

It is suggested by the Crown Law authorities that the words "Coming into operation of the principal Act" should read "prior to the commencement of this Act." I move an amendment—

That the words "coming into operation of the principal" be struck out and "commencement of this" inserted in lieu.

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

Clause 4—Amendment of Section 4:

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: I move an amendment—

That after "Act" in line 5 the words "or is intended to carry out such objects as aforesaid" be inserted.

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

Clauses 5 and 6—agreed to.

Title—agreed to.

Bill reported with amendments.

*House adjourned at 9.23 p.m.*

## Legislative Assembly,

*Wednesday, 28th September, 1921.*

	Page
Question: Oil Prospecting Areas ... ..	1000
Bills: Dredging License, 1R. ... ..	1000
Criminal Code Amendment, 2R., Cont. ... ..	1013
Adoption of Children Act Amendment, Council's Message ... ..	1029
Motions: Speaker's Gallery, Privileges to Women ... ..	1000
Forests Act and Millars Company, to inquire... ..	1009
Wheat for Local Consumption ... ..	1022
Return: Public Service, Cost of Leave ... ..	1019
Railways, Privilege and Free Passes ... ..	1019
Federation and the State, Council's Message... ..	1029

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

### QUESTION—OIL PROSPECTING AREAS.

Mr. A. THOMSON asked the Minister for Mines: 1, Is it his intention to place on the Table of the House a map showing concessions granted for prospecting for oil in the State? 2, The approximate area of the concessions? 3, The amount charged per year per area? 4, The labour conditions required under

the Act and subsequent regulations to hold same? 5, If any labour conditions—are they being complied with? 6, Can forfeiture be claimed failing such compliance? 7, In case of dissatisfaction, is there any Court of Appeal other than the Minister? 8, Can a syndicate holding eight or ten million acres work with a few men on, say, 10 or 20 acres, and hold the balance against any prospecting by Australian prospectors? 9, Having found oil on a concession held by another syndicate say 25 to 50 miles away, where the syndicate is operating, and able to prove that the syndicate holding the concession have never attempted to prospect that area, can the finder apply for and obtain a small concession to prospect and develop his find? 10, The Federal Government having offered £50,000 as a reward to the finder of payable oil, is it a fact that the State Government have given practically the whole of the State in concession to about 15 syndicates and threaten with heavy penalties anyone prospecting for oil although unable to obtain concessions, thus preventing any but the favoured syndicate participating? 11, As certain areas held by concessionaires are not being prospected, will he consider the advisableness of altering the regulation to permit of an oil prospector entering on such concession and prospecting for oil?

The MINISTER FOR MINES replied: 1 and 2, My intention in this regard is to comply with the wishes of the House, and will therefore do so if it is desired. 3, See Section 6 of Act No. 50, 1920. 4, See Section 7 of Act No. 50, 1920, Regulation 25d, copy of which was laid on the Table of the House on 28th July last. 5, As far as I am officially aware, yes. It is within the province of any person to apply for forfeiture; if it is considered that such conditions are not being complied with, action may be taken under Subsection 2, Section 7, of the Act, No. 50, 1920. 6, Answered by No. 5. 7, No. See Subsections 2 and 3 of Section 7 Act No. 50. 8, Yes, if it is considered reasonable, although provision is made for reduction of the area. See Clause (c), Regulation 25 (b). 9, Answered by No. 8. 10, Concessions only cover Crown lands, and I am not aware of any threat as suggested in the question. 11, The position is already met by Clause (c) of Regulation 25 (b).

### BILL—DREDGING LICENSE.

Introduced by the Premier and read a first time.

### MOTION—SPEAKER'S GALLERY, PRIVILEGES TO WOMEN.

Mrs. COWAN (West Perth) [4.35]: I move—

That in the opinion of this House the privilege of admission to the Speaker's gallery should be extended to women as well as to men.

The constitution of the House has altered since the last elections and women are now admitted into this Chamber, as members, if they can get here. It is somewhat anomalous to find that there are two galleries for men and only one for women. A member is able to extend privileges to male members of the community, but is unable to extend any privilege whatever to women. It seems to me that is hardly what was intended; nor is it quite a fair thing to women that we should not be able to show them that distinct attention—which it is supposed to be—of giving them the privilege of sitting in the Speaker's gallery on occasions. I do not think the Speaker's gallery will be overcrowded because, of the two, the public gallery is probably the more comfortable. It is the mere fact that women are not admitted that makes them wish to have that stigma removed. It seems rather an absurd position in some ways to most of us. To-day in discussing the position with a gentleman, it was explained to me that the Almighty never intended women to be put in the position that I was in to-day. I was obliged to remind him that not only did the Bible tell us that it was not a good thing for man to be alone, but that "male and female created He them and gave them dominion over all things." I do not think He intended that special privileges should be granted to one section of the community which could not reasonably be granted to the other. I understand that in New South Wales women are admitted to the Speaker's gallery. I have been told that by a woman who has been admitted there. In the Commonwealth Parliament women are admitted to the galleries. I do not think the Speaker's gallery will be overcrowded, because after all there will be only one woman in the Chamber who will be likely to give the necessary permit. I do not think other members of the House will rush the privilege at once and fill the gallery with women.

The Premier: You never know!

Mrs. COWAN: If they do it will not be the fault of women. I understand that quite lately, since this change in our constitution occurred, one or two women have been privileged to be admitted either to the gallery of the Upper House or upon the floor of the Upper House. I do not wish to stress the matter much further, but I do think it is not quite fair to the women that they should not be given equal privileges with the men in this House. They are not admitted to the bar of the House to plead on important occasions, if there happens to be anything very much affecting their interests. I think it was intended that all that should be done away with when equal citizenship rights were given to my sex, and enabled one of us to get here. I hope the motion will be carried and that the House will support me in what I am asking.

Mr. J. THOMSON (Claremont) [4.39]: I second the motion. I cannot under-

stand, Sir, why you gave the ruling you did the other day. Although I should be glad to see the ladies beyond the bar of the House I do not want to see them on this side of the bar of the House. Upon the Address-in-reply there was something in particular I wanted to say and I should like to say it now, but perhaps it might be just as well for me to refrain from doing so. I have much pleasure in supporting the motion.

Mr. O'LOGHLEN (Forrest) [4.41]: I anticipate that this motion will probably be carried, but I hope that it will not be carried in the form in which it has been moved.

Mr. Underwood: What other form would you suggest?

Mr. O'LOGHLEN: I will indicate it if the hon. member will exercise a little patience. I move an amendment—

That after the word "gallery" the words "and all other galleries" be inserted.

If hon. members desire to extend to ladies the right and privilege of sitting in the Speaker's gallery, then I think that the men should have the right to sit in the gallery now occupied only by ladies. There is no reason why we should have a law for the segregation of either men or women into particular groups. In the Federal Parliament both sexes sit together in the Speaker's gallery and in the public galleries.

Mr. Underwood: Do they do any harm?

Mr. O'LOGHLEN: I am not opposing the motion. I say we should not stop half way. We have the right to stipulate that if ladies are enabled to go into the Speaker's gallery, the men should be free also to accompany their women folk into the public galleries of the House. That is a fair proposition and I think the House will agree to it. No argument can be advanced against it. We do not want to set up any sex distinction. If this motion is carried in its present form it will have the effect of setting up a sex distinction, because while ladies will be privileged to go into the Speaker's gallery they will still have the sole right to occupy the public gallery on the left of the Chamber. I do not think it just that they should have the sole right to occupy the gallery for themselves. It is of no use going half way. The amendment will enable people to sit together and not separate into different groups.

Mr. UNDERWOOD (Pilbara) [4.46]: I am in favour of the motion, for the amendment does not quite meet the case. The amendment would require to be extended so that men would be allowed into the women's gallery as well.

Mr O'Loughlen: The amendment provides for that.

The Minister for Mines: No, it does not. It means that the women will keep their own gallery but can take seats in the gallery on the other side of the Chamber.

Mr. UNDERWOOD: On reflection, I think the member for Forrest (Mr. O'Loughlen) will see that that is the position. Our desire should be to throw our galleries open to all sections, irrespective of sex.

The Premier: That is wrong.

Mr. UNDERWOOD: That may be so, but that is what the member for Forrest desires to attain. Regarding the Speaker's gallery, with all due respect to yourself, Mr. Speaker, to whom I have always, or mostly always, paid respect, I contend that the member for West Perth (Mrs. Cowan) has the advantage of me under existing circumstances, seeing that she can have her husband admitted to the Speaker's gallery while I am debarred from having my wife admitted there. Having determined that women shall have a vote as well as men, and having admitted the natural corollary that women shall have the right to sit in Parliament equally with the men, the admission of women to the Speaker's gallery follows in natural sequence. Under the present arrangement, we make a sex distinction. I will admit that that distinction was formulated ages ago and since then, we have followed in the same groove. However, women can be elected to Parliament and they are here. I cannot help hearing remarks which the member for Claremont (Mr. J. Thomson) is passing.

Mr. J. Thomson: I said they should never have come here.

Mr. Willcock: Not "they."

Mr. UNDERWOOD: The member for Geraldton (Mr. Willcock) may know more about it than I do but I say it is a question of "they."

The Minister for Mines: They will all come.

Mr. UNDERWOOD: That is the position—if they can get elected. Once elected, however, women should have the same privileges in the House as the men.

Mr. Sampson: That is not denied.

Mr. UNDERWOOD: It is denied. With the election of the member for West Perth (Mrs. Cowan), we have to go further and admit the women to the same privileges in the galleries as are possessed by men. If we follow the position to a logical conclusion, and I see no reason why we should not, we should cut out any—

Mr. O'Loughlen: Exclusive rights.

Mr. UNDERWOOD: That is the position. If we give the women equal rights they will be entitled to gain admission to any gallery—if they can; if they cannot gain admission, they will have to stop outside. I see no danger underlying the amendment. I trust the motion will be carried.

Mr. DURACK (Kimberley) [4.51]: I regret that the member for West Perth has had occasion to bring her motion before the House. I think it is out of order. Time honoured custom has laid it down that there are certain privileges to which the Speaker is entitled. The motion we should be discussing is rather one as to whether we should take those privileges away from the Speaker. If

the House decides that Mr. Speaker shall forego those privileges, then the motion by the member for West Perth might come forward in due course.

Mr. RICHARDSON (Subiaco) [4.52]: I desire to support the amendment, which will secure what we are aiming at, namely, that women shall have equal privileges to men in the galleries.

Mr. SPEAKER: The language of the amendment will not cover that position.

Mr. O'Loughlen: I intend to strike out a couple of words, which will have the effect of meeting the case.

Mr. RICHARDSON: I am surprised at the remarks by the member for Kimberley (Mr. Durack). If I remember aright, Mr. Speaker, you gave a ruling to the effect that this House could alter any decision of this character. Therefore, the member for West Perth (Mrs. Cowan) is right in bringing her motion before the notice of this Chamber, with the addendum moved by the member for Forrest. For many years we have been endeavouring to break down sex distinctions and following on the extension of the franchise to women, the last Parliament enacted a measure whereby women are now allowed to sit in Parliament. The motion and amendment merely take another step forward to afford women equal privileges with the men.

Mr. O'Loughlen: May I explain, Mr. Speaker, that I propose to move to strike out all words after "women" and insert "and men."

The PREMIER (Hon. Sir James Mitchell—Northam) [4.54]: Before the House carries the amendment, we should consider how it will operate. The arrangements, which have obtained till now, have worked well so far as the women are concerned. In other Houses of Parliament similar arrangements have worked well. Men and women do sit in the same galleries in South Australia and the Federal Houses of Parliament but the galleries there are small. A large number of women come to the Chamber and have the right to occupy the gallery on the Speaker's left. They take a keen interest in the work of the House. Why should we make this change? I do not mind women having the right to sit on the Speaker's right but I do think they should have a gallery reserved for themselves. Before we make any change we should consider the matter more closely.

Hon. P. Collier: Why not raise the same objection regarding churches and picture shows?

The PREMIER: This is neither a church nor a picture show. I think women enjoy the privilege they have of sitting in their own gallery on the left of the Speaker. Naturally I admit that we, sitting on this side of the House, enjoy the spectacle of ladies sitting on the other side. I hope the House will not hurriedly carry the proposals before the Chair. The amendment would

have the effect of taking away privileges from the women and not extending them.

Mr. O'Loughlen: It will give women equal rights with the men.

The PREMIER: At the present time so many feet of space on the left side of the Speaker are reserved for women and an equal space is reserved for men on the right of the Speaker. Members should realise that the ladies have enjoyed their privileges for very many years and I know many of them come regularly to Parliament to follow the debates. The alteration will not benefit them materially.

Hon. P. Collier: There is no compulsion about the matter.

The PREMIER: But if the amendment is carried men will have the right to sit on the women's side of the House. Notwithstanding the motion by the member for West Perth, I think the ladies should have the right to sit in their own galleries. I do not know what the opinions of other members may be.

Mr. J. Thomson: That is the opinion of most of the members at any rate.

Mr. Munsie: You speak for yourself.

The PREMIER: There is no necessity to carry this amendment hurriedly. I suggest that members who are married should discuss it with their wives and those who are not married should discuss it with their sweethearts.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: If you bring your daughter and your wife here, your wife will have to sit in one place and your daughter in another place because you can only take one into the Speaker's gallery.

The PREMIER: I think we should defer consideration of this matter.

Hon. T. WALKER (Kanowna) [5.0]: I trust sincerely that the amendment will be carried. It is the logical outcome of the franchise we have granted to women, the privilege to sit as an equal with every member of this House, the privilege to become Premier, the privilege, Mr. Speaker, to occupy your Chair. Just imagine if the member for West Perth happened to be elected Speaker of this House and she refused to allow her own sex to sit in her gallery! What an anomaly!

Hon. W. C. Angwin: The Speaker has the option now.

Hon. T. WALKER: But his desire is to keep things as they are; in other words, this institution is to go along at the old jog trot. Yet we are giving privileges and rights to outsiders that we here refuse to recognise, although they are passed into the laws of the land. With the progress of the age woman is coming into an exact equality with man on all matters, social, political, and economic. She has the right to take her share of every industry she feels fitted for, or desires. We exclude her from no avenue, and we only exclude her here because we are adherents of the old order that has passed away. The hon. member,

when she was speaking on this subject, desired to impress upon us the logic of her argument by citing some Christian who had been upbraiding her for her boldness. I would advise my friend, if she will permit me to call her so, never to go back to the old times.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: The good old times.

Hon. T. WALKER: Let us just refer for a moment to the authority the hon. member herself quoted. She quoted—

And the Lord God said it is not good that the man should be alone. I will make him an helpmeet for him.

The Minister for Mines: Are you quoting from "May" or "Liberty"?

Hon. T. WALKER: I am quoting from the oldest authority we have on this subject—

—And out of the ground the Lord God formed every beast of the field, and every fowl of the air, and brought them unto Adam to see what he would call them, and whatsoever Adam called every living creature that was the name thereof, and Adam gave names to all cattle and to the fowl of the air and to every beast of the field; but for Adam there was not found an helpmeet for him.

