate women who have been deserted by husbands who do not maintain them. There is nothing more pitiful—I shall not burst into tears over it all the same—than the spectacle of women who having married wasters, are forced to secure court orders against them and then, when they visit the court week after week, find no money is available for them. A woman placed in that position is forced to go to the Child Welfare Department and plead for sustenance for the maintenance of herself and her children. She is then asked, "What have you done about your husband?" I have known of an instance of a woman who pawned her wedding ring to pay 4s. 6d. in order to issue a warrant to have her husband arrested. That was all she could do, and when she did that, he had to go to gaol. But that did not provide the necessary maintenance. I suggest to the women of this State that they should endeavour to secure an amendment of the law so that when an order is made for the payment of maintenance, the money shall be made payable to the State which should then assume the responsibility of making the delinquent husband meet his obligations.

The Premier: The Bill is not concerned with that point. You are dealing with maintenance, which is quite different.

Mr. HUGHES: I am explaining the law as it stands to-day.

The Premier: But that has nothing to do with the Bill.

Mr. HUGHES: When a husband refuses to stand up to his marital obligations and habitually neglects to pay maintenance, then at the end of three years his wife can secure a divorce. That is as it should be. But in securing her divorce, the woman liberates the man on the marriage market again. That is the existing law. At present there is no check at all on the guilty party. Why should we provide relief for a guilty party after the lapse of three years, and facilitate the re-marriage of an individual who has failed to stand up to his or her obligations? Under the law to-day we say to the man or woman who has fulfilled all obligations and abided honourably by agreements entered into, "Because you have been decent and have realised your responsibilities and acted in a proper manner, we shall not extend to you the relief that we do to the waster who has acted in a most unmanly or unwomanly manner." The Bill is designed to give relief to people who have been separated for five years or more.

Mr. Marshall: If they desire to secure that relief.

Mr. HUGHES: Yes. That position may arise in one of three ways. A man or a woman may agree to put an end to their marriage state and to go their several ways. The wife may say, "I do not want any maintenance from you." If there are children as the result of the marriage, she may say, "You maintain the children and I will look after myself. I do not want anything further from you. You can go your way and I will go mine." Under the Bill either party at the end of five years may secure a divorce. In the second case that may arise, a married couple may have separated as the result of a private agreement. It may have been on the score that their married life was incompatible with their happiness. They may live separate and apart, and abide by the terms and conditions arrived at regarding maintenance and the custody of the children. At the end of five years either party can approach the court and secure a divorce. The third case is where, instead of a private agreement, a separation order is obtained from the court. If at the end of five years the husband has fulfilled all his obligations, he can secure a divorce. That clause seems to me to go too far inasmuch as it provides for a

divorce irrespective of whether the guilty party or the innocent party applies for the dissolution of the marriage. On the previous occasion when legislation was introduced in that form I voted against it. I would do so again if it were in that form.

In New Zealand and elsewhere where similar legislation is enacted, certain safeguards have been provided. The first is that when one of the parties petitions for a divorce, if the other party is agreeable the proceedings can go through uncontested. But if the respondent objects to the divorce and it is found on evidence to the satisfaction of the court that the petitioner was the cause of the separation, then divorce is refused. Thus the position in New Zealand is this: If a man is living apart from his wife, either by mutual agreement or by order of the court, then at the end, not of three years as previously provided for, but of five years, the innocent party can object to the divorce on the ground that the party applying was the cause of the separation. In such circumstances the court is bound to dismiss the petition. The matter is not left to the discretion of the court at all. Therefore, despite all this talk about the position, if the Bill were modified slightly, it would meet the objection that the man who had failed to observe his marital obligations and had separated from his wife, would, at the end of five years, be free to start all over again with a fresh marriage. If the Bill is slightly modified along the lines suggested, that type of person could be eliminated altogether and the interests of the innocent party could be adequately safeguarded. While such a provision would prevent the guilty party from deriving any benefit, it would also destroy the objections that have been raised to the Bill. It is necessary that the divorce court shall not be bound by any decision of the Married Women's Protection Court. The reason for that is that, in many instances, as I mentioned previously, the issue is decided by consent and frequently the guilty party does not provide proper evidence. It seems to be imperative that the superior court must not be fettered in its right of examination of applications on their merits and to grant, or refuse, divorce upon satisfactory evidence regarding the guilt or otherwise of the petitioner.

There seems to me also to be one other safeguard that is necessary—it really exists to-day—and that is regarding any amendment, or variation, of an order for maintenance in a court of petty sessions. Should the action be followed by divorce proceedings either because of adultery or because the husband had failed to discharge his obligations under the order of maintenance—he cannot get a maintenance order or a discharge of it if he is a guilty party—it is desirable, if the Bill is to become law, that all orders or contracts made in the court of inferior jurisdiction or by mutual agreement between the parties, shall be preserved intact unless the higher court orders a review. Then they should be modified only to that extent, just as at present, when a guilty party is divorced, the maintenance order remains intact. The reason is that the procedure is more effective and simpler than that under the Married Women's Protection Act, because for 4s. 6d. a warrant of commitment can be taken out and the non-payer imprisoned. Hundreds of men who have been separated from their wives under orders made by the Married Women's Protection Court have subsequently been divorced, but are still paying maintenance and are subject to imprisonment under the existing orders. Those safeguards should be maintained if this Bill becomes law; and, on the understanding that this Bill is carried through the second reading and is modified in Committee—I reserve the right to vote against it on the third reading—I am in favour of the Bill. I ask the House to pass the second reading, and, if we can persuade the Committee to place certain safeguards in the Bill, it will do much good and certainly will do no harm.

One other aspect of the measure with which I do not agree is that the Bill is designed to stop publicity in divorce cases. After all, the fact that people's actions will be exposed to public view is frequently a strong deterrent. There is no reason to prohibit the publication of this type of court proceedings, any more than there is to prohibit publication of reports of murder trials and other proceedings. If we pass this provision, we shall not succeed in our objective. If local papers are prohibited from publishing reports of divorce proceedings, then certain Eastern States papers circulating in Western Australia will publish them. There-

fore the effect of the provision will be to prevent local papers from publishing such reports and to open the field to Eastern States papers. We cannot prevent a paper published in the Eastern States from circulating in Western Australia. We would not be able to prevent, say, the Sydney "Truth" from publishing a full report of a divorce proceeding in Western Australia. We should therefore be merely inflicting a penalty upon the Press in Western Australia. In my opinion, it is highly undesirable that there should be secrecy about court proceedings. A great deal of harm has been done to the community owing to the lack of publicity of proceedings in the Children's Court. There is nothing like the glare of public opinion to keep things in order. Let the public know what is going on, because it will promptly bring to notice anything in the nature of an abuse. It would have the effect of making those working in these spheres alert to the fact that the eye of public criticism was upon them. A section of the community revels in reports of murder trials, divorces and so on; and if these reports are not published locally they will be published in the Eastern States papers. I do not think the passage of the measure will result in making millionaires of our legal practitioners. If that is the main objection to the Bill, do not let it stand in our way, because it would not be an un-mixed blessing. I suppose it would not result in an additional 10 per cent. of divorce applications. If the 2,000 married people now living apart all applied for a divorce in the next five years, that would mean only 400 cases a year. It would be quite safe to say that not more than 10 per cent. of the 400 would make application. Therefore I am of opinion that the measure will not cause any great increase in divorce applications. It will, however, give people who have a deserving case an opportunity to approach the court, present it to the judicial tribunal and get relief if they deserve it.

MR. J. HEGNEY (Middle Swan) [8.5]: I move an amendment—

That the word "now" be struck out with a view to adding "this day six months."

MR. MARSHALL: I expected this.

MR. SPEAKER: Order! There can be no discussion on the amendment.

MR. MARSHALL: This is not a motion for an adjournment. It is an amendment to strike out the word "now."

MR. SPEAKER: With a view to inserting the words "this day six months."

MR. MARSHALL: Yes.

MR. SPEAKER: Order! There can be no discussion on the amendment.

MR. MARSHALL: This is an amendment moved under Standing Order 268. It is a short cut to defeating the Bill and has always been used by the Opposition. Quite frequently, when Labour was in Opposition, it held up the Government for hours. I would request you, Mr. Speaker, to peruse Standing Orders Nos. 268 and 269. The object of this amendment is to defeat the Bill. The amendment was one of the greatest weapons Labour had when in Opposition. I await your ruling, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: I rule that the amendment may not be discussed.

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

Ayes	17
Noes	21
Majority against	4

AYES.

Mrs. Cardell-Oliver	Mr. Needham
Mr. Coverley	Mr. Nulsen
Mr. Fox	Mr. Panten
Mr. J. Hegney	Mr. Shearn
Mr. W. Hegney	Mr. Willcock
Mr. Keenan	Mr. Willmott
Mr. Lambert	Mr. Wise
Mr. McLarty	Mr. Patrick
Mr. Millington	(Teller.)

NOES.

Mr. Abbott	Mr. McDonald
Mr. Berry	Mr. Rodoreda
Mr. Boyle	Mr. Seward
Mr. Cross	Mr. F. C. L. Smith
Mr. Doney	Mr. J. H. Smith
Mr. Hill	Mr. Triat
Mr. Hughes	Mr. Watts
Mr. Lambert	Mr. Wilson
Mr. Leahy	Mr. Withers
Mr. Mann	Mr. Sampson
Mr. Marshall	(Teller.)

Amendment thus negatived.