It was not good for man to be alone, so all these things were created, but not an helpmeet for Adam.

And he took one of his ribs—

A rib only, mind you!

—and closed up the flesh instead thereof, and the rib which the Lord God had taken from a man, made he a woman and brought her unto the man.

Mrs. Cowan: Go back to the first chapter.

Hon. T. WALKER: The first chapter is contradictory. This is what the hon. member quoted. She started, "It is not good for man to be alone," and those are the words with which I commenced my quotation. I am taking the context.

Mr. Underwood: She never quoted that on this debate.

Hon. T. WALKER: Yes!

Mr. Underwood: No!

Mr. SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. J. Thomson: There were no members of Parliament in those days.

Hon. T. WALKER: No, and I am saying that this is an unreliable argument to use.

Mr. J. Thomson: Why do you not oppose it?

Hon. T. WALKER: I say this very antiquated Jewish record, nay, a Babylonian record, comes from the mythical past, long anterior to the time of this alleged Adam, and I am quoting scholars of high standard and great learning who can teach us anything upon this subject. If we even come to later times I question whether my friend would be able to support her argument

from the same Book. Even Saint Paul says—

For the man is not of the woman, but the woman of the man. Neither was the man created for the woman, but the woman for the man.

And the same authority further says—and I would commend this to my friend if she is going to use this kind of argument to advance the cause of women, not to refer to these very antique records. The same author says—

Let your women keep silence, for it is not permitted unto them to speak, but they are commanded to be under obedience, as also saith the law. And if they will learn anything let them ask their husbands at home; for it is a shame for women to speak in the church.

And these are not the only authorities.

Mr. Angelo: Was not St. Paul an old bachelor?

Hon. T. WALKER: Undoubtedly, and it is on such sentiments that have been handed down century after century that women have been kept in subjection.

Mr. Marshall: Quite right.

Hon. T. WALKER: There is the past speaking, and it has never been remedied through the thousands of years, when man was master and woman had to obey. This is the condition of things that exists now universally in some parts of Europe, where woman is put into a kennel and only allowed to leave it at the will of her master. We have grown out of that. It is the merit of our civilisation which compels us to recognise woman as our equal. Woman has proved her capacity in every sphere of art, literature and science; in fact wherever she has entered. We owe as much to Madam Curie as to her talented husband for the discovery of radium and the suggestiveness it has afforded to the scientific world. Modern advancement has been due to the energy, zeal, acumen and learning of women themselves who have shown their capacity in many spheres. Now, we frame the laws of the land which permit the election of women to Parliament, and a woman can sit here in this Assembly. What injury would you do if you allowed some other woman to sit on those cold, bleak chairs at the far end of this Chamber? Let me tell you, Mr. Speaker, that your ruling is an undoubted injustice to the Opposition. Here we stand, or sit, night after night listening to the opposite side pouring their calumny upon us for the views we hold, and casting their eyes over our heads upon the beauty and adornment of Perth. We from this side of the House can see nothing of the kind. No wonder, so to speak, we put on our armour. We have to do it with our backs to the women, while our friends opposite get all the inspiration from the beauty and loveliness of Perth above our heads. I like to feel that I am only half a man even whilst I speak in this Chamber, that the complete man

is the complement of man and woman. That is the complete fruit of the human family so to speak, and I want to see the counterpart sitting there facing you, Mr. Speaker. How much better tempered would you be, when this Assembly was in disorder, if you saw the calm and homelike smile of the matrons of Perth encouraging you in the exercise of your paternal influence upon this Chamber. That is what you desire. Therefore, why not have our galleries mixed? If you want to do what chivalry suggests and what I would approve of, I would have a ladies gallery, a gallery that would see both sides of the Chamber at the same time as is the case in other assemblies. Why put women on one side and men on the other side? Why separate and divide them? That kind of thing comes from those old days when women were not even allowed to sit in the sacred sanctuaries of the land, when they were put aside as they are to-day in the synagogues, and when under the old order they were compelled to remain outside and know nothing of what was going on. We are past those days, and now let us try to see that the women of to-day are not subjected to what is none the less an insult, because it happens to be venerated and time-honoured. We must get rid of superstitious notions that man is lord and the woman the slave. She is our equal, the complement of man, and her equality is necessary for the betterment of the human race. I, therefore, support the amendment. Reserve if you please, a section of this House for women alone, but throw other sections open to men and women.

Mr. PICKERING (Sussex) [5.15]: I oppose the motion on the ground suggested by the member for Kimberley (Mr. Durack). I think the privilege rests with the Speaker and that the motion should take another form. I strongly oppose the amendment, which suggests that all the galleries of this House should be thrown open to men and women alike. I know many women who would not come to this House at all if they were compelled to share the galleries with men.

Mr. Lambert: Then they have no right to be here.

Mr. PICKERING: If we go on to any platform of our railway system, or along any train, we will find compartments specially reserved for ladies.

Mr. O'Loughlen: There are reasons for that.

Mr. PICKERING: Because the member for Kanowna has not the facility for gazing on the beauty of Western Australia, that is no reason why we should deprive the ladies of the right of a gallery for their own special use. I trust that the House will not agree to such an amendment as that moved by the member for Forrest (Mr. O'Loughlen). I was opposed to the change in the Constitution which resulted in the appearance in this place of the member for West Perth (Mrs.

Cowan); therefore I am quite consistent in opposing a change of system which has been in vogue for so many years. I sympathise with the constable who has charge of the galleries. I quite foresee that the galleries might be used for purposes for which they are not intended.

Hon. T. Walker: Oh, oh!

Mr. O'Loughlin: What do you mean?

Mr. PICKERING: One of the objects in keeping men and women separate, I think, was to maintain silence in the galleries. It would be very difficult indeed to maintain silence if people could come up here in pairs to have a half hour in the galleries.

Mr. O'Loughlin: What about the theatres? They maintain silence there.

Mr. PICKERING: The constable has a certain amount of difficulty in the galleries.

Mr. Lambert: What, in sleeping?

Mr. PICKERING: The main ground for my opposition to the amendment is that I think it only right a certain portion of this Chamber should be set aside specially for ladies. It is not everybody who holds the opinions of the member for West Perth. Many of her own sex are not in sympathy with the movement that enabled her to become a member of this House, and there are many women in this State who would not fall in with her suggestion to have access to the Speaker's gallery, or with the amendment that the whole of the galleries be thrown open for common use.

Mr. JOHNSTON (Williams-Narrogin) [5.18]: I strongly support the amendment of the member for Forrest (Mr. O'Loughlin) and congratulate him on having brought it forward. It is absurd in these enlightened days, when we recognise the equality of the sexes to the extent of permitting ladies to be elected by the people and to sit in this Chamber, that we should say we will not permit women to sit in any of the galleries or in the Speaker's gallery. I have no objection to a special gallery being set apart for ladies only if it is so desired, but I do say that women should have the right to sit in the Speaker's gallery, or in any other gallery. It is absurd that when a husband and wife come here to listen to the debates, we should put the husband in the Speaker's gallery and the wife somewhere up above out of sight.

Mr. Lambert: A happy relief.

Mr. JOHNSTON: When this matter was brought forward by way of a question, I understood you, Mr. Speaker, to say that, so far as you knew, ladies were not permitted to sit in the Speaker's gallery in any other Parliament in Australia. If that is what you said, I would like to enlighten you.

Mr. SPEAKER: I did not say that.

Mr. JOHNSTON: In the Federal Parliament women have access to the Speaker's gallery. I myself occupied a front seat marked "For State members only" and sat next to the wives of two well known Labour politicians who were there during the whole of the evening listening to the debates.

Mr. J. Thomson: I saw you there.

Mr. JOHNSTON: The hon. member, who at that time was not a member of the State Parliament, occupied a seat also in the gallery marked "For State members only," showing that coming events often cast their shadows before. In the Federal Parliament, ladies have access to the Speaker's gallery. They occupy seats alongside the men and why should not they have an equal opportunity of enjoying the best seats here? Why should the front seats be reserved for men only, while the wives and other relatives of members are put away in the other galleries? It is absurd, and I am certainly surprised, Mr. Speaker, that you, with your chivalrous instincts, should permit it. I hope the amendment will be passed and that this enlightened Parliament in Western Australia, the first in the Commonwealth to have a lady member, will determine that, so far as the galleries in this House are concerned, the women in Western Australia have an equal right to them with the men, just as they have an equal right to offer their services to the electors if they so desire.

The MINISTER FOR MINES (Hon. J. Scaddan—Albany) [5.22]: I think we ought to be able to arrive at a compromise which will be acceptable not only to members but to those people who frequent the galleries. It is generally recognised that the Speaker has some privileges by virtue of the office to which we have elected him, and amongst them is the right over admission to one of the galleries in this Chamber known as the Speaker's gallery. It has been recognised, too, that the right should be conceded to members of another place to occupy what is practically one-half of the Speaker's gallery, so that they may come in and listen to our debates just as we, by the courtesy of the President of the Legislative Council, might occupy portion of the President's gallery in that Chamber. I do not think we ought to deliberately interfere with the right of the Speaker in this direction. Whether he chooses to permit men only to occupy seats in the Speaker's gallery is a matter which he must answer for, but I suggest that we might extend the privilege of allowing a man and his wife or daughter, or a mother and son, to occupy seats together in any part of the public galleries, except in the portion which is reserved for ladies. Very frequently women who come here to listen to the debates desire to sit in a gallery reserved for ladies and to which men are not admitted. We cannot always guarantee the condition of a man who might come into the gallery from the street as he has a perfect right to do. But I do not think we should prevent people from sitting in any part of the public galleries where they choose, except that the ladies' gallery should be reserved for ladies. If ladies choose to sit with their male friends, they ought to be entitled to do so in any part of the public gallery. This would be a fair compromise

and would go a long way towards removing what is now a recognised difficulty. I suggest that, instead of conveying a direction to the Hon. the Speaker, we might get over the difficulty by striking out all the words after "House," and inserting—

The Speaker should consider the question of extending permission to women and men to use all galleries with the exception of the ladies' gallery.

Then, if the Speaker chose to adhere to his present policy of admitting men only to the Speaker's gallery, he could do so and be answerable for it. The balance of the galleries, with the exception of the ladies' gallery, would be available to men and women alike.

Hon. P. Collier: There is no difficulty.

The MINISTER FOR MINES: I do not know that we need worry very much about it. If my wife came here, she would prefer to sit in the ladies' gallery, but if she came here with my boy she would prefer to sit where the boy could sit with her. I do not think there is any likelihood of our being discomfited by such an event as an interference with the debates. Women can behave themselves as well as men, and but for the belief that they can behave better than men, I would not suggest reserving a part of the gallery for them.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Minister has only suggested that as an amendment?

The MINISTER FOR MINES: That is all.

Mr. TROY (Mt. Magnet) [5.25]: I support the view of the Minister. It is desirable that there should be a gallery reserved for ladies because some undesirable character might come in and cause trouble.

Mr. Willcock: Some undesirable ladies might come in.

Mr. TROY: Quite so, but there is not so much probability of that as the other. I agree with the proposition that the ladies should be allowed to enter any gallery in the House, but I believe that there should also be a place apart for the ladies.

Mr. O'Loughlen: Why reserve one part where the men should not go?

Mr. TROY: My experience of men is that they like to go wherever the women are. There might be a crowd in the galleries, as often happens at the picture shows.

Mr. O'Loughlen: Is that the reason why you did not open the Speaker's gallery to ladies for five years?

Mr. TROY: I was not asked. When members' wives came here, they had the right to sit in the Speaker's gallery. If I were in your position, Mr. Speaker, I think I would concede the request. At the same time there should be a ladies' gallery apart from the men's gallery, because some objectionable character might enter. It is not desirable that women should be thrown into the company of an objectionable character, unless

they choose to go into the common gallery in preference to the gallery reserved for ladies.

Mr. WILLCOCK (Geraldton) [5.28]: This matter is hardly of sufficient importance to warrant the House devoting a full hour to discussing it. We have progressed too far to give force to the argument that a time-honoured custom of the last 700 or 800 years in some institution 13,000 or 14,000 miles away should be retained here. We should cut out that kind of stuff altogether. I am inclined to support the amendment as moved originally by the member for Forrest (Mr. O'Loughlen), that ladies be admitted to all portions of the House and that the ladies' gallery be reserved for ladies. I am not prepared to say that men would make themselves any more objectionable than ladies. They would not come here and behave in an unseemly manner, and even if they did, we have protection which picture shows do not enjoy; we have not only the Sergeant-at-Arms, but the police to maintain order. My intention is to support the amendment as originally moved by the member for Forrest (Mr. O'Loughlen), the carrying of which would mean that the gallery above the heads of the Opposition would be reserved for ladies as against men.

Mr. A. THOMSON (Katanning) [5.31]: Do I understand that the carrying of the amendment of the member for Forrest means that the present ladies' gallery will continue to be reserved for ladies, and that ladies will also be admitted to all other parts of the House?

Mr. O'Loughlen: Yes.

Mr. A. THOMSON: I agree with other members that a gallery should be specially set apart for ladies. However, it is an anomaly that when a man and his wife come here he must take a seat on one side and she on the other. They should be permitted to sit side by side. I have much pleasure in supporting the amendment moved by the member for Forrest, and I hope that the hon. member will stick to it and that it will be carried without many further words.

Mr. DAVIES (Guildford) [5.32]: I shall certainly support the amendment, and I shall be glad to see ladies on the floor of the House. I think that the presence of ladies on the floor of this Chamber at the opening of this Parliament represented their first appearance here. The privilege of securing admittance to the Speaker's gallery for friends should be extended to the member for West Perth (Mrs. Cowan) in the same way as it is extended to all other members. She should be able to invite lady friends to that gallery in the same way as the rest of us invite men friends there.

Mr. Troy: No. That privilege is the Speaker's.

Mr. DAVIES: I observed Lady Newdegate sitting here on Opening Day, and I understood that that was the first time a lady had

sat on the floor of the House. In my opinion, ladies should be admitted to any portion of the House, and, besides, there should be accommodation reserved specially for ladies, because some of them—possibly old maids, possibly married women—might prefer to sit alone.

Mrs. COWAN (West Perth—on amendment) [5.34]: It seems to me that the point is being lost sight of. I asked that things should be made equal. At present there is a public gallery open to men, and another public gallery open to women. Then there is the Speaker's gallery, in respect of which the privilege is extended to men coming in and sitting there, by the Speaker's permission. In moving the motion I had no desire to be in any way whatever discourteous to our Speaker; and, indeed, His Honour the Speaker himself expressed a preference for having the matter referred to the House for decision: at least, so I understood. So long as men and women are equal in the matter of admittance here, that is all that is required. I have never heard of a woman asking that all the galleries of this Chamber should be thrown open to women. All I am asking is that in respect of the Speaker's gallery—there being no Speaker's gallery for women—women as well as men should have the privilege of sitting there at any time. I should like to reply to the remarks of the member for Kanowna (Hon. T. Walker).

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member must speak to the amendment at present.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN (North-East Fremantle) [5.35]: In connection with this matter, the only request I have heard from ladies is that they should be allowed to come with their husbands. I have heard nothing whatever said about the Speaker's gallery, but I have known ladies to say, "Why should we go on one side, and our husbands on the other?" In all probability, if anything special was on here, the only ladies who would have the opportunity of sitting in the Speaker's gallery—assuming the motion is carried—would be those living in the immediate neighbourhood of Parliament House. Ladies residing in the suburbs would be unable to arrive here by 7.30 after getting their husbands' dinners. Let me mention that while, say, 48 of us now here are anxious, possibly, to put women in the Speaker's gallery, not one of us is anxious to put a woman in his own seat. The matter is one that should be left entirely in your hands, Mr. Speaker. The Speaker's gallery belongs to the Speaker. My feeling is that having heard all this discussion Mr. Speaker will decide that members hold that ladies should be admitted to the Speaker's gallery if tickets are requested for them by members. Still, during the 16 years I have spent in this Assembly I have never been asked by a lady for a ticket to the Speaker's gallery. The member for Mt. Magnet (Mr. Troy) says that during all the years he occupied the Chair no such request was ever made to him. Really, the motion is a

mere fad, and intended to show that the member for West Perth is determined to do something for women even when there is no occasion for doing it. Were I in her place, I would adopt a different line. I would try to get a woman something worth having, and, upon being refused, I would defy the Chair, get put out, and then say, "Look how I am treated for standing up for women; you must send more women, to help me." It is a paltry thing to ask this Assembly to decide whether women should be permitted to sit among half-a-dozen men in the Speaker's gallery. The motion is ridiculous, and should never have been brought forward.

Mr. SPEAKER [5.38]: Before putting the question, I should like to make a few remarks. I do it indeed very reluctantly. However, I consider that I should be failing in my duty as Speaker of this Assembly if I allowed any of the privileges of the position which I temporarily occupy to be taken away without offering a few observations. I do not wish to leave this position of Speaker with any of the privileges, conferred on it by the House before I took the office, in any way impaired. Hon. members seem to have made a deal about what is done in other Parliaments of Australia. I believe there is a Speaker's gallery set apart in every Parliament in the Commonwealth. In some of them there are two or three small Speakers' galleries. The least sitting accommodation in the gallery or galleries reserved for the Speaker in any other Parliament is 40, and in other instances the accommodation amounts to 80 seats, 75 seats, and 56. In all those Parliaments the Speaker is the only person who has the right to issue a ticket to any lady to enter that gallery. In that respect the position in those Parliaments is the same as it is here. The gallery is the Speaker's gallery, and he has the right to issue tickets for it to ladies or gentlemen, as he pleases. In two of those other Parliaments there are ladies' galleries with a seating accommodation of 50; I refer to Queensland and South Australia. I take it, however, that in the case of those Parliaments the ladies' galleries are similarly circumstanced to our ladies' gallery here, and that no tickets are necessary for ladies to enter them. In the case of the New South Wales Parliament a lady is admitted to the Speaker's gallery only when she is in the company of a gentleman. I was rather surprised to hear the remarks of the member for Williams-Narrogin (Mr. Johnston), who has occupied the position which I now occupy, and who in respect of the ladies' gallery adopted the same practice as I have followed.

Mr. Johnston: If I had been in the Chair a little longer, I would have acted differently.

Mr. SPEAKER: The member for Mount Magnet (Mr. Troy) put the case very clearly. That hon. member occupied the



position of Speaker for some five years, and during his tenure of the Chair the Speaker's gallery was conducted in the same way as it has been during my tenure. The hon. member further said that he had never been asked for a lady's ticket for the Speaker's gallery. I am sure that I have never been asked for such a ticket, except on one occasion, after the member for West Perth (Mrs. Cowan) had put her question. I would not grant the application then, because I knew that this motion would be brought forward. In the case of the Speaker's galleries in the Parliaments of the Eastern States, I do not know but that it may have been the practice to admit ladies to the Speaker's gallery, in view of the ample seating accommodation provided. But in the Speaker's gallery of this House there is accommodation for at most 21 persons. It was the practice of Speakers before me, and it has been my practice, to grant each member a ticket for any friend the member may desire to place in the Speaker's gallery, so long as there is seating accommodation. Now, there being only 21 seats, and there being 49 members—apart from the Speaker—who may be desirous of putting friends in the Speaker's gallery, the very limited extent of the accommodation is apparent. I wish to say, further, that if the House takes away the Speaker's privilege or responsibility in respect of that gallery, it no longer remains the Speaker's gallery, because then hon. members will only be giving the Speaker a gallery with restrictions. If the member who occupies the high and honourable position of Speaker is not, in the opinion of the House, quite capable of knowing what to do with the gallery, or not fair in his judgment of what he should do with it, then the Speaker should, I think, be removed, and another member put in his place. Personally I do not want to have a gallery called the Speaker's gallery unless I do control it. If hon. members desire that that gallery should be available to all visitors, male and female alike, then I have no desire that it should be called the Speaker's gallery. I do not wish that any privilege should be taken from the position I temporarily occupy, without my putting up some defence.

The Minister for Mines: What about the public galleries, Mr. Speaker?

Mr. SPEAKER: As regards the public galleries, I am more unfortunate than was the member for Mount Magnet (Mr. Troy). I had not occupied this position longer than two or three months when I received an application from organisations of women asking me to throw open the public galleries to men and women in common. I refused that because, with my limited knowledge of ladies, I thought they preferred sitting by themselves. In the following year I had a similar request from the same person, signing herself as secretary of a

women's organisation. In all I have had three letters from her. It is remarkable that I should have got those letters so soon, seeing that they were from people who would be more likely to ask the late Speaker than to ask me.

Mr. O'Loughlen: The organisation was not in existence in his time.

Mr. SPEAKER: However, that is the position. The Standing Orders provide that the Speaker has a right to admit visitors to the floor of the House. I do not think that has been abused since the House has been in existence. I granted that privilege to ladies on the opening day of the present session which was, I think, the only time such a request was made. The galleries were packed on the opening day, and very many ladies who could not get into the galleries were anxious to hear the member for West Perth (Mrs. Cowan) move the adoption of the Address-in-reply.

The Minister for Mines: It resulted in no harm on the opening day.

Mr. SPEAKER: I told the member for West Perth that unless the House decided otherwise, the Speaker's gallery would be open. The House has a right to take from the Speaker the privileges which it has given to him, including control over the gallery. If the House desires to give me, as Speaker, the Speaker's gallery with restrictions, I maintain it is no longer the Speaker's gallery. As for the ladies' gallery, I am of opinion that the majority of ladies would prefer sitting in that gallery by themselves. However, if it is the wish of the House, the galleries can be made common. If the motion is carried, the Speaker's gallery will be a public gallery for men and for women.

Amendment put and passed.

The Minister for Mines: I am not sure that under the amendment the ladies' gallery will still be reserved to them. If not, I will have to move a further amendment, as for instance, the inclusion of the words "with the exception of the ladies' gallery."

Mr. SPEAKER: I do not think the motion as amended will leave the ladies' gallery reserved to ladies.

Mr. O'Loughlen: Yes, under the amendment the women can go anywhere, but the men cannot go into the women's gallery.

Mr. Johnston: If we strike out the words "as well as to men," it will extend to women the right to enter all galleries, and will reserve to them their own gallery.

Mr. SPEAKER: No, that amendment would reserve the Speaker's gallery exclusively to women.

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

Ayes	..	..	..	23
Noes	..	..	..	16
Majority for				7

## AYES.

Mr. Angelo	Mr. McCallum
Mr. Carter	Mr. Munroe
Mr. Collier	Mr. Richardson
Mr. Corboy	Mr. Scaddan
Mrs. Cowan	Mr. Simons
Mr. Davies	Mr. A. Thomson
Mr. Heron	Mr. Troy
Mr. Johnston	Mr. Underwood
Mr. Lambert	Mr. Walker
Mr. H. K. Maley	Mr. Willcock
Mr. Mann	Mr. O'Loghlen
Mr. Marshall	(Teller.)

## NOES.

Mr. Angwin	Mr. Latham
Mr. Boyland	Sir James Mitchell
Mr. Broun	Mr. Pickering
Mr. Chesson	Mr. Piesse
Mr. Denton	Mr. Sampson
Mr. Durack	Mr. Stubbs
Mr. Gibson	Mr. J. Thomson
Mr. Hickmott	Mr. Mullany
	(Teller.)

Question thus passed.

Mr. STUBBS: What is the position now? There appears to be a misunderstanding. Is the ladies' gallery now to be open to men as well as to women?

Members: No! no!

Mr. STUBBS: I should like a ruling from the Speaker.

Mr. SPEAKER: Some hon. members seem to think that all galleries are now open to ladies, while the ladies' gallery is still reserved to ladies only. I interpret the resolution as meaning that the galleries are open to men as well as to women. However, I cannot allow any debate. Hon. members can think the matter over and see me in my room at the tea adjournment.

Mr. Troy: The motion can be further amended.

Mr. SPEAKER: But not now. Since it has been carried, it cannot be further dealt with to-day. It can only be amended by a separate motion, of which notice must be given.

## MOTION—FORESTS ACT AND MILLARS' COMPANY.

To inquire by Royal Commission.

Debate resumed from the 7th September, on the following motion by Mr. Pickering:—That a select committee be appointed to inquire into—1, The working of the Forests Act of 1918 generally. 2, The financial clauses of the Act and their operation. 3, The extensions of Millars' Timber and Trading Company's leases and concessions, and to report with recommendations to the House.

The PREMIER (Hon. Sir James Mitchell—Northam) [6.0]: I have no objection to the fullest possible inquiry. I am perfectly willing that the motion should be carried subject to a slight amendment. The

inquiry should be full and the evidence taken before the inquiry should be on oath. The investigation will extend not only to the matters set out in the motion, but will go very much further. There are many persons interested in the forestry business and everyone should be given an opportunity of coming before the tribunal. I have no intention of discussing the Conservator of Forests to-night. I do not know that any good purpose would be served by discussing the position which has arisen, except that I have to point out that as far as Millars' Timber and Trading Company are concerned, they get a concession beyond the present term of their leases for such period as they ceased work upon certain of their concessions during the war. For that extended period they will pay a royalty of such amount as the Conservator of Forests may decide. In other words they pay for the extension of the tenancy of their areas precisely the same royalty which would be asked of any other person in like circumstances. I hope that is clear to hon. members. We are giving away nothing at all. It must be remembered that Millars' have the right, and any other man who cares to apply to the Government for an extension of his lease in accordance with the law also has that right, to cut timber subject to the payment that is now required for the rest of the currency of the lease, and, for cutting over any term beyond the currency of the present lease, they must pay a royalty that any other man would be asked to pay who wanted to lease timber country. No other person would be required to pay more than Millars' pay. It is nonsense to suggest that a million pounds has been lost to the State. Whatever we are entitled to get for the timber we shall get from Millars' under their extended leases. The House decided that the extension should be made and that is the law as it stands to-day. We have obeyed the law and agreed to make the extension. The House must realise that if Millars' wish, and any other leaseholder wishes, to cut every stick of timber on their lease before the old lease expires, they can do so.

Mr. O'Loghlen: The plant would not enable them to do that in many cases.

The PREMIER: They can hew timber and cut it in any way they please. They could, of course, increase their plant if they have four years to run as is the case in most instances. It is, however, ridiculous to expect them to expend a large sum of money in increasing their plant when it can only be used for so short a time. I hope the House will realise that we are not losing a brass farthing by giving this extension, and that it is made under the law which this House passed quite recently. The law directs Ministers what to do and the Conservator what to do. Acting under the powers conferred upon them by that Statute, they have extended these leases. I propose to move an amendment to which the member for Sussex is agreeable, which, if passed, will mean the appointment of a Royal Commission.

Mr. Johnston: I hope the mover of the motion will be on the Commission.

The PREMIER: The Commission will consist of members of this Chamber and not of persons outside.

Mr. Johnston: And include the member who brought it forward?

The PREMIER: Perhaps the hon. member who has just interjected would like to serve on it.

Mr. Johnston: I am not anxious to.

The PREMIER: I move an amendment—

That the words "select committee" be struck out and "in the opinion of this House a Royal Commission should" be inserted in lieu.

Amendment put and passed.

Mr. PICKERING (Sussex—in reply) [6.12]: I cannot allow the motion as amended to pass without replying to certain statements which have been made in the course of the debate. One of the most serious things which have been said was said by the Minister for Forests. He said—

I am afraid that if ever a member had a brief the member for Sussex holds it, and in my opinion it would be very unfair to the public, to the department, and to Parliament that any committee of the nature suggested by him should inquire on this basis.

I feel that is a reflection not only upon me as a member, but upon any other member of the Assembly who might be selected by the House to inquire into this particular matter. I had the distinction of being a member of this Assembly in 1919 when the Forests Bill was passed and became law. I gave considerable attention to it when it was going through. I have since perused "Hansard" dealing with the debates bearing upon that measure. It is because I believe the Bill was framed with the intention of giving to the State a sound forests policy that I have taken action during this Parliament. Instead of this being a reflection upon me, as suggested by the Minister for Forests, it should redound to my credit that I have thought so much of the forests of the State as to desire a thorough investigation into the position as it stands to-day. That, and not the basis suggested by the Minister for Forests, is what actuated me in bringing forward this motion. We heard last night the member for Nelson saying that the Conservator of Forests was a dictator. The hon. member advocated the destruction of the forests.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member cannot discuss the speeches delivered last night. He should reply to the discussion on this motion.

Mr. PICKERING: In the course of the debates which have taken place certain remarks were made which deal very particularly with the motion we are discussing. The other day the member for Forrest (Mr.

O'Loghlen) took the opportunity, on a motion of a somewhat similar nature, of expressing his views on this Act. There was no doubt about that from the tone of his remarks. Members who have spoken with regard to the forest policy of the State said they are in sympathy with such a policy for Western Australia upon certain conditions, and upon the understanding that it did not conflict with the interests of any particular member.

Mr. O'Loghlen: You are wrong.

Mr. PICKERING: It is so. Some of the objections raised by the various members in this House—

Mr. SPEAKER: I had better put the hon. member right. On this motion moved by the member for Sussex, the member for East Perth and the member for Bunbury, as well as the Premier, have spoken, and now the member for Sussex is replying. The hon. member must, therefore, confine himself to the debate on this motion.

Mr. PICKERING: Some of the objections to the forest policy of the State, illustrated by various members who have spoken, would mean the cessation of a forest policy for Western Australia. There are perhaps some members who think that the dignity of Parliament is the prime factor in this State. Members have advocated the keeping of a contract as of greater import than the conservation of our forests. Everything else appears to be of more importance to them than our duty to posterity. If we are to proceed with the destruction of our forests on lines advocated by members—

Hon. W. C. Angwin: Do you advocate the breaking of contracts?