Question put and a division taken with the following result—

Ayes	18
Noes	20
Majority against	2

AYES.	
Mr. Abbott	Mr. McDonald
Mr. Berry	Mr. Rodoreda
Mr. Cross	Mr. F. C. L. Smith
Mr. Hill	Mr. J. H. Smith
Mr. Hughes	Mr. Triat
Mr. Lambert	Mr. Watts
Mr. Leaby	Mr. Wilson
Mr. Mann	Mr. Withers
Mr. Marshall	Mr. Sampson

(Teller.)

NOES.	
Mr. Boyle	Mr. Millington
Mrs. Cardell-Oliver	Mr. Needham
Mr. Coverley	Mr. Nulsen
Mr. Doney	Mr. Panton
Mr. Fox	Mr. Patrick
Mr. J. Hegney	Mr. Seward
Mr. W. Hegney	Mr. Willcock
Mr. Keenan	Mr. Willmott
Mr. Latham	Mr. Wise
Mr. McLarty	Mr. Shearn

(Teller.)

Question thus negatived.

Bill defeated.

BILL—APPROPRIATION.

Returned from the Council without amendment.

BILL—MEDICAL ACT AMENDMENT.

Council's Amendment.

Returned from the Council with an amendment, now considered.

In Committee.

Mr. Marshall in the Chair; Mr. Seward in charge of the Bill.

Insert a new clause to stand as Clause 6 as follows—

“This Act shall continue in force during the continuance of the war in which His Majesty is at the commencement of this Act engaged and for a period of six months thereafter and no longer.”

Mr. SEWARD: The amendment should not be accepted. I have no intention of doing anything that would tend to deprive doctors at present serving overseas of their practices. Ample provision is made in the Bill to ensure that that will not occur. The regional certificate would have to be renewed every year. The Governor would declare a region and enable a doctor to be appointed only when he was of opinion that there was insufficient medical service available for the area. When our doctors returned from the war and their services

were available, the Governor would cancel the regional certificates. Some Continental doctors are specialists. If the Minister found, say, a brain specialist, he would not be suitable for country practice, but his services might be valuable at the mental hospital, and the Minister might grant him a regional certificate and appoint him to the institution. Under the new clause, however, six months after the termination of the war, he would have to go out, no matter how valuable his services were. Further, Parliament might not be sitting six months after the termination of the war, and thus the certificates would be automatically cancelled by the lapsing of the Act. There is ample provision to ensure that our own doctors will not be displaced by men who are granted regional certificates. I move—

That the amendment be not agreed to.

Question put and passed; the Council's amendment not agreed to.

Resolution reported and the report adopted.

A committee consisting of the Minister for Health, Mr. Watts and Mr. Seward drew up reasons for disagreeing to the Council's amendment.

Reasons adopted, and a message accordingly returned to the Council.

BILL—CITY OF PERTH (RATING APPEALS).

Council's Message.

Message from the Council received and read notifying that it did not insist on its amendments Nos. 3 and 4.

BILL—STREET COLLECTIONS (REGULATION).

Second Reading.

Debate resumed from an earlier stage of the sitting.

MR. McDONALD (West Perth) [8.28]: I propose to support the Bill. I notice that its operation is confined to the metropolitan area, and I should like the Minister to explain the reason for that restriction. It might well be that the measure could be

specifically applied to towns like Kalgoorlie and Boulder.

Mr. Withers: And Bunbury.

Mr. McDONALD: Yes, and any other towns that might be nominated. I would be interested to hear the reason. The Bill is designed to encourage the response of the public to street collections. If we have street collections too often, the general public may become disgusted with that form of help to our patriotic efforts and charities. If we confine these collections to a reasonable number, as the Bill proposes, it might result—I hope it will—in the maximum effort being made by the public in support of the deserving objects sanctioned for the collections. While we are restricting the number of street collections and placing them more under control, I think it is proper that a tribute be paid, in which all members will acquiesce, to the people who give so much time, not only to collecting in the streets for charities and patriotic purposes, but also to the great amount of organisation involved. We cannot sufficiently express our indebtedness to those who, in an honorary capacity, are giving so much time and energy to these deserving causes.

MR. RODOREDA (Roebourne) [8.30]: I am glad that a Bill of this nature has been brought down. A fault I have to find with it is that it is about 12 months too late. The measure is termed a Bill to restrict street collections, but there is not much restriction about it. Fifty collections per annum would be ample.

Hon. N. Keenan: Is not the figure 60 a maximum?

Mr. RODOREDA: The maximum will be taken full advantage of by organisations applying to the Chief Secretary for permits to take up collections. My view of street collections is that they are in the nature of a sectional tax. The tax is imposed upon people whose business makes it necessary for them to use the streets. Tens of thousands of metropolitan residents never see a collector and a box. That is obvious. But housewives doing their shopping on a Friday and commercial men in the city are the victims of this form of taxation—it can be called by no other name. I would have liked to see in the Bill definite provision for a number of days to be reserved for collections on behalf of local charities only, these hav-

ing been neglected to some extent. Unless such a provision is inserted, the local charities are likely to continue to experience neglect. I may move an amendment in that direction in Committee.

I am indeed pleased to see that the Bill proposes regulation of the use of types of collection boxes, and more adequate supervision of the application of the funds collected. In the suburbs I have seen collectors sitting alongside galvanised iron buckets and asking people for contributions. I observed that in Claremont. The method of collection is not desirable. While not accusing the collectors of not returning every penny put into the receptacles, I contend that great lack of supervision is evidenced by the use of such methods. Moreover, it is merely presenting, free of charge, opportunities for graft. Some people will go to any length to create such opportunities, but here is one presented to them without any devising on their part. I hope the Chief Secretary will cause strict supervision of that aspect. I support the second reading of the Bill.

HON N. KEENAN (Nedlands) [8.34]

The previous speaker is under a misapprehension regarding the number of days for which permits to collect may be granted, in supposing that those days can be selected or demanded by people desirous of taking up collections. The matter is entirely in the discretion of the Chief Secretary.

Mr. Rodoreda: I realise that.

Hon. N. KEENAN: Assuming that the Chief Secretary is a man of common sense he is not likely to grant a permit every week unless for very good reason.

Mr. Rodoreda: We can make sure of that.

Hon. N. KEENAN: Then why not restrict the collections altogether, and declare that the numbers of days is to be not at the choice of the Chief Secretary but at the choice of the organisations, and is not to exceed 20 for the whole year? The Bill gives the Chief Secretary considerable discretion as to the number of days. One other matter to which I wish to refer was mentioned by the member for West Perth (Mr. McDonald). I see no reason why the operation of the Bill should be confined to the metropolitan area. If it is a good measure—and it is accepted as being such—why should it not be applied generally?

The Minister for Mines: I do not think there are many collections in the country.

Hon. N. KEENAN: Collections do take place there.

Mr. Patrick: There would not be one a week in country towns.

Hon. N. KEENAN: Collections are made there from time to time, and why should they not be controlled?

Mr. Doney: Collections would not average one a month in any country town.

Hon. N. KEENAN: The matter should be properly controlled. The Bill should be made applicable generally, wherever necessary. This is entirely a discretionary Bill empowering the Chief Secretary to exercise his judgment.

The Minister for Mines: At present he has no power at all.

Hon. N. KEENAN: Another matter referred to by the member for Roebourne (Mr. Rodoreda) was that the result of street collections is to collect only from people using the streets. I see no cure for that. If it could be cured by any amendment of this measure, or by the introduction of any new measure, I should be glad to be a party to it. Is the right to be given to collectors to knock at the door and say, "I want to come in with my little box?" Unfortunately it does so happen that those who walk down the Terrace or Hay-street or any of the principal thoroughfares of Perth are the people who are called upon to contribute to these funds. That is unavoidable. For such a reason we should not refuse to support the measure. I support the second reading.

MR. ABBOTT (North Perth) [8.57]: I support the Bill. Street collections impose quite a tax on city workers, many of whom have to consider their weekly budgets rather carefully. If they are compelled to frequent the Terrace and Hay-street, as many are during a good part of the day, these collections prove a hardship. An objectionable practice was used on one occasion by the issue of differently coloured tickets indicating the amount subscribed. That was most objectionable. If only for that reason it is fitting that the Chief Secretary should have power to make regulations in regard to collections. I fail to see why the Chief Secretary should not also have power to regulate collections taken up elsewhere than in the metropolitan area, because though such

collections are not numerous there ought to be some control of the methods adopted to secure contributions and for checking the funds obtained. I consider that 60 days are too many to be allotted to collections. Once a week is sufficient to use the city streets for the purpose. It is all very well to say that the matter is within the Chief Secretary's discretion. For that Minister it is difficult to refuse to grant a permit if it is open for him to do so. Probably it will also be difficult for him to determine which organisations shall have the privilege. Fifty-two permits a year will be quite sufficient. If no one else moves an amendment to that effect in Committee, I shall do so. It may be urged that it is inadvisable to permit these collections during the luncheon hour.

Mrs. Cardell-Oliver: At other times you cannot get any money.

Mr. ABBOTT: It is difficult for a good many workers on small salaries to face the ordeal of collecting boxes.