Mr. PICKERING: I would advocate the conservation of our forests in the face of any contract, because I realise the vast importance they are to the State. Without a proper forest conservation policy this State is doomed. It is absolutely essential that Western Australia should realise what the forest policy of to-day will mean for the future. We are not always going to be a population of 330,000, but I hope we shall later on have a population here of from three to four millions. If we base our forest policy on a population of 330,000 people we are working on wrong premises. The forest policy of the State should provide for millions and not for thousands or hundreds of thousands of people.

Mr. Johnston: Are we not losing the Conservator?

Mr. PICKERING: I am not aware of that. Although I am supposed to know everything about him I do not know if there is any truth in the statement that the Conservator is leaving the State. If it is a fact it will mean a great loss to Western Australia.

Mr. J. H. Smith: Which member advocated the destruction of our forests?

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

Mr. PICKERING: Prior to the tea adjournment I was endeavouring to deal with some of the objections to our forest policy. One of the objections to the measure we passed was the amount of the finances which were made available to the Conservator. It may be of interest to members to know that in Germany, prior to the war, the sum spent on the forests was five million pounds per annum, and the annual return from the forests was 21 million pounds gross, or a net profit on the expenditure of 16 million pounds. That naturally means a big sphere for employment among the people in Germany. I have claimed many times that this particular phase of the question should be gone into. From this aspect alone, if the money available were properly expended, the sphere of employment for people would be considerable, and would be such a sphere of employment as would be acceptable to those taking it up, because the life of a forester is not a hard one, and it is certainly cast in a pleasant environment. Another objection to the Act has been the freedom of the Conservator from political control.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! Is the hon. member replying to his motion or to the amendment?

Mr. PICKERING: I am replying to objections to my arguments.

Mr. SPEAKER: Is the hon. member replying to his motion or is he discussing the amendment?

The Minister for Mines: The amendment has been carried.

The SPEAKER: Is the hon. member replying to his motion?

Mr. PICKERING: I am speaking to the motion.

Mr. SPEAKER: Then there can be no discussion on the Act. The hon. member can only speak in reply on his motion. He is not in order in discussing the Act.

Mr. PICKERING: I am speaking upon the arguments that have been raised against my motion.

Mr. SPEAKER: There have been no arguments advanced to which the hon. member is replying. He is discussing the Act.

Mr. PICKERING: I am replying to the arguments advanced against my motion.

Mr. SPEAKER: Who put up the arguments?

Mr. PICKERING: I put up arguments.

Mr. SPEAKER: Is the hon. member replying to his own arguments?

Mr. PICKERING: I am replying more particularly to the arguments advanced against those which I placed before members.

Mr. SPEAKER: By whom were those arguments advanced?

Mr. PICKERING: By the Premier and several members who spoke on it.

Mr. SPEAKER: No, not on this motion. The only members who spoke on the motion in addition to the hon. member himself were the member for East Perth and the member for Bunbury. The hon. member is confusing

the motion under discussion with the next motion on the Notice Paper, which also stands in his name.

Mr. PICKERING: I am at least trying to justify the carrying of the motion in favour of the appointment of a Royal Commission. I want the constitution of that Royal Commission to be on such lines as will maintain a proper forestry policy for Western Australia. I do not think I am likely to induce members to take that point of view unless I put forward arguments in support of the proposition. In the course of discussions which have taken place in this House, several members have dealt with this question. I do not wish to cast any reflection upon anyone, but I must say that consideration was extended to them and particularly to the member for Forrest (Mr. O'Loughlen) and the Minister for Mines, who were given considerable latitude in speaking on matters included in this motion. It is not my purpose to deal very extensively with this subject because the Premier has agreed to the appointment of a Royal Commission, but I am anxious that the Commission shall be one which is likely to do justice to Western Australia. I do not desire the Commission to be one that will see only one point of view. Unlike the Minister for Mines, I do not agree that anyone appointed to a seat on any select committee should have no point of view on the subject to be investigated. No member has taken a seat upon any select committee who has not been prejudiced from one standpoint or another.

Mr. SPEAKER: May I remind the hon. member that the Minister for Mines did not speak on this motion? The hon. member is confusing the motion before the Chamber with the succeeding one which also stands in his name.

Mr. PICKERING: I am very sincere in my desire that the members of the Royal Commission who are to be appointed shall be men who will see that justice is done to the interests of Western Australia. I do not want them to take into consideration the interests of any company, local or foreign. All I want to see is that a forest policy for Western Australia is maintained for all time.

Mr. O'Loughlen: Do you suggest that any member of this Chamber would subordinate the interests of the country to those of a company?

Mr. PICKERING: It has been suggested that I am so biased and unfair that I could not be appointed to the select committee.

Mr. O'Loughlen: Who suggested that?

Mr. PICKERING: It has been suggested.

Mr. SPEAKER: Not on this motion.

Mr. PICKERING: I am not allowed to read "Hansard" or I would show you, Mr. Speaker, what I mean.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am desirous of confining the hon. member to the discussion of his motion.

Mr. PICKERING: I am endeavouring to advocate that the Royal Commission to be appointed will be such as will conserve the best

interests of Western Australia, and if members of this Chamber abuse their privileges—

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! I am the judge of whether the privileges of the House are abused or not.

Mr. O'Loughlen: You have spoken on several motions.

Mr. PICKERING: I do not know—

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member must confine himself to the motion. The next motion also stands in the hon. member's name and he must not encroach upon that motion at this stage.

Mr. PICKERING: The motion as amended says that a Royal Commission should be appointed to inquire into the working of the Forests Act of 1918 generally. I am endeavouring to discuss that aspect but I am called to order.

Mr. SPEAKER: You are not called to order. I have drawn the hon. member's attention to his references to the remarks of members which were not made on this motion but on the other motion.

Mr. PICKERING: The motion goes on to refer to an inquiry into the financial clauses of the Act and their operation and also into the extensions of Millars' Timber and Trading Coy.'s leases and concessions. I do not intend to refer at great length to this particular subject but, seeing that I am debarred from expressing my views in any other way, I must deal with them so as to impress members with the importance of the matter, as I view it. The financial sections of the Act provide for the future development of our forests and I am of opinion that any undue interference with the finance sections of the Act will militate against the interests of the forests of Western Australia.

Mr. O'Loughlen: Is it proposed?

Mr. PICKERING: I am not permitted to say that it is proposed but hon. members can cast their minds back to the Address-in-reply when the Premier made certain allusions to this matter. Regarding the extension of the leases to Millars' Timber and Trading Coy., I am not permitted to deal with the remarks made by another hon. member when discussing another motion, but I consider the greatest importance to this State is not Millars' concession, nor the concession belonging to any other person, but the forest policy of this State. I place that before the interests of any concession or contract.

Mr. O'Loughlen: Do you think others are forgetting to do so?

Mr. PICKERING: I do not know, but members must protect the interests of the State. Neither Millars nor any other saw-millers, whose interests conflict with those of our forests, should be allowed to take undue advantage of our Conservator of Forests. Regarding the forests of this State, it is time a serious view of the position was taken, particularly when we see these people combined to take that undue ad-

vantage of the Conservator, which I have referred to.

Mr. O'Loughlen: What evidence have you of that combined action?

Mr. PICKERING: There was the deputation to the Minister recently.

Mr. O'Loughlen: When they asked for a reduction in the royalty?

Mr. PICKERING: Yes; when Millars were paying a royalty of 7d. a load for their timber as against 6s. royalty paid by others. The member for Forrest knows that the payment of a royalty of 7d. per load by Millars, when other persons interested are paying a much higher royalty, is viewed with a sense of injustice by others. They should be required to pay a royalty more in conformity with the values and in accordance with that paid by other permit holders.

Mr. O'Loughlen: I suppose, as a member of the Architects' Association, you put up a fight for other architects' interests from time to time?

Mr. PICKERING: I will put up a fight in their interests when occasion arises.

Mr. O'Loughlen: I am alluding to the architects as an association putting up a fight.

Mr. PICKERING: We have no association; we have an institute.

Mr. O'Loughlen: You will understand that the members are part and parcel of an association.

Mr. PICKERING: We take no undue advantage of each other as architects. I contend that Millars have secured their extension under the provisions of the Act and that that extension is not right. No one will contend that Millars suffered during the war to any greater extent than other people in Western Australia and yet the Government, under the section giving them the option of saying which course should be followed, have seen fit to grant the extension of the leases to Millars and so place them in a favourable position. That means a very large loss to the State, a loss of money which should have been paid as royalty instead of the rents they are paying to-day and during the time the leases were operating.

The Minister for Works: Do you say the Government have gone beyond the powers under the Act?

Mr. PICKERING: I say the Government had the right to exercise the choice between the two sections in the Act and the Government chose the course which I say placed Millars in a very favourable position. I was discussing the matter a few days ago with the former Minister for Forests who was responsible for the Forests Act passing through Parliament. He told me that he was of the opinion that the forest policy of this State was doomed. I said I agreed with him but I could not understand how he, who had the interests of the State at heart, and who had placed such an excellent measure upon the statute-

book, which measure he had introduced with such an able speech, could have defeated the whole aim and object of the Act by including such a section as included the provision for the extension of concessions and leases on lines opposed to the whole spirit of the Act and in direct conflict with the tenor of his speech.

Mr. O'Loughlin: What was his reply?

Mr. PICKERING: He said he agreed with me; he could not do anything else. There has been too much worry about the dignity of Parliament in connection with this matter. Let us think rather of posterity. What will the people of, say, 2021 think of our dignity? How will it worry them? It does not give us any sore head or worry as to what the people of 2021 will think of us. What will worry them will be the loss of their forests. On the other hand, if the people of 1821 had taken such an action as I have referred to, and adversely affected us at the present day, it would be a source of concern for us in these times. We should not see posterity robbed of its forest heritage. It has been said that those whom the Gods would destroy, they first make mad.

Member: You think everyone has done so except yourself.

Mr. PICKERING: I consider that in this matter there has been a conspiracy among members of this Chamber. I assure hon. members that in spite of what has been said in the House, the information I have used has been obtained by my own efforts. I have got it from as many sources as possible and nothing has come from the Conservator. I have not spoken as the mouthpiece of the Conservator; I have spoken for the benefit of future generations, and I hope hon. members will not attribute to me base and ulterior motives which have been attributed to other members of this Assembly. It has been said that members are tired of my motions for the appointment of select committees. I have only moved two motions for select committees since I have been a member of this Chamber. The member for Forrest in seconding the motion last Wednesday used words which I think did him very little credit in that direction. He said that the House was tired of my motions for the appointment of select committees.

Mr. O'Loughlin: The motion was on the point of lapsing.

Mr. PICKERING: It was not.

Mr. Willcock: Nobody seconded it.

Mr. PICKERING: Anyhow it was quite unnecessary for the hon. member to make that remark.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Forrest did not address himself to this subject.

Mr. PICKERING: So I understand.

Mr. Lambert: You do understand something.

Mr. PICKERING: Yes, and in that respect I have an advantage over the hon. member. I have agreed to the amendment to the motion I moved, and I trust the House will

accept it. If we want the State to have a proper forestry policy, that policy must be free from political control. I trust also that the Act which has been placed on the Statute Book will not be so mutilated that the State will lose control of its forest policy.

Question, as amended, put and passed.

## BILL—CRIMINAL CODE AMENDMENT.

Second Reading.

Debate resumed from 14th September.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY (Hon. F. T. Brown—Beverley) [7.53]: I take it that the object the hon. member has in presenting this Bill to the House is to legalise lotteries for the purpose of raising money for charity. In the past different Governments have granted permits to various bodies to conduct lotteries, provided the object of those lotteries was to raise funds for charitable purposes, although under the Criminal Code it was an offence to conduct such lotteries. The present Government have merely followed the practice which has been adopted in this respect for a considerable time past. It was considered that a hardship would be inflicted in certain cases if the required permission was not given. The Government have been caused a good deal of trouble and difficulty in connection with the granting of these permits because other organisations have come along and claimed that they too were entitled to consideration similar to that granted to religious bodies. The Bill covers a very wide range. Personally I am opposed to lotteries being made legal. The present Act prohibits the conduct of lotteries of all descriptions. I have noticed from time to time in places where the lotteries have been conducted by permission a number of children have congregated around spinning jinnies or wheels. I am of opinion that the effect on the youth cannot be good. I take it that in connection with the prevention of the conduct of those lotteries, a principle is involved, and if we are to permit lotteries to be conducted for charitable purposes we at once do away with that principle. If it is right for us to allow lotteries to be carried on for charity it must be right also for us to allow the lotteries to be carried on for any other purpose.

Mr. Willcock: Oh, no.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: If it is right in one instance it must be right in another. At any rate that is my opinion, and the House will have an opportunity now that the Bill is being considered, of saving whether lotteries should or should not be legalised so far as charities are concerned. I wish the House to remember that if the Bill is carried it will give the Minister controlling the Act power to issue permits for lotteries for charitable purposes, but that if it is not carried it will amount to a direc-

tion that no permit whatever is to be given at any time for a lottery, whether that lottery be for a charitable or for any other purpose.

Mr. Clydesdale: What is to become of the charitable institutions?

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: I know that a great number of charitable institutions will find it difficult to raise money. Some of the charities have raised large sums of money every year by being permitted to carry on these lotteries. Quite a number of other people come along and say that they want to run a lottery for a certain purpose, and that after having been given permission, we discover the fact that the lottery was not conducted for charity, but that it was run for personal gain. We grant permits provided there is no question of personal gain. If the practice we have carried on in the past is to continue, well and good; permits can be issued as before. I suggest to the hon. member who introduced the Bill, that instead of providing that these lotteries be permitted for charitable objects he should alter it to read that the permits may be issued for "any worthy object." If he were to do that the Minister would not have any serious objection to granting a permit, provided, of course, there was no question of personal gain. However, I intend to oppose the Bill, because I have noticed, on going into different places, the evil I have described, so far as children are concerned.

Mr. Latham: Do you agree that we should continue to permit money to be sent out of the State?

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: Tattersall's sweeps are an entirely different thing. I am referring particularly to that form of gambling which is watched by the children, and who grow excited over the prospects of winning perhaps 5s. for 1s. or £1 for 5s. That is where the evil comes in.

Mr. Clydesdale: That is a lot to excite Australians!

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: That is the position, and it is left for the House to decide. If the House decides to carry this amending Bill and to permit lotteries for charitable purposes, well and good.

Mr. WILLCOCK (Geraldton) [8.0]: I support the Bill. I do not see any other method of running our charitable and worthy institutions than by giving them means of raising money. There are many institutions in the State which should be financed by the State, but owing to the financial position, these responsibilities have been taken over by other people, and it is a matter of obtaining sufficient money to keep them going. In the circumstances we must provide means to raise sufficient funds to fulfil the purposes for which these institutions exist. There are many desirable objects, for the attainment of which people band themselves together, but unless they run fairs or entertainments, they are not likely to raise sufficient funds.

Particularly is this so when the amount required is considerable. In Geraldton we have a very fine soldiers' institute. The Premier was there last week and was very pleased with it. The member for Moore and other members who have been there know it is a very fine institution for the purpose for which it was created. The building cost £4,000 or £5,000. It is used as a club and to give meals to soldiers, and can be availed of by soldiers for hundreds of miles around. Some times 40 or 50 soldiers are there together, and great use is made of the building. Unfortunately, we have succeeded in paying off only about £2,000. The Government were approached, but the reply was, "Your object is absolutely worthy. We would be very glad if it were possible to assist you in such a laudable object, but we cannot do so."

The Colonial Secretary: That would be a worthy object, not a charitable object.

Mr. WILLCOCK: But the Minister is opposing the Bill altogether. If he had his way, he would not give these people an opportunity to run lotteries to liquidate the debt. There is a debt of about £2,000. Last year we held a series of public entertainments and raised about £200, and that was the most we could do after resorting to all sorts of different amusements. That amount was only about sufficient to pay the interest for one year. The people of the district and the soldiers want to get the balance paid off, and they consider that if they were given permission to run lotteries, they would eventually be able to clear the debt and the building would be there for the soldiers for all time. We have asked different people to suggest means for raising the necessary money and the only way seems to be by means of fairs or lotteries. The member for Cue (Mr. Chesson) was talking to-day about selling tickets to raise money for the working expenses of the Cue hospital. If the State were in a financial position to give assistance to this institution, it would do so. Owing to the financial position of the State, it is impossible to get a subsidy for this hospital. Entertainments with which are associated some lotteries are of no great harm in a case like this, and the ultimate good is undoubtedly considerable. I am not what is termed a wowsler. There might be some little harm in instances if people were given unbridled license to do as they wished, but I do not think that the harm in this connection is sufficient to counteract the ultimate advantages which would accrue to many of the worthy objects now in need of funds. Permission has been given in some instances during the past 12 or 18 months for lotteries to be held, and we recognise that the time has come when the House and not the Minister should take the responsibility. Personally, I am prepared to take the responsibility by supporting a measure of this description. It is unfair to expect the Minister to accept a responsibility which is in conflict with the spirit of the Act. With the Minister I think that we should specify "worthy" object instead of "charitable" object. "Char-

table" is very difficult to define whereas, if we stipulate "worthy" object, the Minister would have no difficulty to decide. I doubt whether the hospital at Cue would come under the definition of charitable object.

The Colonial Secretary: The raising of the money for the hall you mentioned would not.

Mr. WILLCOCK. Quite so; the soldiers and the people connected with the hall would resent it if it were termed a charitable institution. I support the Bill.

Mr. LAMBERT (Coolgardie) [8.8]: I was pleased to hear the suggestion from the Minister charged with the administration of the Act that he desires a wider interpretation of the clause giving permission for certain lotteries to be run. However disagreeable it might be to some members to support an amendment of this description, the times through which we are passing really demand it. It need not be considered as a permanent measure. During the stress of war when money was required for national defence, for the maintenance of soldiers' wives and many other laudable objects, all sorts of efforts had to be put forth to raise sufficient money. While under ordinary circumstances many members would hesitate to give the Minister carte blanche to run lotteries for laudable or worthy objects, under present conditions there is practically an obligation cast upon us if we desire to keep these institutions going. The Minister must know that at the present time Western Australia is sending a considerable sum of money to Tasmania, to Queensland and to other places for legalised lotteries. So long as people will invest their modest 5s. or 10s. in lotteries, Western Australia's laudable institutions should have the advantage. Many members would hesitate under ordinary conditions to sanction a departure of this description, but the obligation is now cast upon us to keep these established institutions going and to give those who are prepared in their unselfish way to conduct these lotteries the opportunity to raise sufficient funds to tide over the present bad times. I hope that some discrimination will be shown. Discrimination is necessary when it is the right of the Minister to grant or veto the running of lotteries by betting houses and similar institutions. I know of instances which I need not particularise of certain betting houses being prepared to conduct lotteries, probably for laudable objects, and the men associated with them are decent and worthy men, but I do not think these people should receive the right to conduct lotteries. There are many other organisations such as the Ugly Men's Association which have done a considerable amount of good in this State, and I do not think they have done any very great harm even if they have run "get-rich-quick" concerns or spinning jennies or something of that kind. The Minister in his desire to protect the youth of the community need

not fear the evil influence of running an innocent spinning jenny. This sort of thing would not be desirable if we could do without it. There are many things which are not desirable in our present economic and social system such as gambling and drink. It would be better if these things were unknown to civilisation, but they are with us and probably will remain for all time. While to some extent I regret the necessity for the amendment, I hope it will take such a form as will enable the Minister to give it the broadest and most commonsense application. I have no fear as to the Minister exercising his discretion with regard to what is a worthy object, but I hope he will not be cramped in his interpretation as to what a laudable or worthy object is. If he has the right to exercise his discretionary power with regard to anything that has for its object the promotion of the happiness, well-being and care of the sick, I hope it will receive his favourable consideration. I do hope that if Section 212 of the Criminal Code is amended, the Minister will not permit people who run betting shops in the main streets to conduct lotteries. I trust some endeavour will be made also to curtail the amount of money which goes out of the State every year to the East for sweeps. I am indiscreet enough to spend a modest 5s., or sometimes 10s., by way of investment in a lottery. In doing it I have no idea that such an action hurts me or anyone else. I should be glad to spend a few shillings every week in that way if charitable purposes were incidentally furthered by my doing so. The time has arrived for a broad review of this important subject, a review bringing into immediate focus all the plain, everyday facts. At present thousands of pounds are going out of Western Australia, from which money the State derives no corresponding advantage. The Commonwealth Government, while they have made a sort of display of putting down the conduct of lotteries—without, however, having in fact attempted to do it in a practical way—derive a great deal of revenue from that expenditure. Having focussed commonsense upon the experience we have had and are having of thousands of pounds going year by year from this State to the Eastern States for lotteries, I say the time has come for us to conclude that we should be justified in seeking all the revenue we can out of money destined for lotteries, seeking it for the benefit of charitable and other laudable objects. I shall be pleased to support the second reading, subject to an understanding that the Bill, if passed, would have a wider meaning and a wider interpretation. Otherwise I can hardly support the measure. I agree with the member for Kalgoorlie (Mr. Boyland) and the Colonial Secretary that, while no harm can possibly result from the Bill, a great deal of good may spring from it under present conditions by



reason of its leading to the conduct of lotteries on decent lines.

Mrs. COWAN (West Perth) [8.19]: I feel that I cannot support the second reading of the Bill. We ought not to get down to such a low level that we can take care of our poor and our sick and our wounded soldiers, and our children who need air, only by offering a quid pro quo in the shape of gambling. I cannot believe that our spirit of humanity has fallen so low. Surely taxation is the right method of providing money for these objects. I am here to stand for that. I contend that the needs of sickness, the needs of poverty, and the needs of our wounded soldiers should be met either by direct giving or by direct taxation. I have listened to the Colonial Secretary, and I know from past experience, from what one sees of children with whom one is brought into contact, that the gambling methods which the Bill proposes to legalise are very deleterious. One does not want to see gambling, either at bazaars or in any other place, extended further by Act of Parliament. Personally, if I were only earning 5s. a week I would rather contribute in taxation a few pence from that pittance than see charitable institutions obliged to depend for aid on gambling pursuits, the wherewithal being obtained at the price of a quid pro quo in the shape of excitement or the chance of winning a large sum of money. In contributing a few pence weekly under such circumstances, I should feel that I was doing more for charity than people who contributed pounds in that direction through the medium of gambling. I have here a note from the Child Welfare Committee which met last week. It was a large conference, at which religious, educational, municipal, and social bodies were represented; and the conference passed the following resolution:

That this conference condemns the Bill before Parliament seeking to legalise lotteries for charitable purposes.

That resolution was passed on Wednesday, the 21st inst.

Mr. LATHAM: Some members of that conference were unpatriotic enough to remain sitting down while the National Anthem was being played.

Mrs. COWAN: They may have contributed to funds for the benefit of sick and wounded soldiers, all the same. Their conduct in the respect referred to does not make any difference to the principle of this Bill. Certainly we should make it illegal to have children take any part in lotteries. When young people reach the age of 21 years, they can have the right to decide the gambling question for themselves. I quite realise the object of the sponsor of the Bill; I fully acknowledge that he wishes to do good. The proposal appeals to one in a specious manner, holding out the prospect of doing some good; but if we have not citizens who

are willing to give either directly or by way of taxation what it is a duty to give, we shall not improve the position by passing a Bill to permit gambling, and indulgence in lotteries.

Mr. LATHAM (York) [8.22]: I support the second reading. When considering a question of taxation, we must realise the actual facts. By permitting the raising of money for charitable purposes as the Bill suggests, we shall not hurt anybody, seeing that thousands upon thousands of pounds are going out of Western Australia to other States for no other purpose than swelling the revenues of those States, and particularly the revenue of one State.

Mr. Willecock: And the profits of the proprietors of the sweeps.

Mr. LATHAM: That is so. I think the member for Kalgoorlie (Mr. Boyland) has acted very sensibly in bringing before the House this amending Bill, which empowers the Colonial Secretary to permit the raising of money for charitable and other worthy purposes by means of lotteries so long as the money is obtained from those who are willing to pay it. I know very well that if we depended on voluntary giving to maintain our hospitals, the patients would often go hungry. It is impossible to get the people to maintain charitable institutions by direct giving. In putting on a charities tax we should hurt people who can ill afford to be hurt.

Mr. MacCallum Smith: The people can afford to pay taxation.

Mr. LATHAM: The hon. member interjecting knows that taxation gets passed on in every instance, passed on until it reaches the primary producer and the poor man. The objection as to encouraging children to gamble, and exciting children by gambling, does not hold good, because methods can be adopted of running the lotteries without children being affected. One result of the passing of the Bill will be to retain in this State much money that is now sent East for investment in lotteries. Let me say that I am not a believer at all in the spinning-jenny system; we can go in for a better system of gambling, if hon. members insist on the use of the word "gambling." I shall support the Bill, because I consider that the effect of passing it will be to maintain worthy institutions without increasing taxation.

Hon. T. WALKER (Kalgoorlie) [8.26]: I am going to support the Bill. I think it necessary for our honesty that we should do so. It is stupid and uncivilised hypocrisy to prevent lotteries while permitting church bazaars and the State totalisator. The State itself has admitted the principle of lotteries on every racecourse. We are raising funds, if not exactly swelling our finances, by legalising lotteries at certain spots and at certain times, and legalising them for gain. The State takes a share in the proceeds, and delights when the proceeds are big, so that

the Treasurer may derive some substantial benefit. Can it be said that a thing is moral in one spot, and immoral in another, under the same sun and on the same earth? Is it the locality that adds virtue or gives the moral aspect? Can it be said that at particular times in the year the thing is moral, and at other times of the year immoral? The running of a totalisator is either moral or immoral. If it be moral, it is moral at all times. The particular spot and hour do not make it either moral or immoral. If a thing is moral in principle, it is right. If it is immoral in principle, no one has a right to give a monopoly of it either to the State or to any person or persons for a particular period of the year. If totalisator gambling is immoral, then the State itself is a criminal, and we cannot expect the State to prosecute, under the Criminal Code, others for doing that which the State does itself. Such conduct would be humbug and hypocrisy. Whilst I thoroughly agree with some members who have addressed the Chamber on the Bill to-night, that all our really charitable institutions should be a matter for State provision, I say it is absolutely wrong to put the burden of those institutions on the few, and to allow the uncharitable to go without contributing at all. I am certainly of opinion that we should by our laws provide for the necessitous of all kinds, and that everybody should be compelled to bear his fair share of the burden. But, unfortunately, we cannot do that; or we are not doing it. Indeed, I do not know how we can do it, having regard to the enormous burden of taxation under which the people are already staggering, and having regard to the habit and custom, referred to by previous speakers, of passing on the burden, so that ultimately the necessitous, the struggling, the oppressed, and the poor have really to carry the burden all upon their shoulders. Whilst we are in our present position, the proposal of this measure is wiser than the conditions actually prevailing. Semi-State institutions, such as the Perth Public Hospital, the Children's Hospital, the institutions for the blind, in fact all our charitable institutions, to-day put young women upon our public streets with begging boxes in their hands, sticking up all passers-by, and almost blackmailing them by charm and other means into contributing.

Mrs. Cowan: It is direct giving, all the same.

Hon. T. WALKER: It is not direct giving; it is not voluntary giving; it is forced giving. Put a lot of old ugly men on the streets with those boxes, and see what you will get.

Mrs. Cowan: I do not say that it is the right way of doing it.

Hon. T. WALKER: No. It is an absolutely dishonourable way of doing it. It is an appeal to the sex passions of humanity in very many instances. It is making use of human weaknesses. These girls, fresh from school, carrying these boxes and bailing up

young men and offering to put a flower in their button holes, with a few nice smiles and remarks while it is being done—is that the way to support charity?

Mrs. Cowan: No; we want taxation.

Hon. T. WALKER: Well, we want to abolish that, and I submit that this will do it. What is it you want? Do you wish to crush the betting instinct? You cannot do it. All life is a gamble, from beginning to end. Your penny prize boxes and your Sunday school bazaars are infinitely worse than the open method, giving one a chance. The primary producers—I am one of them myself—what do they do? They gamble every year. The member for West Perth will not deny that it is a legitimate gamble. They wager against the season and the rainfall and the unsympathetic critics of the wheat pool, and all that sort of thing. All through it is a gamble. I will undertake to say that the member for West Perth has her life insured.

Mrs. Cowan: No, I have not.

Hon. T. WALKER: Well, I am surprised to hear that, because of her anticipatory mind, her desire to provide for the future of those who are dear to her. However, she knows good friends of hers who are insured, and I guarantee she has never attempted to discourage them. Is not every life insurance policy in the nature of a wager? It is admitted lawfully that it is of the character of a wager. I have quoted law authorities on that point in the House before to-night. Is not every enterprise of ours a wager? We start a woollen industry; is it not a wager? Is it not pledging money on the chance of making more? And, as somebody interjected, every time we go into an election, asking the support of our constituents, are we not running a risk? Is not that a bet, a wager? Some may lose, some win, but it is all a wager, a risk. Everything in life is a risk. Where, then, is the immorality? Every man in business is wagering his capital, his talent, and his energies against the future. What is the idea here? To prevent this? You cannot stop it. You have tried to stop it. The State has tried to stop it. There is as much wagering now as ever before. The Commonwealth has tried to stop it; and now the Commonwealth, learning a little wisdom, is collaring 14 per cent. of it, sharing the plunder.

Mr. Latham: While pretending to stop it.

Hon. T. WALKER: Yes, prosecuting some persons.

Mrs. Cowan: Why not be consistent and abolish all gambling?