MR. MARSHALL (Murchison) [8.40] A point not raised by previous speakers is why there has been a change in regard to collections. The Lotteries Commission would be the better body to control the issue of these permits, because there are now permits granted by that Commission to certain organisations to raise money by means other than collecting in the streets. The point is that while some popular organisation will receive permission to run an art union or a lottery, the same organisation may obtain permits from the Chief Secretary, he not being aware that the Lotteries Commission had already granted other facilities. Some charitable bodies, awake to the position, would be able to do much better than others. That is an error. The Lotteries Commission should control this phase as it controls similar phases. All charitable organisations should have a fair share of opportunities to collect during the year. Again, various of these organisations receive actual donations. I have no strong objection to the Bill, though taking the view of the member for Roebourne that street collection is a form of taxation by intimidation. People who can afford to run motor cars to and from their offices are immune from street collections, but unfortunate individuals like myself, who have to walk everywhere, are caught. One does not like to be out of step, particularly when the collection is for a

patriotic purpose. Though the street collections do wonderfully good work, having regard to the system under which we live, in the final analysis they go to show how deplorably poor we are, having to get our womenfolk and even our children to appeal in the highways for contributions towards things which should be a State or national responsibility. In my electorate, I may mention, the system of street collections is unknown. We never have them. I say this for the country people, that they contribute most liberally to funds for patriotic purposes, although they never make collections by means of boxes or badges on the streets of their towns. They raise money by other means, such as concerts and bazaars. A Bill of this kind, if passed, would prove most inconvenient to country people. When they set about raising money for patriotic purposes, they meet and decide upon a certain date when the effort will be made. Under this measure, they will first have to obtain a permit. That would involve making an application to the Chief Secretary. All this would appeal to them as being so much Government red tape; and, because of the inconvenience and delay involved, they would give up hope of being able to do much to raise funds. I respectfully suggest that, in those circumstances, the measure should apply to no portion of the State except to the metropolitan area.

THE MINISTER FOR MINES (Hon. A. H. Panton—Leederville) [8.47]: In my opinion, this is an essential Bill. Street collections in the metropolitan area have grown to such an extent that we now almost have daily collections. The reason for confining the measure to the metropolitan area is that country people have different methods of raising money for patriotic purposes. But even country people must obtain a permit from the War Funds Council before they can raise money for such purposes. In any case, street collections would not prove of much use in country towns, except perhaps Kalgoorlie, but Kalgoorlie adopts a different method and large amounts are raised there. The member for Murehison (Mr. Marshall) suggested that the matter should be in the hands of the Lotteries Commission; but I point out that the Chief Secretary, to whom application must be made under this measure, if passed, is also Chairman of the War Funds Council.

He, by virtue of that position, will know what organisations are registered, although admittedly organisations for patriotic purposes, if not registered, will be enabled to make collections after having obtained the necessary permission. I agree with the member for Nedlands (Hon. N. Keenan) that the maximum number of days upon which collections may be made should be 60. As originally introduced, the Bill provided for 50. The number is, however, in the discretion of the Chief Secretary. That is but right, because at certain times of the year in the metropolitan area it might be advisable to have more than one collection per week. At other times of the year, owing to climatic conditions or for other reasons, collections cannot conveniently be made. The only person who has any authority to-day over street collections is the Commissioner of Police; he raises no objection provided the collections do not interfere with traffic. This Bill will confer upon the Chief Secretary authority to control these collections and will also give him discretionary powers.

THE MINISTER FOR THE NORTH-WEST (Hon. A. A. M. Coverley—Kimberley—in reply) [8.50]: The Minister for Mines has replied to most of the arguments put forward against the Bill, but I wish to add a few words by way of further explanation. The Bill, as originally introduced, made provision for 50 days for street collections; another place altered the number to 75, and then, after much debate, compromised by fixing the number at 60. I hope the member for Roebourne (Mr. Rodoreda) will not persist in his intention to reduce that number; if he does, I can visualise much argument and probably a conference, which I consider unnecessary. The measure is not so much designed to restrict the number of days on which collections may be made, but rather to control street collections. The measure confines street collections to the metropolitan area, for two reasons. The first is that overtures were made by the War Funds Council to bring down legislation to control street collections in the metropolitan area. The second is that country districts employ other methods to collect money for charitable and patriotic purposes. As was pointed out by the member for Murehison (Mr. Marshall) and other members, street collections are not

made in country districts. Another point raised was the differentiation in the matter of coloured labels or tickets to indicate the amount donated by the purchaser. Such things are not done in the country. If it is considered that street appeals are becoming a nuisance—

Mr. Doney: They are not likely to be.

The MINISTER FOR THE NORTH-WEST: I realise that. If the country people desire to be covered by this legislation, then an amending Bill can be introduced next session. There is not much more I can say.

Hon. C. G. Latham: You will get the Bill through.

Hon. N. Keenan: You will get your Bill.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Mr. Marshall in the Chair; the Minister for the North-West in charge of the Bill.

Clause 1—agreed to.

Clause 2—Interpretation.

Hon. N. KEENAN: I move an amendment—

That the definition of “metropolitan area” be struck out.

If street collections are not to be made outside the metropolitan area, then this Bill will not apply to country districts.

Mr. PATRICK: The measure was asked for in Perth, not by the country.

Amendment put and negatived.

Clause put and passed.

Clause 3—No collections in metropolitan area except by permission of Chief Secretary:

Mr. WATTS: I move an amendment—

That the following subclause be added to the clause, to stand as Subclause 2:—

2. For the purposes of this section the words, “public street,” in addition to the ordinary meaning assigned to them include any doorway, opening, lane or place adjoining or adjacent to any street or road, and also land, whether public or private, used or capable of use by the public for pedestrian traffic.

I have spoken to the Minister in charge of the Bill on this amendment and he is agreeable to some such amendment as this. At

present, it would be possible successfully to evade what is intended by the measure, because all that one would have to do would be to do the collecting in a place like London Court, the Plaza Arcade, the Piccadilly Arcade or the Central Arcade. These are not streets, and no regulation could possibly control collections in them so far as this Bill is concerned. It might also be possible to evade the measure by making collections in alcoves and doorways off public streets. The Bill originally included the word “place,” but that word was apparently considered by the Council to be too wide and so was struck out.

The MINISTER FOR THE NORTH-WEST: I do not oppose the amendment. I think it will prove acceptable to the Council and hope it will be carried.

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

Clause 4—Permit as prescribed may be granted:

Mr. ABBOTT: I move an amendment—

That in line 7 of Subclause (1) the word “sixty” be struck out and the word “fifty” inserted in lieu.

Mr. RODOREDA: I support the amendment. We have been assured that 60 days is the limit and that because it is the maximum it will not be available. It would be as logical, therefore, to have 100 days and say that is only the maximum and it will not be available.

Mr. Hughes: This is a case where the maximum will be the minimum.

Mr. RODOREDA: It is for that very reason that I support the amendment. The Minister offered no reason why the number should not be reduced except that there would be an argument with the Legislative Council and consequently, in all probability, a conference. We are sent here to debate matters and express our opinion irrespective of what is decided by another place. The fact that the matter might have to be made the subject of a conference will not prevent me from submitting my viewpoint. In any event, there is no certainty that there will be a conference. Nearly all of us agree that one collection a week is sufficient, and that very little more money would be obtained by sanctioning a greater number of collections.

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

Ayes	25
Noes	12
				—
Majority for		13
				—

AYES.

Mr. Abbott	Mr. Nulsen
Mr. Berry	Mr. Pantou
Mr. Boyle	Mr. Raphael
Mr. Coverley	Mr. Rodoreda
Mr. Cross	Mr. F. C. L. Smith
Mr. J. Hegney	Mr. J. H. Smith
Mr. W. Hegney	Mr. Triat
Mr. Hughes	Mr. Willcock
Mr. Lambert	Mr. Willmott
Mr. Leahy	Mr. Wiae
Mr. McLarty	Mr. Withers
Mr. Millington	Mr. Wilson
Mr. Nham	

(Teller.)

NOES.

Mrs. Cardell-Oliver	Mr. McDonald
Mr. Doney	Mr. Patrick
Mr. Hill	Mr. Sampson
Mr. Keenan	Mr. Seward
Mr. Latham	Mr. Shearn
Mr. Mann	Mr. Watts

(Teller.)

Amendment thus passed.

Mr. RODOREDA: I move an amendment—

That in line 7 of Subclause (1) after the word "year" the words "twenty of which days shall be for local charities only" be inserted.

We are all aware that a drive is being made with a view to making up the sum lost to local charities as a result of collections for patriotic purposes. Local charities ought not to be neglected. I hold the view that the welfare of the troops is entirely a matter for the Commonwealth Government. That we should have to keep the war going and our troops in reasonable comfort by rattling collection boxes in the street is a reflection upon ourselves and the system under which we live. I am not wedded to the word "twenty." All I want is an acknowledgment of the principle that local charities should be supported.

Mr. Doney: Then why not make the number five?

Mr. RODOREDA: Someone else can do that.

Mr. NEEDHAM: Under different conditions I would have supported the amendment, but action has been taken to meet the position referred to by the hon. member. I agree that the responsibility for the upkeep and comfort of our troops is really a Commonwealth matter. However, the combined Charities Council has asked the various

patriotic committees to desist from making appeals to the public for war purposes during December and the request has been acceded to so that collections made for the whole of this month will be for local charities. Had that not been so, I would have supported the amendment. If the struggle lasts through next year, as it probably will, another appeal will be made to the patriotic committees and will probably be as successful as this one so that instead of 20 days being set aside by Act of Parliament for collections for charitable purposes, 31 days will be available. There is no doubt that until a move was made to help local charities they were suffering as a result of the numerous appeals on behalf of our soldiers and sailors. Our soldiers would be the first to resent any loss in revenue by local charities as a result of what had been done for them.