Hon. T. WALKER: Then we shall have to abolish life. We cannot stop gambling. Every time a marriage takes place it is a wager. It is of no use, therefore, ignoring the facts. We have to take human nature as it is. We are not all like Galatea, made of marble, but are human creatures with flowing blood in our veins, and therefore we must

make our laws cognisant of that fact. We must get down to realities and practical common sense. This straight-laced morality of the same kind that used to turn the faces of the clocks to the wall on a Sunday, used to prevent the cocks crowing on the Sabbath day—all that sort of thing may be admirable in historical books, but it is not practical. We must come down to human nature. Wagering is a routine of life, and on that score I am glad to see it legalised; that is to say, permitted and controlled by the law. Because with the law as it now stands, we have it evaded at every possible turn. So we not only create a crime by our law books, but we create hypocrisy, we make sneaks of the community, we drive them into the dark to do what is not in its nature dishonorable, what is not in its nature wrong. We drive them into sneaking so that they become hypocrites and crawlers and deceitful creatures at the same time as they are criminals by our codes. That is not wise statesmanship or law. Let us give in our law books full liberty to extend and utilise all the elements of human nature with which we are endowed. Let us not attempt to stop those elements, because if we do it will be like stopping a stream by damming it back and so forcing it to cut away somewhere else. We must have those forces growing, and to pretend that this one, which is fundamental, is criminal is rank hypocrisy. There is no crime about it. It is done everywhere, and even our parsons—I have seen them myself—when they desire to add another story to their steeples, they go around helping to swell the little raffle or taking a dip in the prize bag, with a view to popularising the function. And all our community are using these similar forces, and they are winked at by the authorities, whereas a straight-out honest desire to further strengthen any good and useful institution in our midst with an open sweep is tabooed, and if it does not get the approval of the Colonial Secretary there is fine or imprisonment for doing a thing which is permitted, which the State itself does through the totalisator. Let us be men and women and, recognising facts, shape our laws accordingly.

Mr. BOYLAND (Kalgoorlie—in reply) [8.40]: I do not know that I have heard many arguments against what I may term legalising the lottery for charitable objects or worthy purposes. The only thing which has been said was said by the member for West Perth (Mrs. Cowan), namely that we have come to a very low ebb in having to raise money in this manner.

Mrs. Cowan: I said that human nature was coming to a very low ebb.

Mr. BOYLAND: I have had a good deal of experience in raising money for charitable purposes and worthy objects, and I have always found it is the same people who contribute over and over again. There is always the willing horse, the man ever prepared to give. That has been the unfortunate ex-

perience of my friends also until, considering the state of the finances, and that the Government cannot help, we would have lotteries legalised. In moving the second reading I pointed out that in my electorate we have what we call the Fresh Air Fund, to help our little children who live in those hot arid districts, and to send them to the coast once a year. The only way in which we could raise money for that object this year was by a sweep. While the sweep was in progress the police stepped in, but we succeeded in our object, raising £900 to help the little children to Bunbury, where fresh life will be put into them. I hope we shall never fail to get money for so good a purpose. We also have the Children's Hospital, for which Kalgoorlie and Boulder raise £500 per annum. We have been up against it from time to time in the raising of this money, but if the Bill is passed we shall have no further trouble, seeing that the people of our community are fond of a little gamble, especially when it is based on a worthy object. We also have the benevolent societies. The Premier can tell the House that he had to give us money to help tide us over our very bad times. With these worthy objects before us we must raise money by some means or other. I cannot see anything in this form of raising money that will degrade the public in any way. Life itself is a gamble. I have two little boys—one aged 10 and the other 11. They know nothing about gambling or, indeed, anything of the world, and yet I frequently hear them arguing one with the other and one saying that he will bet the other so and so on a certain issue. Even the Premier in this House the other day offered to bet a member across the Chamber and you, Sir, called him to order and told him that betting was not allowed in this Chamber. It seems to be natural to us, and so long as the object is a worthy one what is there against this form of gambling, if it can be called so? It is for a laudable purpose, to help our children, and our sick and infirm. What can be said against it? I was reared in an atmosphere of gambling. I travelled through the west of Queensland which you, Sir, know well. It was a regular gambling hell. It never affected me. If I wanted to have a gamble now I would have it. Though I have lived in that atmosphere, it has not dragged me down. As a matter of fact, I do not gamble. A sweep or a lottery, as we propose it shall be carried out, cannot be harmful. I am sure the Minister in charge will do his duty, and see that gambling for a worthy object of this sort will not be abused in any way. During the war we had permission to run any form of gambling that was desired for the benefit of our soldiers. When the war was over this was abolished. If it was good enough in connection with an object of that sort then it is good enough in connection with the object I now mention. I trust the Bill will be passed.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

## In Committee.

Mr. Stubbs in the Chair; Mr. Boyland in charge of the Bill.

Clause 1—agreed to.

Clause 2—Amendment of Section 212:

Mr. WILLCOCK: I move an amendment—

That in line 4 of the proviso the word "charitable" be struck out and "worthy" be inserted in lieu.

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

Title—agreed to.

Bill reported with an amendment.

## RETURN—PUBLIC SERVICE.

## Cost of Holiday and Other Leave.

Debate resumed from 14th September on the following motion by Mr. A. Thomson:—

That a return be laid upon the Table of the House showing—(a) The total cost to the State for the year ended the 30th June, 1921, for annual holidays for State employees (exclusive of the Railway Department); (b) The cost for the same period for long service leave; (c) The cost for the same period for sick leave.

to which an amendment had been moved by Mr. McCallum—

That paragraph (a) be struck out.

Mr. A. THOMSON (Katanning—on amendment) [8.55]: I hope the amendment will not be accepted. Perhaps I was unfortunate in the way in which I framed this motion. What I really wanted to find out was the total amount paid in this connection.

Mr. O'Loghlen: What was your object in getting the information?

Mr. A. THOMSON: I want to know the total amount paid each year for annual leave.

Mr. Corboy: Will the cost of getting out this return make it worth while?

Mr. A. THOMSON: I do not think the cost will be very great. If the Department are keeping their books as a private concern would it should be easy to ascertain what the probable amount is. The information will certainly be instructive. We have heard it said these returns will be of no value. I differ from that statement. I have no desire to take away any of the privileges which Parliament or the Public Service Act has conferred upon civil servants. Seeing that we have a precedent already laid down, in that the motion moved by the Leader of the Opposition for a return in connection with certain officials was carried, I contend that my motion should also be carried. I looked upon it merely as a formal matter, and I regret that the time of the House has been taken up in debating it.

Amendment put and passed.

Question as amended put and negatived.

## RETURN—RAILWAYS—PRIVILEGES AND FREE PASSES.

Debate resumed from 14th September on the following motion by Mr. A. Thomson—

That a return be laid upon the Table of the House showing—(a) the cost to the Railway Department for privilege tickets for the year ended 30th June, 1921; (b) The cost of free passes issued to railway employees for the same period; (c) The cost of free passes over interstate railways; (d) The cost to the Railway Department for annual holidays for the same period; (e) The cost of payment for sick leave; (f) The cost of free passes for members of Parliament.

Mr. WILLCOCK (Geraldton) [8.58]: I think this motion will meet with the same fate as the previous motion. Most of the matters set out in it have already been under the jurisdiction of the Arbitration Court. Even if we did find out the cost it would be very little satisfaction to us, because we cannot alter the conditions. The conditions appertaining to the railways have been dealt with by the Arbitration Court which has decided that these conditions should be granted as part of the emoluments for work done by the employees. Whether this will cost a thousand pounds or a hundred thousand pounds does not make any difference; we have to pay. We cannot alter the conditions laid down by the Arbitration Court. The member for South Fremantle (Mr. McCallum) interjected during the debate that farmers' wives had similar privileges granted to them, but this was denied by members on the cross benches.

The Premier: They only have one ticket a year.

Mr. WILLCOCK: It was denied that there were any tickets given.

Mr. Latham: It is only the ordinary excursion that they get.

Mr. WILLCOCK: The ordinary excursion which other people living in the country cannot get.

Mr. Latham: They get it then because it is their spare time.

Mr. WILLCOCK: The miners' wives at Mt. Magnet or Cue or elsewhere do not get any such concession.

Mr. Latham: They can avail themselves of the Christmas and Easter excursions.

Mr. WILLCOCK: That is not so. The miner's wife cannot get the concession that the farmer's wife can.

Mr. A. Thomson: I admitted that the farmers' wives get that concession.

Mr. WILLCOCK: The hon. member's voice must have been drowned in the interjections by other members who denied that they did get those concessions. I have a letter from the Commissioner in which he expressed his regret that he could not grant an extension of a similar concession to other women. The letter is dated from the Commissioner's

office and was sent to Mr. McCallum at the Trades Hall. The letter read—

Your letter of the 15th inst. has had the Commissioner's earnest consideration, but he regrets he cannot extend the concession to other than farmers' wives.

The Premier: That was because they can get away during the ordinary excursion seasons.

Mr. WILLCOCK: Not necessarily. It is not right to assume that other women can get away during that season. I am not saying that it is wrong to grant the concession to the farmers' wives, but I quote that communication from the Commissioner to justify the interjection by the member for South Fremantle (Mr. McCallum) which was denied by members sitting on the cross benches. The Commissioner says that he cannot grant an extension of those privileges for apparently grave reasons and the cost which it represents to the department. That being so, it ill becomes members of the Country Party to deny the existence of those privileges.

Hon. T. Walker: I do not gather from that letter that any concession is given to a farmer's widow.

Mr. WILLCOCK: What is the world to a man whose wife is dead? I do not desire to say anything about the rest of the motion beyond remarking that most of the matters indicated are decided by the Arbitration Court and embodied in the awards of that tribunal. Therefore it does not matter whether it costs a thousand pounds or a million pounds. It is a matter decided by the courts. It is futile to give a return of the description asked for, for it would only be misleading.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN (North-East Fremantle) [9.3]: It is impossible to get an accurate return of the nature sought. Any return which is procured in pursuance of this motion would only mislead the public. What is the use of a return unless it is accurate? As the member for Geraldton (Mr. Willcock) has stated, the first three or four of these questions have been settled by the Arbitration Court. As to the last portion of the motion dealing with the cost of free passes for members of Parliament, it is impossible to get any information. All that would happen would be that an official in the department would say that so many passes had been issued to members of Parliament and that such passes, if used, would be worth so much. Members know, however, that the passes are not used to the extent that they are used, for instance, by a commercial house. In fact, members do not use their passes as much as they should, and I think the Premier will agree with me in that contention.

Mr. Willcock: At any rate, the Premier does his fair share.

The Premier: Members do not see a fraction of the country.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: The fact is that members cannot afford to do so. A return such as that asked for, would be useless to the public and to members of Parliament because of its inaccuracy.

Hon. T. Walker: It would be misleading.

Mr. Corboy: And expensive.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: It would not be expensive because the department would not be able to do more than make a guess, saying that so many passes were issued to members of Parliament, that passes issued to commercial houses were worth so much, and that therefore the passes issued to members of Parliament would be worth so much. Regarding the payment for sick leave, it is a matter of impossibility to get information sought under that head so far as the wages men are concerned. In any case sick leave is provided for in the award but it does not cost much for the wages men.

Mr. Davies: There is no sick leave so far as the wages men are concerned.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: The awards of the Federal Arbitration Court have provided for sick leave as, for instance, in the engineers' case.

Mr. Davies: But that does not affect the State employees.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: That is so and, in addition to that, when a man is ill the men who are working on the job do the absent man's work as well without any additional remuneration for the most part. In that case, there would be no additional cost at all. The return would be useless and misleading to the public.

Mr. LATHAM (York) [9.7]: I do not see why it should be a matter of impossibility to get a return such as that sought. I am surprised to hear an ex-Minister of the Crown say that it is impossible to get it.

Hon. T. Walker: He says that because he knows.

Mr. LATHAM: I am surprised to hear that statement. It simply leads the House to believe that the Railway Department must keep their books in an extraordinary way.

Mr. Willcock: They cannot say how many times you travel to York.

Mr. LATHAM: I am not talking about that aspect so much but I would like to have some information about some of these matters for the benefit of railway men. I heard an hon. member make a statement that members of Parliament cannot travel because they cannot afford to do so. There are men in the railways who cannot afford to use their privilege passes, and those who are in that position to my mind should receive some monetary compensation.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: Such compensation would be charged up as a cost against the department, but the department would not know whether the passes were used or not.

Mr. LATHAM: So far as sick leave is concerned, I do not know why we should not be able to get that information. I am not saying anything against sick leave, because I think the men are entitled to it.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: It does not cost the Railway Department much.

Mr. LATHAM: I do not think so, but it is extraordinary that some branches in the public service can have these privileges and other branches do not get them.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: That is another question.

Mr. LATHAM: At any rate, it is extraordinary.

Mr. O'Loughlin: In one case they have a union and in the other case they have an association. In the one case they have their awards; in the other, they get what they can.

Mr. LATHAM: It is an unfortunate position. Regarding the statement about farmers' wives availing themselves of excursions at Christmas and Easter time, farmers' wives are fully occupied during that period. In order that these people should be able to get away from the country, representations were made that the privileges should be extended to them at excursion rates at more suitable periods. I think it was the Minister for Mines who was asked for that concession.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: It was the Premier who granted the extension. The Minister was there and I backed him up.

Mr. LATHAM: The concession was granted at that time. Instead of first class fares like some civil servants receive, the farmers' wives get second class fares, but their husbands cannot travel on the same train. That is most extraordinary. Women availing themselves of the concession along the agricultural lines are not questioned by the guards as to whether they are farmers' wives or not. Therefore, the same privilege extends to others.

Mr. O'Loughlin: The Commissioner will be glad to hear that.

Mr. A. THOMSON (Katanning—in reply) [9.11]: I am surprised at the attitude adopted by some members in opposing this motion. The member for North-East Fremantle and the member for Geraldton have stated that if we secure this return it will not be of any value.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: It will not be accurate.

Mr. A. THOMSON: If the Railway Department cannot give an accurate return dealing with the various matters raised in the motion, it is time we had a clean sweep and replaced the officers by men who are capable of giving this information.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: No person could give an accurate return dealing with some of these items.

Mr. A. THOMSON: The officials can give us returns for mileage and the amount of

goods and revenue received at the various railway stations throughout the State, and if they can do that, surely they can give this House the information I am asking for.

Mr. Willcock: They know that you are given a railway pass, but they do not know whether you travel 10 miles or 1,000 miles.

Mr. A. THOMSON: The member for Geraldton has stated that these privileges are granted to the railway employees by the Arbitration Court and are embodied in their awards. I wish to draw the attention of the House to the statement made by the Commissioner of Railways when the engine-drivers' case was before the Arbitration Court. The Commissioner pointed out in connection with this question that the privileges had been abused, and it was in consequence of his statement that I seek the information regarding those privileged tickets.

Mr. O'Loughlin: He would give you a different statement to-day. He was "scrapping" then.

Mr. A. THOMSON: He stated that people were using privilege tickets and, as a matter of fact, during the hearing of that case before the Arbitration Court, a certain railway employee was prosecuted for improperly using a privilege ticket. I do not want to debar people in the outside areas from using these tickets. It may be information for the House and the country to know that private citizens travelling on the suburban railways have to pay full fares while railway employees use privilege tickets. While the railway employees have the right to these privilege tickets, that was never intended when this matter was introduced. The idea of the privilege tickets was to allow those people who are compelled to work in distant parts to get away to the larger towns to do shopping.

Mr. Willcock: Oh, no.

Mr. A. THOMSON: Oh, yes. It is, of course, a matter of interpretation.

Mr. Willcock: There are two different classes of tickets altogether.

Mr. A. THOMSON: A man went fishing the other day and three railway employees went as well. They had first class return tickets, whereas the other man had to travel second class.

Hon. T. Walker: They get those tickets twice a year.

Mr. A. THOMSON: All I can say is that the man travelling in the metropolitan area is foolish if he uses privilege tickets for journeys in the suburban area. We should know what this privilege costs. We are entitled to the information, and I trust the House will agree to have it supplied. The member for Geraldton asked what was the use of getting information of this description because it would be of no value to the State. If that is the way the country is to be administered, well and good. Then it will not matter whether our deficit increases or not.

Mr. Willcock: If you cannot alter the position why bother?

Mr. A. THOMSON: We can alter it.

Mr. Willcock: The court says you cannot.

Mr. A. THOMSON: The award will not last for all time. It is quite possible that these privileges are being abused and that they are costing the State more money than they should. The railway men are receiving practically as much wages, and as a matter of fact in many cases more than is being received by outside employees.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: The Arbitration Court decides that, not us.

Mr. A. THOMSON: True, owing to my position as a member of Parliament, I have the privilege of a railway pass, and my Parliamentary duties necessitates my travelling backwards and forwards on the railways. If any railway man is also travelling backwards and forwards on official business, he is entitled to do so.

Mr. O'Loghlen: Do you confine your travelling strictly to your district?

Mr. A. THOMSON: Do you?

Mr. O'Loghlen: No, like you, I go to Geraldton sometimes.

Mr. A. THOMSON: The men who are in the employ of the Railway Department are assured of their jobs from the beginning to the end of the year so long as they carry out their duties faithfully and well.

Mr. Corboy: They are being retrenched now.

Mr. A. THOMSON: I admit a certain number of men are being retrenched, but most of them worked from the 1st January to the end of December. Take the position of the men engaged in the building trade.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: What has that to do with the motion?

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member had better confine himself to the motion.

Mr. A. THOMSON: I want to explain the motive which prompted me to submit the motion. The railway men told the Arbitration Court that the privileges were of no use to them and then added, "Do not take them from us." However, I do not intend to labour the motion. Since I gave notice of it I have received a number of anonymous letters drawing attention to the privileges enjoyed by members of Parliament and also by the Commissioner of Railways. It is not my desire to injure any section of the community, nor to curtail the privileges granted by the Arbitration Court to the railway employees, but I maintain that in view of the big loss being sustained by the Railway Department, and also because of the huge deficit with which we are faced, we, as members of Parliament, have a right to ask for information like this.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: I would vote with you if you could get the information.

Mr. A. THOMSON: The hon. member can take a risk, and if I may be permitted to repeat what the Premier said a few nights ago, if the carrying of the motion will not do any good it will not do any harm. The carrying of the motion will have the effect

that when the railway employees see the enormous amount of money which is involved it will make them realise that they have a better job than they think they have.

Hon. T. Walker: It is a motion to reduce wages.

Mr. A. THOMSON: That is a brilliant interjection. Can the hon. member show me in what way the motion suggests the reduction of wages?

Hon. T. Walker: Your speech has suggested it.

Mr. A. THOMSON: I know the hon. member is a clever juggler of words, but I defy him to prove that my motion means what he suggests.

Hon. T. Walker: I should take that as a compliment coming from anybody but you.

Mr. A. THOMSON: I submit the motion.

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

Ayes	..	..	..	18
Noes	..	..	..	17
Majority for				1

#### AYES.

Mr. Angelo	Sir James Mitchell
Mr. Boyland	Mr. Money
Mr. Broun	Mr. Pickering
Mr. Carter	Mr. Plesse
Mrs. Cowan	Mr. Sampson
Mr. Denton	Mr. Stubbs
Mr. Durack	Mr. A. Thomson
Mr. Hickmott	Mr. Mullany
Mr. Latham	(Teller.)
Mr. H. K. Maley	

#### NOES.

Mr. Angwin	Mr. Munsie
Mr. Chesson	Mr. J. H. Smith
Mr. Clydesdale	Mr. J. Thomson
Mr. Collier	Mr. Troy
Mr. Corboy	Mr. Underwood
Mr. Davies	Mr. Walker
Mr. Heron	Mr. Willcock
Mr. Lambert	Mr. O'Loghlen
Mr. Marshall	(Teller.)

#### PAIR.

Ayes: Mr. Johnston. Noes: Mr McCallum.

Question thus passed.

[The Deputy Speaker took the Chair.]

#### MOTION—WHEAT FOR LOCAL CONSUMPTION.

Debate resumed from the 21st September on the following motion by Hon. P. Collier—

That in the opinion of this House the Government should immediately reduce the price of 9s. per bushel now being charged for wheat for local consumption.

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE (Hon. H. K. Maley—Greenough) [9.29]: I would like to explain to the Leader of the

Opposition that when I secured the adjournment of the debate last Wednesday, I did so because the Leader of the House was away, and I considered it my duty to ask for the adjournment on that account. That was the only reason why the debate was not proceeded with. I agree that the question has been worn somewhat threadbare, but there are one or two aspects of the case which I think the House should be acquainted with. I wish to correct the Leader of the Opposition when he stated that it was the Australian Wheat Board who had decided that the price of wheat for local consumption should be advanced to 9s. per bushel for the whole of the present year. I think he is aware that the Premier and representatives of the various State Governments assembled in conference in Melbourne in January of this year, when the price was fixed. The State Governments asked the Australian Wheat Board to reserve for local consumption 30 million bushels of wheat, and if the board retained that quantity each State undertook to pay whatever was agreed upon as a fair computation of what the 1920-21 pool, as a whole, was expected to realise. That was the equivalent based on what London parity was likely to be for the whole year. The 30 million bushels of wheat had to be retained in Australia for local consumption, having been bought by the Governments of the several States. The proportion representing Western Australia's share was estimated at about two million bushels. If the Government decide to reduce the price for local consumption at the moment, whatever the difference between the reduced price and the price fixed might be, it would have to be made good to the Australian Wheat Board by the State Government. There is no question whatever about that. That money, of course, would naturally have to be found by the general taxpayer, who is the consumer.

Capt. Carter: When does the agreement expire?

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: On the 31st December of this year. When the necessary legislation for the inauguration of the State pool is passed, it is quite possible that a month may be shorn off that period. Wheat is practically in in December, and so we can expect about a month to be cut off the period. Under the legislation we are seeking, the wheat will be charged for on the equivalent of London parity. From the first Wheat Marketing Bill which was brought down, London parity has been recognised as the basis. The preamble to the first Wheat Marketing Act in 1916 sets out that the scheme was formulated "for: concerted action by the Governments of the Commonwealth and the (four wheat producing) States for utilising on a fair basis the means of transport available, and for the marketing of the said harvest on behalf of the growers at prices based on those obtainable on the London wheat

market, with certain deductions." I do not wish to infer that, because the price was fixed for the year 1919-20 and the farmers got the worst of the deal, and because the price was fixed for this year and the consumer has had the best of the deal, there is any virtue in price fixing. Two wrongs do not make a right. I am not going to argue on this basis at all, but I do point out that the average export value of the wheat for the 1919-20 pool was 10s. per bushel for the wheat exported, while the price of wheat for local consumption during that year was 7s. 8d. per bushel. From that pool the producer in Western Australia will also be victimised by the fact that this State agreed to supply wheat to New South Wales, Queensland and Tasmania, and our proportion of that quantity will be an additional loss on the producer of this State.

Mr. Troy: Who was responsible for that?

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: I am not going to say, but it was the only possible thing we could do in the circumstances. We had the wheat to sell and, having fixed the price, we could not refuse to sell at that price.

Mr. Money: What is the average for this year?

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: The estimated net realisation on this year's pool is approximately 7s. 11d.

Capt. Carter: That average of 10s. would not be net.

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: That is net to the farmers at the sidings.

Mr. Troy: It has not been paid.

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: No, because the 1919-20 pool has not been finalised. The separation of the supplies to New South Wales, Queensland and Tasmania has not yet taken place. The 10s. per bushel was the f.o.b. price realised for wheat exported. Taking the wheat supplied to New South Wales, Tasmania and Queensland, and the wheat used for local consumption at 7s. 8d. per bushel, it will be seen that, although that pool has realised on the export basis 10s. per bushel, these factors will make a considerable reduction in what we reckoned the pool was likely to realise. We have paid already on that pool 8s. 6d. per bushel. The position, however, will be best outlined by reading a statement made by the Prime Minister before he left for England. This statement was reported in the Melbourne "Argus" of the 2nd April. He said—

The conference, in fixing the price at 9s. for home consumption, did what the subsequent movements of the world's markets have so far amply justified. We have sold overseas a quantity of wheat many times greater than that consumed here, and we have sold—despite the recent weakening of the market—these huge quantities at an average price well over 9s. f.o.b. If the market had hardened and the price of wheat had gone



up, would anyone have suggested that the farmer should have the benefit of the increase? There must be finality in contracts. One party cannot take all the risks and the other all the advantages. The 30 million bushels required for Australian consumption were absolutely withdrawn from participation in the overseas trade. No matter how much tonnage could be obtained or what price could be obtained, the farmer could not send these 30 million bushels overseas. Australian requirements, very properly, were the first charge upon the crop. In all the circumstances the Australian consumer has so far nothing to complain of. He still gets, with the exception of New Zealand, the cheapest loaf in the world. The farmer has not exploited him. On the contrary, he has received considerably more per bushel for the wheat he has sold overseas than he has for wheat sold for home consumption. If and when the average of prices received for overseas falls below 9s. a different position may arise, and the Commonwealth will convene a conference of State Premiers and farmers' representatives to consider the position as it then exists.

We have received no representations whatever from the Governments of the other wheat producing States in regard to the price of wheat for local consumption this year. In fact, when I was in Melbourne in June, I had the assurance of the Minister controlling the wheat scheme in New South Wales, and the Minister for Agriculture of Queensland, that they were entirely satisfied with the price of 9s. per bushel fixed for local consumption, and they expressed the opinion with considerable force that the price of the loaf would not alter to any material extent by basing it on the figures of the export of wheat up to that date. Those gentlemen are representing Governments—

Mr. Troy: Governments like the party opposite, out to rule the farmers.

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: I do not think I have ever said that.

Mr. Troy: That applies to your party.

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: I am prepared to admit that I give everyone else credit for having as fair a mind as I have, and as much ability too. A great amount of ability is displayed by members sitting opposite. The Government must oppose this proposal to alter the price of wheat. It is a contract entered into by the Governments of the various States and, if we break that contract, the Government of this State will have to pay the price. We will have to pay the difference between the export parity, which is in the neighbourhood of 7s., and the 9s. on which the contract was made with the Australian Wheat Board in order to retain this 30 million bushels of wheat in the Commonwealth for local consumption. That wheat has always

been preserved to hand over for gristing, and it has been stored at the expense of the producer. It was always a definite reserve to work on in the event of a failure of the succeeding harvest. In the circumstances, I hope the House will not agree to the motion. The Government have gone as far as they possibly can to meet the situation in regard to all classes of the community with respect to the Bill before the House to control the next harvest, and, having done that, I think we can reasonably claim to have done all we possibly can do. I repeat that there has been no demand from the Governments of the other States to review the position with regard to the price of wheat for local consumption this year, and until such a conference is convened by the Commonwealth Government, I certainly do not think it wise for this State to break away from the contract.

Capt. CARTER (Leederville) [9.43]: I have previously stated in this House that more consideration should be given to the metropolitan area and to the mass of people generally who make up the local consumers in the matter of fixing the price of wheat. I have pointed out the effect which the fixing of the price of wheat has had upon my own electorate in regard to the poultry, dairying and pig-raising industries. I have stated that we produce in the Osborne Park district over 80 per cent. of the milk supply of the metropolitan area. I can also state that once upon a time we were a big poultry-raising district. To-day that is not so, for our poultry industry has practically disappeared. The same thing can be said, in a lesser degree I will admit, of the pig-raising industry; but what is true of the Osborne Park district is also true of practically every other point in the metropolitan area. I can take Belmont as another illustration. In Belmont during the year 1915 there were 100,000 head of poultry. To-day there are not 5,000 head of poultry in the whole district. In the past the poultry and pig raisers have suffered a gradual and lately a very sudden decline in prosperity. There are two or three reasons for this which seem to me to be very patent and apropos of the subject we are discussing to-night. In the first place, under the ruling given by Mr. Baxter, when Honorary Minister for Agriculture, the poultry and pig raisers of the metropolitan area were not looked upon as local consumers. That was the definite ruling given by him, and is one which, I think I am right in saying, the present Minister for Agriculture maintains. This has operated greatly to the disadvantage of these people.

The Minister for Agriculture: What do you mean by local consumers?

Capt. CARTER: The Minister will understand what I mean directly. In 1920, when the world's parity stood at 7s. 8d., dairymen, poultry raisers and pig raisers were not looked upon as local consumers. They were charged up to as high as 11s. per bushel for

their wheat. In 1921 when the local price is 9s. a bushel, and we are selling wheat on the Continent for 7s., these men are considered to be local consumers, because apparently the price for local consumption as fixed is greater than that which we obtain overseas. From the Minister's own mouth we have been told to-night that the net price for exported wheat to the farmer is 7s. 11d.

The Minister for Agriculture: That is the average, or will be the average.

Capt. CARTER: The figures quoted by him were an excerpt from the speech delivered by the Prime Minister on the 13th November, 1920, and therefore do not stand to-day as they undoubtedly applied in 1920. The position is therefore anomalous and it is distinctly unfair to the people of Australia, that we should have to pay at least 1s. per bushel more for our own wheat than we are getting for it overseas on the Continental markets. It seems to me that the powers that be in the price-fixing world have decided on the policy that, when the world's parity is higher than the local price, the producers to whom I am referring are not to be considered as local consumers; but directly the local price is high the local man is called upon to pay, as a local consumer, the higher price.

The Minister for Agriculture: That will be remedied in time.

Capt. CARTER: It is time it was remedied. While the machinery has been set in motion—if that has been done—we have suffered a loss in the Belmont district alone of 95 per cent. of the value of our poultry industry. To-day it is practically non-existent. Apparently we regard the general question of wheat from an altogether wrong point of view. In effect we produce something like 3 per cent. of the world's output of wheat, and yet people talk as if we were a deciding factor in the world of wheat. The day is coming when we will have to look for other avenues for the sale of our wheat. I believe that, when the greater competition which is facing us in the near future occurs, the world's market is not going to be such a payable concern to Australia, and will not be so easily accessible to us as it is to-day. I put it to the House as a business proposition that it will pay the primary producers to feed one industry upon another, and to establish one industry not at the expense of the other but alongside and co-ordinating with the other; in other words, to turn our wheat into bacon, eggs and dairy produce.

Mr. O'Loughlin: Supplementing it.

Capt. CARTER: I am particularly referring to the dairying, the pig raising, and the poultry raising industries of the State. Last year we imported a tremendous amount of these commodities from the Eastern States. I understand we imported into Western Australia £400,000 worth of butter on the one hand and £18,000 worth of eggs on the other.