The MINISTER FOR THE NORTH-WEST: I oppose the amendment. This is not a Bill for the allocation of dates to any particular organisation, but one to control street appeals. It is not the duty of the Legislature to say what committee shall have any particular dates. It is for the committees to apply for those dates that are required.

Mr. RODOREDA: Now that I have succeeded in having the matter brought under the notice of the Government, I would like to withdraw my amendment.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Clause, as previously amended, put and passed.

Clauses 5 to 9, Title—agreed to.

Bill reported with amendments, and the report adopted.

Third Reading.

Bill read a third time and returned to the Council with amendments.

BILL—RESERVES (GOVERNMENT DOMAIN).

Council's Message.

Message from the Council received and read notifying that it did not insist on its amendments Nos. 1, 2, and 3.

MOTION--BETTING SUPPRESSION.

Debate resumed from the 30th October on the following motion by Mrs. Cardell-Oliver (Suhiaeo)—

That this House instructs the Government to give instructions to the Chief of Police to use immediately all statutory powers to close all betting shops, houses, dwellings, and places of whatsoever kind where illegal betting is conducted, so that the law of the land may be honoured and Government Departments duly respected, the responsibility for the execution of this motion to rest with the Government.

to which an amendment had been moved by Mr. J. H. Smith (Nelson) as follows—

That in line 5 after the word "conducted" the following words be added:—"and that the totalisator be established and legalised throughout the State where considered necessary."

Amendment put and negatived.

MR. McDONALD (West Perth) [9.20]: These subjects are necessarily overshadowed by the more urgent problems of the war. Were it not for that this would be and still is a matter of great importance to the community. In his latest report the Commissioner referred to starting-price betting, as it now exists, as an evil. I accept that view, as I think will most people. I have come to the conclusion that it is not so important now what we do as it is important that we do something. Starting-price betting may be contrary to the true interests of the community, but it is now carried on so flagrantly and in such complete defiance of the law that it has given rise to an even more serious consideration, namely, the influence upon the community of the laws of the country not being adequately enforced. When I spoke on a previous occasion I was rather opposed to any kind of toleration or recognition of starting-price betting. Sooner than have the spectacle of people carrying on starting-price betting shops in full view of the public and the police, and doing so in defiance of the law, I would be prepared to modify my previous opinion, if necessary, so that we may get some law that can be adequately enforced. The main thing is to take action at the earliest possible moment. I regret this discussion has come on so late in the session. Had it come on earlier, a better opportunity for fruit-

ful suggestions being made to meet the problem would have been offered. I do not propose to analyse the speech of the member for Brownhill-Ivanhoe (Mr. F. C. L. Smith) except in one respect. He pointed out that if we were to enforce the law against betting, we must, to be consistent, enforce it everywhere and upon racecourses.

The Minister for Works: The motion says so.

Mr. McDONALD: Yes. It is proper we should regard the matter historically and should inquire why betting on racecourses has been tolerated in this State. Towards the end of last century a Bill was brought down in this Parliament and passed by which betting on racecourses was definitely made an offence against the law. In 1898 Mr. Leake brought down another Bill to repeal the previous legislation which had made betting on the racecourse an offence. In the course of the debate on that occasion it was said that the original sponsor of the measure that prohibited betting on racecourses, the then member for York (Mr. Monger), had no doubt learned that the Act was ineffective and that its object had not been accomplished. Because the Act was not effective, and because members in 1898 thought that betting on racecourses was a fairly innocent recreation, they repealed the legislation which had expressly made betting on a racecourse an offence. There seems no doubt that in 1898 this Legislature meant to allow betting on a racecourse. Following that legislation there has always been a kind of understanding that betting on a racecourse was either legal or should be tolerated. No doubt that impression sprung from the legislation of 1898, which was passed with the intent of allowing betting on a racecourse. We cannot regard the matter of law enforcement in the last few years against betting as entirely inconsistent, because some differentiation has been made between starting-price betting and betting on the racecourse.

Mr. F. C. L. Smith: What about the decision in the case to which I referred?

Mr. McDONALD: I do not think in that case the Act of 1898 was argued, though I am not suggesting the decision was incorrect. Under the 1898 Act there was an excuse for people thinking that betting on a racecourse stood on different ground from starting-price betting. I am not concerned

very much with the past but I am concerned about the future. It is not my intention to enter upon an analysis of betting or to estimate its gravity compared with other offences against the law. I do not think that individually it is a grave offence, but in its present form it is not in the interests of the community that it should be permitted to continue. What are the alternatives? We can enforce the law that is not being enforced to-day. The Police Act of 1892 gives the authorities three weapons against, particularly, starting-price betting. In the first place they can prosecute the keeper of the betting shop; secondly, they can prosecute the punters who bet in the shop; and in the third place they can prosecute the man who owns the shop. The only remedy that has been taken has been against the man who keeps the shop. That is the weakest of the three remedies. No attempt has been made to put into operation the law against the punter.

Apart from one instance on the gold-fields, there has been, so far as I know, no attempt to put into force the law that enables a prosecution to be brought against the owner of premises in which that individual knows, and must know, that starting-price betting is indulged in. This last weapon against the owner is the most effective in the hands of the police. If prosecutions were taken under that particular heading, there would be a very rapid and considerable decrease in starting-price betting, because the owners of the premises know the consequences of allowing betting to be carried on there. The law as administered to-day by those charged with that duty is really in an extraordinary position. We have the legal farce of those "dummies," who are known to be such by the police, public and the court, being brought week after week before the court and fined, whereas the man who is the real culprit and is running the business is, so far as I know, hardly ever, if ever, dealt with. Not only are we limiting ourselves to the weakest weapon we have against starting-price betting, but in doing so we make no full use of the weakest weapon that could be availed of.

We can do one of two things at the present time. I want to put this matter constructively, because it is a matter of very great public importance, even if it is overshadowed to-day by problems associated with the war. We could try to introduce new

legislation, even if it involves a partial tolerance of betting on racecourses, as in the case of the recent enactment initiated by Mr. Forgan Smith in Queensland. We could work out some new legislation that could be considered during the next session of this Parliament. If we decide to do that, and if the Government feels that is the proper course—I certainly think it is very advisable—I suggest that a select committee, or even an informal committee, of from three to five members drawn from all sections of the House, should be asked to collaborate with the Government in the formulation of proposals that would be acceptable to the House. By what means we could minimise an existing evil and go some distance towards satisfying a very real apprehension upon the part of the public regarding the state of affairs relative to this question at the present time. Such a committee of inquiry could be set up to study the question with a view to being prepared to assist the Government with the framework of legislation that could be introduced next session.

The alternative is to provide for the enforcement of the existing law, which is not being enforced. It is a powerful law that is not being given the credit that belongs to it. In his annual reports the Commissioner of Police has referred to lack of power. In my opinion, he has at his disposal all the power that he requires to bring about a very great diminution in the volume of starting-price betting. If only the Commissioner would use the power that has been available to him during the last 50 years or so, he would accomplish much. If we are to enforce the law, as we should, then if the Commissioner of Police feels himself unable to appreciate how best to put the law into force, the Minister for Justice might invite one or two members of the House to associate themselves with the Commissioner and assist him in putting into force the undoubted powers he possesses at present. We should do one of two things. We should either enforce the law—we should do that always—or, if it is found that the law does not meet with public requirements and is inadequate in any respect, we should introduce new legislation and enforce it.

As to the motion presented by the member for Subiaco (Mrs. Cardell-Oliver), she is entitled to the thanks of this community for raising in this House a matter of great public interest, one regarding which many

responsible people, particularly parents of growing children, are very much concerned. Although her motion does create a difficulty in the minds of some members who consider it may involve action against those who bet on racecourses as well as against those who carry on starting-price betting, I propose to vote for the motion to support the principle which it embodies. The mere wording of the proposition is not of first importance. The principle is that the law shall be enforced without fear or favour and to the fullest extent of the powers possessed by those whose duty it is to enforce our laws, for which Parliament is responsible. That law must be enforced until a new law is enacted and then in turn that latest law must be given application. Looking at the principle of law enforcement that is involved, I feel that the motion is one that the House is not only justified in carrying but would be well advised to endorse, as an affirmation for the people who are in doubt whether we believe in enforcing the law that we have framed.

The Premier: You cannot stop people breaking the laws. You can only punish them.

Mr. McDONALD: But if we see a man walk down the street day after day, stealing property from shops under the very eyes of the police who take no action, we would naturally want to know what had happened to the police.

The Premier: But the man would be punished.

Mr. McDONALD: Day after day, week after week, we can pass by shops in the city and notice the blackboards, hieroglyphics and all the other paraphernalia associated with starting-price betting, and we all know that the police and public alike are aware that starting-price betting is being conducted in those shops. And yet they are allowed to carry on without molestation, except that occasionally some people are fined, for which they do not care twopence.

The Premier: No.

Mr. McDONALD: They continue to carry on because it is profitable to pay the fines and continue operations. No, Mr. Speaker, we cannot enforce our laws a hundred per cent., but we can enforce the law whenever we see it is being abused.

Mr. F. C. L. Smith: And the licensing laws too?

Mr. McDONALD: Yes, and every other law. If the licensing laws, as laws sometimes are, happen to be in conflict with public opinion, and the people feel that they should not be enforced, that they are unduly restrictive, and we know that they are broken by those who feel no moral responsibility because of the nature of those laws, then we should take steps to alter them. I do not desire to preach a sermon, but nothing could be worse for any country than to allow to remain on the statute-book, laws in which the people do not believe and which they break with impunity. I consider it is our duty, as far as possible, to minimise the breaking of our laws. If the public demand an alteration in a law, we should alter it and then see that it is enforced. In this instance while the law is there, it should be enforced. If some people think, and public opinion is behind the belief, that different action should be taken regarding betting laws, then I would prefer the issue to go to a referendum, so that the people themselves could say whether they wanted unlimited betting or restrictive legislation. While we have the present law on our statute book, there can be only one principle involved and it is the duty of Parliament, Government and the authorities whose immediate task it is to enforce the law, to see that it is so enforced to the best of their ability. That is not being done to-day, and I therefore support the motion.

MRS. CARDELL-OLIVER (Subiaco—in reply) [10.40]: The object and substance of the motion is the enforcement of a statutory law and has nothing whatever to do with the merits or demerits of betting. My remarks will be mainly directed towards the speech of the member for Brown Hill-Ivanhoe (Mr. F. C. L. Smith) who, being a very able and courteous debater, handled his subject without descending to rude personalities. I shall necessarily have to criticise the actual wording of the hon. member's speech, particularly in view of his earlier occupancy of the office of the Minister for Justice, but I trust my reply will not be construed as a personal attack. My reaction to his speech was threefold. In the first place, it was one of amusement; secondly, one of weariness; lastly, of sadness and sorrow. I had a feeling of amusement because of the line of reasoning adopted by one who so recently held the

position of Minister for Justice, and, by his remarks, apparently was content to encourage the flouting of the law. It was wearisome to me because the arguments he used in favour of the criminal were age-long.

The Premier: They say that logic does not appeal to the female sex!

Hon. N. Keenan: To what is that interjection relevant?

The Premier: To the subject the hon. member is dealing with. The speech by the member for Brown Hill-Ivanhoe was the most logical we have heard for many months.

Hon. N. Keenan: But what was the interjection relevant to?

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! I ask the Premier and the member for Nedlands to keep order.

Mrs. CARDELL-OLIVER: I am replying to the so-called logic with what I regard as commonsense. My reaction of sadness was occasioned by the applause that greeted the peroration to what the Premier described as such a logical speech. The peroration represented a quotation from Ramsay MacDonald and included the following—

Time after time the failure of the reform campaigns of outraged respectability in America has taught this simple lesson in moral politics. One cannot devastate and then say, "Behold the good." The gambling habit must be elbowed out, not stamped out.

When I heard the applause of members at the conclusion of that peroration, I was sad. I realised that members of this House could be influenced to cast their votes from a purely emotional standpoint. I was pleased that the vote was not taken immediately and time was afforded members to adapt themselves to the facts of the position rather than be swayed by what the Premier has described as the logic of that particular speech. Now I trust in arriving at a decision the votes of members will be cast with an appreciation of the fact that the object and essence of the motion is to defend our democratic rights and our laws which have been passed by the representatives of the people and that members will realise that they have an obligation and a responsibility to see that laws that affect the well-being of the community shall be honoured and effect given to them. If members are influ-

enced by Ramsay MacDonald, and it is quite evident that they are, I too would like to quote him. He said—

The gambling disease cuts away the roots of good citizenship . . . The spread of the gambling habit is one of the most disquieting events of the time for those particularly who believe in self-government and in an intelligent democracy using its political power to secure moral and social ends. Every Labour leader I know recognises the gambling habit as a menace to any form of Labour Party.

If Ramsay MacDonald were alive to-day he would know that it is impossible to elbow out an evil. It must be fought and stamped out. No one tried harder than he to elbow out war. In the early days of his power he declined to arm, and he influenced millions of now disillusioned people to believe that war could be elbowed-out. He closed his eyes to realities just as our friend is doing to one of the greatest social evils in Western Australia to-day. He took the line of least resistance, and was one of the many visionaries whose inability to face facts left the Mother Country to face the most devastating war of all time practically in an unprepared condition.

Mr. SPEAKER: Is the hon. member replying to the debate?

Mrs. CARDELL-OLIVER: Yes, I am using nearly all the words used by the hon. member, so that I would not be held up in my reply. Had Ramsay MacDonald been a realist, this war might never have been fought because it would have been stamped out in its early stages by a prepared nation. The same thing may be said of social evils. They must be stamped out lest they overwhelm and take control. If evil is allowed to succeed, it spreads. The question before us is, shall we oppose it now; shall we wait until it is stronger or until it is too late? However, when Ramsay MacDonald spoke of elbowing out, he was instancing prohibition, of which the hon. member spoke. We must remember that it was the people of America who asked for prohibition, but we have not asked for gambling dens. The Government of the United States endeavoured to give the people what they wanted, and when prohibition was found to be impracticable, the Government allowed the people to repeal the law.

The analogy drawn between America's prohibition and our starting-price betting

is not a good one, firstly because people here have not asked for the betting shops, and a Bill or motion to abolish them would be absurd because they are already illegal places operating by the tacit consent of the Government, and not with the consent of the law or the consent of the people. All that this motion asks is for the people's right, namely the enforcement of the law. In quoting the hon. member's analogy I should like to ask whether he has ever visited Kansas. If he has, he would have been hard-pressed to find any alcohol to drink. There are no children in institutions there through the drunkenness of parents. Prohibition had been rigorously enforced in Kansas for 30 years before it was adopted by the other States of America. It was because of the prosperity, good government and contentment prevailing in that State that the other people of America were influenced to have prohibition. The fact is that Kansas had stamped out an evil. John Ruskin said—

Every day I am more sure of the mistake made by good people universally in trying to pull fallen people up instead of keeping the yet safe ones from tumbling after them.

This motion, if put into effect, will give youth a chance to remain safe and not tumble after the already fallen. It would give youth a chance to respect the law, and without that respect no State can survive. If the hon. member's suggestion is adopted that the avenue to crime or disillusionment through the starting-price shops should remain open so that the unsophisticated might learn that betting does not pay, I am sure he would find the pathway to the shops continually blocked with new students. He forgets that wisdom generally comes with age, but that there is a continuous stream of youth maturing daily; and surely it is the duty of age to protect youth from the pitfalls that have beset past generations and not hamper the social order by educating youth in the way that those who are older know does not pay. The hon. member instanced himself as having gambled first with cherry stones when a child, but I reply that when one is a child, one acts as a child. He also said that he always attended the races as a youth and that it did him no harm. I suggest, knowing Melbourne, that he did not go too often, as the course was inaccessible, but

had starting-price shops been located around the corner, it might have been more difficult to relate the experiences of his strength of character. In any event, there are always some strong men, and we legislate, not for the strong, but for the weak.

Another weakness in the hon. member's theory of allowing starting-price shops to remain open so that people might learn that betting does not pay is that the punter does not know when to cut his losses. Hope springs eternal in the human breast, and the bettor's hope is limitless. He therefore begs, borrows or steals for betting on that which he feels must win. Losses or gains do not cure him of betting. I have seen men arrive here by boats from England without boots, having bet those articles on the trip out. Economically the hon. member's theory is unsound because betting, especially amongst youth, creates discontent of honest work and increases taxation to keep thousands who but for their betting activities might be self-supporting. There is no need to give specific cases; many of our institutions tell the tale. The hon. member remarked that from time to time he had heard members of this House speaking about the respect that we ought to have for the law. That would be all right, he said, if properly understood, but people should be encouraged to recognise that there is a universal reign of law. I quite agree that there is a universal reign of law. Ages ago the law was self-preservation; we fought for bones, and the strongest got them, but in time we became civilised and christianised and the universal law of the jungle changed. Hundreds of thousands of ordinary people, nay millions, are sacrificing their lives because of that change.

This civilised law has elevated man to give rather than to take. All those men who leave our shores to fight go voluntarily to a probable death so that we who remain behind might live, but that law is not practised by those who eat, clothe and shelter themselves in the s.p. shops at the expense of others. It is not practised by those who live by the sweat of the other's brow and by breaking the law of the land to which he owes allegiance. The hon. member referred to the relaxation necessary in time of war. There is not a member in this House who would not give all the relaxation necessary to those who have joined forces, but for every soldier

that enters an s.p. shop there are a dozen civilians, and they intend to remain civilians. In any event, the married soldier has his pay allotted to his wife and children and the little that is left for him would not make the bookmaker rich. I think the soldier would be very glad to know that when he leaves these shores the temptation to act foolishly is not wantonly placed before those he leaves behind him. He leaves them in trust with us and expects legislators to make this a better place in which to live pending his return.

The hon. member argued that the poor gamble because of the monotony of their daily life. The rich people suffer from ennui; others because there is something to be gained by relieving the tedium of existence. He said people wanted to lend colour to their otherwise drab lives. Such arguments are mere rubbish. People gamble because they want to win and for that reason only. If democracy is such that our lives to be worth while must depend upon chance gains from another's losses and a breaking of the law to obtain that chance, it is time that such a democracy died for it would be rotten. As I have previously said in this Chamber, about 80 per cent of the married couples of this country live on the basic wage or less. If they gamble, they mostly deprive other poor families of their food, because, when the poor win, the money is taken from the poor. It must necessarily be so in a country where the majority of the people are poor. This certainly is not democratic. Consider the palatial buildings constructed in Perth out of bank balances built up in a few years mainly upon the losses of the poor.

The hon. member instances France as a betting nation. It is obvious that he is not well acquainted with the workers and peasants of France. The people of France are amongst the most hard-working and thrifty people of the world. Betting does not interest them. The 360 millions that went into France annually before the war did find a considerable avenue through casinos, but the money came from the playboys of Europe and America and did not come from the people of France. Again, the hon. member quoted Baden Baden. I happened to be there for some time, and many of the visitors were too sick to play, and those playing were wealthy Europeans and Americans. On the other

hand the people and workers of Baden Baden are thrifty, hard-working folk who do not gamble. If wealthy persons care to make betting transactions with other wealthy persons and if one of the parties loses, I am not concerned.

Hon. C. G. Latham: Some of the people there advertise gambling systems, don't they?

Mrs. CARDELL-OLIVER: The hon. member is thinking of Monte Carlo. What people do at Baden Baden is to get the curative waters of the place into their systems. However, my concern is for the people who are living on the breadline in this State.

Mr. Cross: You want one law for the rich and another law for the poor.

Mrs. CARDELL-OLIVER: They are encouraged by the present system to allow themselves to be robbed by those who live not on the stupid gambling of the rich but on the betting of the poor. The hon. member made a most astounding statement. He had been speaking of the advantages of betting and of starting-price shops, and said that Governments tried to restrict gambling because when too many people gambled at the same time and gambled too hard, it led to disaster. Is that logic? Is a Democratic Government to say to some people, "You stop gambling too hard," or to a crowd of punters, "You must wait until another crowd of punters finishes. it is not your turn"? Who is to decide when gambling is too high? Would it be a Government dependent for part of its revenue on gambling? I think not. The Government during this year has had approximately £30,000—I state the amount subject to correction—from gambling. The Government declares that every penny of revenue is vital to the national existence. I ask the Treasurer, is he prepared to enforce the law and forgo that amount? The Government will say that that revenue is a bogey. I say it is not. To depend upon such a form of revenue is short-sighted policy. A statistician would tell the Treasurer that it costs much more in money than the Government receives from this class of revenue to provide for the human derelicts and their dependants made so by the unreasoning policy of deliberately causing demoralisation. I know dozens of homes where absolute poverty exists. I would like to take the

Treasurer and some of his Ministers through certain electorates, and show them—

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member is not now replying to what has been said in the course of the debate.

Mrs. CARDELL-OLIVER: I am sorry, Sir. I know of dozens of homes where the breadwinner spends a considerable portion of his earnings in starting-price betting shops. I also know many cases of young men living on their impoverished or pensioner parents because their wages go to the starting-price shops. I may be told that the parents could turn them out; but would any of us do so? I think, not. I ask why are there so many children undernourished in this State, where we should have only healthy children? Why are hospitals for children filled? Why must the Government through lotteries supply woolen blankets to poor homes? Why should there be 5,000 children undernourished in a population of only 450,000? I do not suggest for a moment that all poverty is caused by drink or gambling, but I do suggest that a great deal of poverty results from those causes, and particularly from starting-price betting, at the present time. The £30,000 revenue collected from that source is a mere mite compared with the hundreds of thousands of pounds paid out by the Treasury in relief, of which amount much could be saved. I know there are two starting-price shops in the suburbs run entirely by women. In fact, the other day in the police court a woman was fined for keeping a starting-price shop.

Mr. SPEAKER: Is this replying to the debate, or introducing new matter?

Mrs. CARDELL-OLIVER: I do not think it is new.

Mr. SPEAKER: I do not think the hon. member is at present replying to the debate. I have given the hon. member a good deal of latitude.

Mrs. CARDELL-OLIVER: Children can be seen running to these shops to take their mothers' bets. What is good for the goose is good for the gander. If the men can keep starting-price shops, women can keep starting-price shops. But a State that permits demoralisation of women is headed for disaster. No democratic Government can decide who may gamble and who may not. I have it from authentic sources that in some mining towns 50 per cent. of the wages paid out on payday—

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! The hon. member is not now replying to anything said during the debate. There has been nothing said about mining towns.

Mrs. CARDELL-OLIVER: The hon. member I refer to comes from a mining town.

Mr. SPEAKER: But that member said nothing about that in the debate.

Mrs. CARDELL-OLIVER: I am going to show where the hon. member said that he would like fair play for starting-price shops in the country. Is that in order?

Mr. SPEAKER: I think the hon. member is getting well away from replying to the debate.

Mrs. CARDELL-OLIVER: I will quote the very words—

I am opposed to the motion. I am opposed to permitting starting-price betting under license. I prefer the continuance of that discreet administration which has kept it within bounds, and kept it on the surface, and which has permitted freer play in those parts of the country where freer play finds justification. I am opposed to the rigorous suppression of starting-price betting as we know it.

Surely that does apply to the country as well as to the town. The only comment I can make is that—

Mr. J. H. Smith: On a point of order. Have we not had sufficient of this tripe?

Mr. SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. J. H. Smith: The hon. member reads speeches to the Chamber by the hour. Surely she should give us her own opinions.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! I ask the hon. member to resume his seat. What he has raised is not a point of order. An hon. member is not permitted to read speeches, but there is no point of order.

Mrs. CARDELL-OLIVER: I regret very much at this late hour wearying any hon. member, and therefore I will let the motion go to the vote now. The only object of the motion was to discover which members believe in enforcement of the law and which do not. It is quite evident that some members do not, and I would like to know who they are.

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

Ayes	17
Noes	19
					—
Majority against					2
					—

AYES.	
Mr. Abbott	Mr. McLarty
Mr. Boyle	Mr. Patrick
Mrs. Cardell-Oliver	Mr. Sampson
Mr. Hill	Mr. Seward
Mr. Hughes	Mr. Shearn
Mr. Keenan	Mr. Watts
Mr. Latham	Mr. Willmott
Mr. Mann	Mr. Doney
Mr. McDonald	(Teller.)
NOES.	
Mr. Coverley	Mr. Raphael
Mr. Cross	Mr. Rodoreda
Mr. W. Hegney	Mr. F. C. L. Smith
Mr. Holman	Mr. J. H. Smith
Mr. Lambert	Mr. Triot
Mr. Leahy	Mr. Willcock
Mr. Marshall	Mr. Wise
Mr. Millington	Mr. Withers
Mr. Needham	Mr. Wilson
Mr. Pantan	(Teller.)

Question thus negatived.

MOTION—AGRICULTURAL PRODUCTS ACT.

To Disallow Regulations.

Debate resumed from the 30th October on the following motion by Mr. Watts (Kataning):—

That the regulations made under the Agricultural Products Act, 1929, and published in the "Government Gazette" on the 6th day of September, 1940, and laid on the Table of the House on the 10th day of September, 1940, be and are hereby disallowed.

MR. SAMPSON (Swan) [10.15]: I much regret that this motion has been brought forward. We have for years past been doing our utmost to encourage the poultry and egg industry, and there is absolutely no justification for an attempt to have these regulations disallowed. If the motion is carried, it would give a bad set-back to the poultry-farming industry. The process of candling, grading and stamping which it is proposed to adopt with regard to eggs for local sale is already in force in connection with the packing of eggs for export. All eggs for export are candled, graded and stamped with a registered stamp, designating the packing floor and the number of the candler. The many faults found in eggs submitted for export by the best producers make it evident that the candling of eggs for local consumption will result in the consumer receiving a better quality egg and at the same time will assist the poorer class of producer to recognise the faults in his consignments. That will tend to increase efficiency; and increased efficiency means bigger returns for the producer who remedies the faults. The statement has been made that

the cost of candling, grading and stamping eggs would be high, but I am informed by an authority which cannot be questioned that to-day this work would not cost in excess of three-farthings to one penny per dozen. This amount would cover the wages costs under the Factories and Shops Act. No opposition is offered to the regulations by those in the trade, nor by the majority of the producers, particularly those whose production is on a scale which makes the industry an important one to them. The regulations will prove of great advantage both to the producer and the seller. This season country supplies have increased to about 1,700 cases a week, each case containing an average of 25 dozen eggs. During the cool period of the year country eggs are fairly dependable, but the same cannot be said of them as summer advances. Some stores secure their supplies direct from the country, so it may be presumed that country prices are lower than those charged in the suburban and outer suburban districts. A low price for eggs when the quality is uncertain is by no means to be commended, because a bad egg has the effect of discouraging consumers to purchase eggs. I realise that eggs are often disposed of under a barter system. Producers take their eggs to certain stores and receive in return groceries and other requirements.

Mr. Cross: Are you opposing the motion?

Mr. SAMPSON: When country eggs are available buyers will purchase only in the cool weather. A spell of hot weather, such as we had early in November, causes a definite slump in the price of country eggs. Only buyers who are prepared to take a risk would dare to purchase them. Candling, grading, stamping and cleaning are for the protection of the consumer; and, when the consumer is satisfied, the demand for eggs increases. Chickens in eggs have reached the market. A chicken was actually hatched in the markets. When the case was opened, the chicken was picking its way out of the shell. That is striking proof of the necessity for candling. The chicken I mention became quite a pet in the market. Unfortunately—because it provided an example of what could happen when candling is not compulsory—the chicken was run over by a passing vehicle.

Mr. W. Hegney: Was it killed?

Mr. SAMPSON: It is said that a Katanning firm sends its best eggs to Kalgoorlie. The second quality is sent to the Westralian Farmers, which candles, grades and cleans them.

The Minister for Lands: Did you say Katanning?

Mr. SAMPSON: Yes.

The Minister for Lands: Not Canning?

Mr. SAMPSON: No. There are in the Canning district many egg-producing firms.

The Premier: You are getting close to home.

Mr. Watts: Do you suggest there are none at Katanning?

Mr. SAMPSON: I have already said that it was stated a well-known Katanning firm sends its best eggs to Kalgoorlie.

The Minister for Mines: Did the chicken come from Katanning?

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. SAMPSON: I cannot say where the chicken came from, but having been hatched in a closed case, it was regarded as a classic instance. The rejects sent by the Katanning firm are pulped, and the third grade eggs go to the markets. Imagine third-grade eggs being purchased by some unfortunate small storekeeper, who, in the absence of these regulations, would sell this bad food to the public! It is definitely stated that the eggs sent to Kalgoorlie depress prices. The usual price paid to producers is 1s. 2d. per dozen. I know something about egg production in South Australia. "Red Comb" eggs sold by the South Australian Farmers' Union enjoy a splendid reputation. The Farmers' Union is the producers' own company. It deals in many lines and plays havoc with the Western Australian market. I cannot imagine any member desiring that these regulations should be disallowed.

The Minister for Mines: Hear, hear!

Mr. SAMPSON: Reverting to the "Red Comb" eggs, the quality is such as to prevent sales of Western Australian lines, while assuring a market for the South Australian product at Kalgoorlie and throughout the goldfields. It is a fact that some storekeepers who deal in "Red Comb" eggs will not handle the local product. I can give the names of some dealers on the goldfields who will not handle Western Australian uncandled, uncleaned, unstamped and ungraded eggs. If any member desires to know

the names of the dealers I will let him have them privately.

The Minister for Lands: Is the Country Party divided on the motion?

Mr. SAMPSON: I cannot say. Why should not Western Australian eggs be dependable?

Mr. Marshall: Are you going to blame us for the fowls' neglect?

Mr. SAMPSON: I will not blame the hon. member for anything to do with egg production, but I hope he will vote against the motion. Let me point out that in South Australia the candling of eggs is not compulsory; but the egg dealers there are not so lacking in knowledge as to sell eggs uncandled, ungraded, unstamped and uncleaned. "Red Comb" eggs are in great demand and fetch the highest prices. A motion for disallowance of the regulations has already been defeated in another place and I hope this motion will meet with the same fate. In order that the egg producers in the suburban and outer suburban districts and in the country may be placed on an equal footing, these regulations certainly should become law. I doubt whether the supporters of the motion would willingly purchase uncandled eggs if candled eggs were available. No housewife would buy an uncandled egg if it were in her power to buy the right article. It has been pointed out to me by those who understand, or by those who have been closely associated with the production of eggs, that on occasion a worm may find its way into an egg. There is a stage in the production of an egg when it is possible for foreign substances to make an entry. Members can imagine the nauseating effect. I will not dwell on it further; I have said sufficient. Improper feeding makes for poor eggs and when eggs are uncandled, eggs with blood streaks, pale yolks and so on are consumed. To detect defects is impossible unless eggs are candled. I have very much more matter on the subject, but I do not think there is any need for me to proceed further. I am convinced the motion was moved under a misunderstanding. It would be a great setback to the industry if the regulations were disallowed, and I hope the motion will be defeated and consequently that those engaged in egg production will have the support which the regulations would give.

Question put and negatived.

BILL—BILLS OF SALE ACT AMENDMENT.

Council's Amendment.

Amendment made by the Council now considered.

In Committee.

Mr. Marshall in the Chair; Mr. Cross in charge of the Bill.

Clause 2—Add the following proviso at the end of the clause:—

Provided that nothing in this section contained shall apply to any bill of sale granted by any person or company engaged in any business or trade and who or which has in his or its possession goods or chattels of the class or description hereinbefore mentioned and which goods or chattels are held, used, or traded in for the purpose of such business or trade.

Mr. CROSS: I move—

That the amendment be agreed to.

I have no objection to the amendment.

Question put and passed; the Council's amendment agreed to.

Resolution reported, the report adopted, and a message accordingly returned to the Council.

MOTION—RAILWAYS.

Free Transport for War Service Personnel.

Debate resumed from the 30th October on the following motion by Mr. Watts (Katanning):—

That in the opinion of this House, the Government should give immediate favourable consideration to the issue to members of the forces, enlisted for active service overseas, of free passes over Government railways to enable them to visit their homes when on leave.

THE PREMIER (Hon. J. C. Willcock—Geraldton) [10.35]: As members are aware, representations on this subject were made to the Government and the matter was taken up with the Railway Department and the military authorities with a view to favourable arrangements being made in regard to concessional travelling for soldiers. The proposals have not been put into effect yet, but we hope that in a day or two some finality will be reached. A conference was held between officials of the Railway Department and the representatives of the military, and I hope satisfactory arrangements will be made.

Mr. Doney: Is there any likelihood of the concessions being extended to members of the militia and to garrison soldiers?

The PREMIER: That was not referred to in the motion but can be discussed on its merits. The general expression of opinion by members of this House was that the Government should provide concessional rates for members of the A.I.F. We attempted to make arrangements five or six weeks ago, and I am hopeful that, as a result of recent negotiations, the spirit of the motion will be given effect to. In the circumstances, I do not think there is any occasion to proceed with the motion.

MR. WATTS (Katanning—in reply) [10.37]: I propose to reply to certain observations made when the motion was discussed recently. I do not suggest that the attempted arrangements referred to by the Premier will not go a very great distance towards fulfilling what I had in mind, if they are brought into operation. However, as they are not yet in operation I doubt whether the House would be well advised simply to have the motion withdrawn because I understand from what the Premier said that difficulty is being experienced with the Commonwealth authorities, and it would surely not be detrimental to the Government's attempt to bring the two authorities concerned to an agreement if the Assembly passed the motion. Be that as it may, there are still one or two observations which were made and which I think I am entitled and intend to reply to. They were not made by any member of the Treasury bench because I think none of the Ministers, except the Premier, has made any reference to the motion.

The Premier: The Cabinet was aware of the negotiations being conducted.

Mr. WATTS: I quite understand the Premier's position. The first point which I wish to refer to is this: Some doubt was expressed as to the bona fides of a statement I made that I had introduced the motion to the House in consequence of a request made to me at a meeting held at Katanning by the Katanning District Soldiers' Welfare Association. I introduced the motion on the 2nd or 3rd October, and have here the letter to which I then referred but which I did not have with me at that time. This letter confirms the request made at the meet-

ing to which I have referred. It is dated the 2nd October and is signed by the hon. secretary of the association. It reads as follows:—

At the meeting of the committee of the Katanning District Soldiers' Welfare Association held on Monday last, I was directed to communicate with you with a view to having an emphatic protest lodged against the system now in force, whereby soldiers on leave, apart from final leave, are charged heavy railway fares when travelling on the State Government Railways.

My committee is of the opinion that, as a married man only receives an allowance of 2s. per day whilst in camp, it is very difficult for him in the present circumstances to travel a long distance to his home and back to camp. A statement was made in the House quite recently to the effect that if these fares were not charged it would mean a big loss to the State Government Railways. My committee desires me to point out that if there was no war and these men had not volunteered for active service they would not require to travel by train from the camp. My committee therefore considers that these men should be permitted to travel free on the State Railways, and they would be glad if you would do whatever you can to have this brought about.

That is point No. 1. Secondly, a statement was made that I was intimately acquainted with the action being taken by the member for Collie (Mr. Wilson). The hon. member knows as well as I know and he knew then that I knew nothing whatever about it. Had I been approached by the hon. member, as were others who are apparently not members of the Returned Soldiers League, I might never have risen to move the motion. I do not wish to enlarge on the matter, except to repeat that both of us knew quite well that I had not been informed of what was being done. That brings me to a third observation, made by one of the members who addressed himself to the debate, namely, that it could be regarded as the special privilege of members of the Returned Soldiers' League to deal with matters of this kind. I have the greatest regard and respect—and, in fact, I could put it in stronger terms than that—for members of the R.S.L. Those with whom I come in contact in my own district are well aware of the sentiments I entertain towards them and their efforts for the good of this community and especially those who took part in the 1914 war. I decline, however, to allow them to claim—though I fully recognise their bona fides in that claim—that they are the only people entitled—as

was suggested by an hon. member—to interest themselves in these matters. To put it quite shortly, it is the privilege of all members of this House and of all citizens in this State—myself included—to do what we can in our humble way to assist our soldiers to improve their conditions and generally to look after their welfare. I do not propose to deal further with the question beyond repeating that it will do no harm for the House to carry the motion and so back up the efforts of the Government in its negotiations with the Federal authorities to have suitable arrangements made in connection with this matter.

Question put and passed.

MOTION—JEHOVAH'S WITNESSES.

Order of the Day read for the resumption from the 6th November of the debate on the following motion by Mr. Holman (Forrest):—

That, in the opinion of this House, the organisation known as "Jehovah's Witnesses" is not acting in the best interests of the nation and that action should be taken by the Federal Government to control or ban the operations of the organisation; and that the Federal Government be notified accordingly.

Question put and negatived.

MOTION—UNEMPLOYMENT.

Relief Work and Sustenance.

Debate resumed from the 20th November on the following motion by Mr. McDonald (West Perth)—

That in the opinion of this House the Government should review the conditions governing relief work and sustenance for unemployed, particularly as to rates of sustenance for children.

Mr. McDONALD (West Perth—in reply). [10.44]: The House is indebted to the Minister for Works for the exhaustive survey of the position of relief workers given by him on 20th November. It is the most informative utterance of the kind I think we have heard. He must have gone to a great deal of trouble to give all the details he did. Since that speech I believe the council of the trade unions in this State passed a motion urging the Government to make some increase in the sustenance rate paid to unemployed men. I am pleased to

see that it supports the suggestion I made that the sustenance rate in particular was a subject meriting review at the hands of the Government. At this stage I do not propose to deal in detail with the survey of the position made by the Minister. As apparently the council of trade unions also feels that the sustenance rate is one of those subjects that will merit further review by the Government in the light of the financial obligations which I know rest upon it, there is no necessity for me to say more. I commend the motion to the House, and hope the Government will accept the suggestion that there should be a review of these various aspects of the unemployment position.

Question put and passed.

BILL—UNIVERSITY ACT AMENDMENT.

Second Reading—Order Discharged.

Order of the day read for the resumption from the 25th November of the debate on the second reading.

HON. C. G. LATHAM (York) [10.46]: As I understand a Royal Commission will be appointed to inquire into matters relative to the University, I move—

That the order of the day be discharged from the notice paper.

Motion put and passed: order discharged.

BILL—MEDICAL ACT AMENDMENT.

Council's Message.

Message from the Council received and read notifying the Assembly that it did not insist on its amendment.

MOTION—WANT OF CONFIDENCE.

Common Gaming Houses and Licensed Premises.

MR. HUGHES (East Perth) [10.48]: I move—

That since the Government has failed to take the necessary action to ensure the enforcement or non-enforcement of the law, with equal vigilance and impartiality as between the re-

spective citizens of the State, in respect to common gaming houses and licensed premises, and, because the Government has failed to take steps to procure the administration of the Licensing Act with impartiality and good faith, in the matter of the granting or refusing of new licenses, and for other reasons, the Government no longer possess the confidence of this House.

Seeing that members apparently do not desire to be harassed by another lengthy speech to-night, I move this motion formally.

MR. SPEAKER: As there is no seconder, the motion lapses.

Sitting suspended from 10.49 p.m. to 2.20 a.m.

BILL—STREET COLLECTIONS (REGULATION).

Council's Message.

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

BILL—BUSH FIRES ACT AMENDMENT.

Council's Message.

Message from the Council notifying that it did not insist on its amendments Nos. 1, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7 and 9, but insisted on Nos. 8 and 10, now considered.

In Committee.

Mr. Marshall in the Chair; the Minister for Lands in charge of the Bill.

No. 8. Clause 11—Delete paragraph (b) of proposed new Subsection (1) of Section 14.

No. 10. Clause 11—In paragraph (d), on page 8: Delete the word "and" after the word "feet" in line 15, and substitute the word "or."

On motions by the Minister for Lands, the foregoing amendments were no longer disagreed to.

Resolutions reported, the report adopted and a message accordingly returned to the Council.

BILL—GROWERS CHARGE.*Council's Amendments.*

Returned from the Council with a schedule of three amendments which were now considered.

In Committee.

Mr. Marshall in the Chair; Mr. Boyle in charge of the Bill.

No. 1. Clause 3: Delete paragraph (ii).

Mr. BOYLE: I move—

That the amendment be agreed to.

The paragraph refers to the 4d. per bushel on wheat marketed.

Question put and passed; the Council's amendment agreed to.

No. 2. Clause 3: Delete all the words after the word "sale" in line 28, page 2, down to and including the word "amendments" in line 30.

Mr. BOYLE: I move—

That the amendment be agreed to.

The deletion of the words does not vitally affect the clause.

Question put and passed; the Council's amendment agreed to.

No. 3. Clause 5: Insert after the word "them" in line 19, page 3, the following words:—"in such shares and proportions as such persons may mutually agree."

Mr. BOYLE: I move—

That the amendment be agreed to.

This is really a clarifying amendment, which in the opinion of the Council renders the meaning clearer.

Question put and passed; the Council's amendment agreed to.

Resolutions reported, the report adopted and a message accordingly returned to the Council.

COMPLIMENTARY REMARKS.

THE PREMIER (Hon. J. C. Willcock—Geraldton) [2.35]: The business of the session is now concluded, and it only remains for me to express to you, Mr. Speaker, to the Chairman of Committees and his deputies, and to the officers of the House and the

"Hansard" staff my wish that they may have as happy and prosperous a Christmas as may be in the serious circumstances in which the Empire finds itself at the present time. I trust that during the year 1941 peace will rule again among the nations of the world. We are confident that when that time arrives it will be because the fight which the Empire has put up for all the nations of the world will have been won. I am sure that whatever sacrifice has to be made will be borne cheerfully. I hope that members will continue, as they have done during the months Britain and the Dominions have been engaged in the war, to give a lead to the people of Western Australia towards supplying the money and other essentials to the success of the war effort, so that the Empire will emerge victorious. I have to thank the Leader of the Opposition and the Opposition generally, and also the Leader of the National Party and the members of that party, for the assistance they have given to the Government during this session. We have endeavoured to arrange the business so that there would be ample time to do whatever business was put before the House. Such an ideal cannot be obtained without the whole-hearted support of hon. members generally. I wish to express my gratitude for the way in which the business has been dealt with, and I trust it will not be necessary to call hon. members together before the usual time. If that should prove necessary by reason of some emergency, I feel sure members will be prepared to come together at short notice. Mr. Speaker, I tender you my wishes for as happy a Christmas as is possible in the circumstances of the present time.

HON. C. G. LATHAM (York) [2.38]: I desire to associate myself with the remarks of the Premier, and to take this opportunity, although it is two or three weeks off Christmas, of expressing to you, Mr. Speaker, the wishes of this side of the Chamber that the Christmas season will prove bright for you, and also for the Chairman of Committees and the Staff of the House. We have not had a very strenuous session, although a worrying time is involved for anyone associated with the government of a country, even though sitting on the Opposition side, when everything is doubtful as to what is ahead of us. I associate myself also with

the remark of the Premier that whatever may be ahead of us we will accept in the true British manner, hoping and believing that because right is on our side we shall be victorious. Whether before the House meets again we shall see peace re-established, as we hope it will be, is doubtful, but certainly we shall have a great deal of work to do during the reconstruction period. I suppose at this time we cannot help thinking of those members who are laid aside through illness. The member for Boulder (Hon. P. Collier) has been, almost needless to say, an outstanding figure of this Parliament for many years. We missed the hon. gentleman during the session. We also missed for a time the Minister for Labour (Hon. A. R. G. Hawke), who was absent through illness. We wish both gentlemen a speedy return to good health. To the members of the staff of the House I desire to express my highest appreciation of their services. One thing we can boast of is the staff we have; they have rendered good service throughout the session. More particularly does that apply to "Hansard." The members of that staff have spent many weary hours, and have shown very great patience indeed, in carrying out their duties. They have accomplished their task exceedingly well, and I am pleased to take this opportunity to express our appreciation of their services during the session. I certainly hope that they will enjoy the holiday season. To the Premier, his Ministers and members sitting on the Government side of the House, I tender my thanks for the kindness and courtesy extended to me throughout the year. The session has been rather pleasant and we seem to have worked together most harmoniously. In doing that, we have given a lead to the people and have shown how united we are in promoting our common objectives. That applies equally to the Leader of the National Party and the members sitting behind him. We are grateful for the courtesy, consideration and tolerance shown by members sitting on the cross benches. To my own members I am specially grateful for the assistance rendered to me. They have made my task much lighter by taking some of the work off my shoulders. I hope they will enjoy the holiday season that is ahead of them, and I wish everyone the very best they can derive from the festive season.

Mr. McDONALD (West Perth) [242]: On behalf of the members who sit with me, as well as on my own account, I wish to join with the Premier and the Leader of the Opposition in tendering to you, Mr. Speaker, the Chairman of Committees, and the Deputy Chairmen our thanks for the consideration and assistance we have experienced throughout the session, to the House staff for their assistance and guidance on so many occasions, and to the "Hansard" staff for the skilful way in which they have managed to record what has been said and done in this Chamber, sometimes under very difficult conditions. My thanks are also tendered to the representatives of the Press for the judgment they have exercised in the very responsible task of condensing the speeches of members and conveying to the public the pith of them throughout the session. I think, Mr. Speaker, we have endeavoured to co-operate to the best of our ability in the business of the country and of the House at a time when we feel that the co-operation of all sections of the community is of the utmost value, and indeed vital, to our emergence from the ordeal with which the Empire is now confronted. I express to the Premier and his colleagues as well as to those sitting on the Government side of the House, to the Leader of the Opposition and those who sit with him, and to my own colleagues, my very best wishes for their good health and all the happiness that they can expect in such times as these and until we again reach the haven of peace. I thank all members for the consideration they have extended to me in the conduct of the affairs of the House, and, in particular, my own members for the assistance that has been forthcoming from them at all times in connection with the affairs of our party.

MR. SPEAKER [244]: On behalf of the Chairman of Committees, the Deputy Chairmen, the officers of the House and the "Hansard" staff, I thank the Premier, the Leader of the Opposition and the Leader of the National Party for their kindly references. My ill-health during the earlier part of the session made the task of the Chairman of Committees and the Deputy Chairmen much more exacting than usual, and I am grateful to them for the assistance they rendered while I was absent on

sick leave. Before we meet again, I sincerely hope the nation will have emerged from the present conflict into an honourable peace and that the State will, by then, have entered upon a new era of prosperity. I congratulate members generally on their conduct during the session. It has been splendid, and I thank them for the respect they have always extended to the Chair. I wish all members and their families the compliments of the season.

ADJOURNMENT—SPECIAL.

THE PREMIER (Hon. J. C. Wilcock—Geraldton) [2.45]: I move—

That the House at its rising adjourn to a date to be fixed by Mr. Speaker.

Question put and passed.

House adjourned at 2.46 a.m. (Friday).