Mr. Sampson: Ten thousand pounds.

Capt. CARTER: I am merely speaking from memory. At the present rate of decline of our pig raising and bacon industries we

shall have to increase our importations of bacon, etc., from the other States. I believe it would be the finest policy that the Primary Producers' Association could adopt if they were to feed these industries, not by giving anything away, but by giving what I claim is our just due, a fair deal, and a much fairer deal than we have had in the past in the matter of local consumption. In 1914 there were 83,000 pigs in Western Australia. In 1921 there were 58,000, a marked decrease, and yet in 1914 growers were only getting 8d. a lb. and only paying 5s. a bushel for their wheat. At present they are getting 1s. per lb., and yet they cannot afford to keep as many pigs as they kept in 1914. The reason for this is obvious. I am not posing as an expert myself, but I am quoting from the opinions of an expert when I say that it takes 7 lbs. of wheat to produce 1 lb. of pork. When wheat was 5s. a bushel it cost a man 7d. to produce 12d. worth of pork. To-day with wheat at 9s. a bushel, that is one penny and four-fifths per lb., it costs about 1s. 2½d. to produce 1s. worth of pork. That is the one, true and good reason why the pig raising industry is going down in Western Australia.

Mr. Hickmott: There is more pork on the market to-day than there was in 1914.

Capt. CARTER: The reason for this is that the pig raisers cannot afford to feed their pigs, and it is not paying them at the rate of 1s. per lb., whereas in 1914 it paid them to breed pigs at 8d. a lb. The cost is now round about 1s. 3d. per lb. to produce and market pork, which is only worth 1s. per lb.

The Minister for Agriculture: The producers have had the Prices Regulation Commission to protect them.

Capt. CARTER: That protection has driven the industry out of existence. It is no good blinking the fact. The figures I have quoted must stand. If they are wrong they should be corrected by the Minister. Whilst that is true of these industries, it is also true of the dairying industry, which is one that vitally affects the metropolitan area. It is bound up closely with our public health. At present the operations of our dairymen have been hampered and in many cases the quality of the milk produced has suffered, because it is practically impossible to feed at a profit the cows which are producing the milk required for the city and the metropolitan area. The high cost of offal has greatly affected this particular branch of the industry.

Mr. Hickmott: There is more butter produced now than ever before in Western Australia.

Capt. CARTER: There is none produced in the metropolitan area. I am speaking from the point of view of that area. In a month or two there will be little or no green feed available. What has obtained in past years will obtain again this year. There are special circumstances which hon. members are aware of that prevent farmers from building silos.

They cannot afford to make provision against the dry day which comes with every summer. Therefore they will be faced with the same old difficulty, and will face it in the same old imprudent way as they have done in years past. This is a matter which should receive urgent attention at the hands of the Government. We are told that we are bound to the Australian Wheat Board in the matter of 9s. a bushel. If that is so, and it is a matter of subsidising the industry by the amount we will have to pay to the wheat board, I do not know that it would seem advisable, but I say that in the long run, were the Government in a position to finance the industry to-day in that manner, it would pay them to do this. By subsidising these industries and helping them they would be in a position to carry on, and to start on the road to increase as was their position a few years ago. These primary producers in the metropolitan area, primary producers in the fullest sense of the word, are just as much entitled to the name of farmers as are the wheat farmers and fruit growers elsewhere in Western Australia, and just as much entitled to receive benefits in the matter of the cartage of their commodities as the farmers in the country. On a given quantity of pigs in 1918 the freight was 7s. In 1921 on the same given quantity of pigs the freight was 18s. 8d. That does not fit in with the prices charged to the farmers in the back districts. It is absolutely unfair to tell people as they come to the State that they must get out into the back blocks, and ignore the present possibilities of the metropolitan area. The House knows that this is a most important branch of our primary production, and that there are thousands of acres within a comparatively few miles of Perth which are capable of the highest and most intense culture. We know what has been done on the one hand by the Ugly Men's settlement on the Swan, and we know that this may be done in many other districts.

Mr. Hickmott: That does not depend on the wheat.

Capt. CARTER: If fowls do not depend upon wheat, I do not know what does.

Mr. Hickmott: If you have land there why do you not produce feed for your own stock?

Capt. CARTER: If the hon. member can tell me where I can grow wheat within a few miles of the city, we might be able to grow it. I am told that we should grow our own feed. The interjection is as nonsensical as anything I have heard in the House.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The hon. member must address the Chair.

Capt. CARTER: The position makes it incumbent upon the Government, and also on the department handling the marketing of wheat, to deal directly and immediately with the question. If we cannot at once reduce the price of wheat, there should be a definite guarantee given to this House and to the people of Western Australia that the price will be reduced at the first available opportunity. If, as the Minister suggested to-night,

though he did not definitely state it, we shall be free from the arrangement with the Australian Wheat Board a month before Christmas, let us have the alteration in price as soon as ever we are free from the contract; and let it come more quickly if possible. The matter is one of vital importance to hundreds of farmers, hundreds of returned men, and hundreds of families all over the metropolitan area. It is a matter seriously affecting the safe working of our community. I say that with reference to our industrial situation. All these things are bound up in one vast circle, and I hold that the upsetting of the even balance of one part of the circle throws the other parts out of balance. Even if the motion is not at the moment expedient, the question is one which should receive immediate attention. I have learnt something from the Minister's speech to-night which has made me think that to give immediate effect to the motion might not be expedient; but at least let us deal with the question so soon as we are released from the contract which, apparently, binds us in the matter of price to the Australian Wheat Board.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN (North-East Fremantle) [10.2]: I do not think the Minister was quite accurate in his opening remarks on this subject. Hon. members who have followed the subject closely are aware that Mr. Baxter, who represented this State on the Australian Wheat Board at the time the price of wheat for home consumption was fixed, refused to take any part in the fixing of that price. During Mr. Baxter's absence from the State Mr. Monger and his party held a meeting, and demanded that the Government should fix the price for home consumption at 9s., and should enter into a contract to take the necessary supplies at that price.

Mr. A. Thomson: That is not so.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: That is what was reported in the Press.

Mr. A. Thomson: I happened to be present.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: The price was discussed at the meeting or conference in question. No arrangement was made for the various payments. The conference had neither the right nor the power to fix the price.

The Minister for Agriculture: The Government agreed to take 30 million bushels of wheat.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: There never was any agreement until after wheat had started to fall in the market.

The Minister for Agriculture: That is wrong.

The Premier: Quite wrong.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: Previously to that, the same conditions were prevailing as had prevailed in connection with every other pool. Prices were fixed from month to month, or from quarter to quarter, whatever the term might be, on the London parity. During the

discussion at the end of 1919 and the beginning of 1920 as to the price of wheat, Mr. Hughes, the Prime Minister, intimated to the conference that his election pledge was that the price for local consumption must be on the London parity. An endeavour was made by the Western Australian representative, Mr. Colebatch, to bring in the world's parity; but Mr. Hughes denied that he had ever spoken of world's parity. Nevertheless, the words appear here in this copy I have of an opinion given by a legal gentleman in regard to the matter. However, Mr. Hughes denied that during the election campaign he had spoken of world's parity.

The Minister for Agriculture: It is a big term.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: Yes. Because a small quantity of wheat was sent to Egypt, the Australian Wheat Board started to fix the price for local consumption on the basis of that transaction. However, the matter became of political significance, and there was a danger of Mr. Hughes's party losing power. Let me point out that there never was a word about fixing the price for 12 months until these political difficulties arose.

The Minister for Agriculture: We are still sending wheat to Egypt.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: Possibly; under that contract. The position then was that early in the year the Australian Wheat Board had decided to make 9s. the parity price for home consumption. The reports which came through to this State from the East never contained a single word about any contract entered into by the Government to take the wheat required for home consumption. All that came through was that the board recommended that the price for home consumption should be 9s. Mr. Baxter said he would not agree to that price until after he had discussed the matter with the Government of Western Australia. The price was, in fact, fixed after Mr. Baxter's return to Western Australia from the Eastern States. Unfortunately, Mr. Hughes has made a statement on the subject through the columns of yesterday's newspapers—just before this discussion. Early in January last, it appears, wheat was bringing 118s. per quarter in London. But that wheat carried a freight of 155s. per ton.

The Minister for Agriculture: Oh, no!

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: Yes. Early in the year that was so, because the two million tons of freight secured before the harvest was mostly priced at 155s. That represents about 4s. 3d. per bushel for freight alone. Out of the 14s. 7d. representing the price per bushel in London, 4s. 3d. must be paid for freight. Then there are handling charges, which also must be deducted in order to arrive at London parity; and so that parity becomes approximately 9s. in Australia. But then the market began to recede, according to the Minister's own statement, until in August the price of wheat fell to 6s. 8d. per bushel so far as Australia was concerned. What was the price between January and August we do not know, because the Min-

ister has not told us. However, the London price to-day is 6s. 8d.; we are to-day paying 9s. for wheat that London secures at the equivalent of 6s. 8d. here. Wheat is coming here to-day from South Australia for sale in our metropolitan area at 9s. per bushel. How could that have occurred if an agreement was arrived at by the conference? If there is any binding contract, how is it that wheat can be sent from South Australia into the metropolitan area of this State and re-tailed here at 9s. per bushel?

The Minister for Agriculture: They have a lot of inferior wheat over there.

Capt. Carter: What is the quality of the wheat that is coming over?

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: I do not know, but I have been told that it is good wheat.

The Minister for Agriculture: It is not f.a.q. wheat.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: I am not saying that it is. I cannot say what it is.

The Minister for Agriculture: It cannot be.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: The explanation must be that the pool is encouraging the sale of wheat at a lower price, to be sent here in competition with our wheat. I say that the contract that is spoken of is merely a farce.

The Minister for Agriculture: The Prime Minister has definitely said that there is a contract.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: The Prime Minister changed his opinion when he saw some political difficulties ahead. It was not until then that the price of 9s. was fixed. It is not fair to the consumers of this State that they should have to pay 9s. for wheat that we sell overseas at 6s. 8d. Such a position is neither just nor equitable. I also want to say for the information of some of my friends opposite, who fail to realise the position, that but for the starting of the wheat pools on the strength of the credit of the States, the farmers would not have got 2s. a bushel for their wheat, would not have been able to sell their wheat at all.

Mr. Hickmott interjected.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: I advise the hon. member to keep quiet. No member of this Chamber did more to keep down the price of wheat than that hon. member did when it suited the farmers. That can be proved by a reference to "Hansard." At that time, so long as the members of the Government kept down the price of wheat, they could do no wrong. A low price for wheat suited the hon. member's book then; it does not suit his book now. No man should advocate fair play for one man and injustice to another. He should advocate fair play for all. To-day we are only asking that the same measure of fairness be extended to consumers as was extended to the farmers in 1914-15. In my opinion, the Government have not entered into any contract to purchase wheat for local consumption and therefore are not holding the wheat for the people of this State. The Government of this State are at present holding two mil-

lion bushels of wheat for which there is no market. In Australia there are between 35 and 40 million bushels of wheat for which there is no market. Then how can it be said that the Government to-day are holding wheat for home consumption any more than such a statement could have been made at any other period of the existence of the wheat pools? The present situation is an imposition on the people of this State, and steps should be taken immediately to reduce the price of wheat for home consumption. I have had complaints from poultry farmers and dairy farmers that the price of wheat is driving them out of existence. So long as such a system obtains, the State cannot prosper. It is no wonder that with such a system we should have a deficit. To crush one man in order to build up another is a policy that is bound to result in deficits. In the interests of the State the House should carry the motion moved by the Leader of the Opposition; and as the Government have not entered into any contract with the farmers regarding wheat for local consumption, we should see to it that the Government do not pay any extra money on that account. Let me repeat that the price of wheat in London to-day is equivalent to 6s. 8d. per bushel free on board ship here. Then we must allow about 4½d. per bag for putting the wheat into the ship from the truck—equal to 1½d. per bushel. Then there are other charges to be deducted as well. Those things being so, it is clear that we are to-day paying an exorbitant price for our wheat, and that steps should immediately be taken to reduce that price. I trust the motion will be carried.

Mr. TROY (Mount Magnet) [10.15]: I support the motion because I desire to be consistent. At the same time I am inclined to think the hour is too late for the motion to be carried. I do not mean the hour of the evening, but the hour of the season. The wheat, the price of which will be reduced if this motion is carried has mostly been disposed of and the new season's crop has not yet been garnered. Harvesting operations will begin in November.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: We have a few months more to pay for it.

Mr. TROY: I support the motion because I am of opinion that the high price the producers have received for their wheat has been a temporary one and the time will come when the price will be very much reduced. As a wheat producer, I fear that within a very few years the farmer will be producing wheat at a price which will hardly pay him. When that time comes I have not the slightest doubt that a motion will be moved asking this House or the Federal Parliament to determine that the people of the Commonwealth or the State shall stand behind the wheat growers, and that the people shall finance the farmers and enable them to be properly supported by a grant of money. I have always held that 7s. 8d. is a fair and reasonable

price for wheat. I would be glad if I knew that I could get 5s. for my wheat all through. I do not think any section of the community in such a position as the farmers should refuse to show consideration for other sections of the community. The time will come when the farmers will require the support of those sections of the community to whom they now deny consideration. I have heard that the poultry and pig-raising industries, as well as others, have suffered because of the high price of this commodity. The member for Leederville (Capt. Carter) stressed the point to-night, but before he sat down I was unable to judge how he intended to vote on this motion. He made a very timid speech and he left it open to doubt as to how he will vote. I doubt if he will support the motion. I have always regarded 7s. 8d. as a fair and reasonable price, and I fear that the wheat producer will not be able to get that price in the future. The time will come when he will have to produce wheat at a lower price.

Mr. Latham: They have done that before.

Mr. TROY: When speaking previously on this subject I pointed out that the wheat pool could never have been financed had it not been that the credit of the people of Australia was behind the pool. The Minister in charge of the Agricultural Department has stated that it was only with the utmost difficulty that the State has been able to secure a small advance on the season's crop. That has not been financed on the crop which cannot yet be estimated but on the security of the people as a whole.

Mr. Latham: How do the dealers get on, the men who buy the wheat?

Mr. TROY: There are no dealers here.

Mr. Latham: There have been in the past.

Mr. TROY: What dealer is guaranteeing a price here?

Mr. Latham: Dreyfus guaranteed a price before this.

Mr. TROY: That was before the establishment of the wheat scheme when the market was open to all buyers, when there was plenty of money, when shipping was plentiful and when the market was stable. To-day the conditions are different. There are no buyers operating and people are impoverished and without credit. Had proper buyers been prepared to give an advance, the Victorian Government would not have been compelled to advance the price of wheat to the extent of 4s. An appeal was made to the country on that subject and it was stated that private enterprise was willing to embark upon these transactions. The buyers were not able to come forward and the Government of that State were compelled to make the advance on the security of the people. This assistance has been rendered to the farmers in the past and although the wheat growers have received good prices for their commodity for some years past, it only requires one or two bad seasons to put the wheat growers back into their former unfortunate position.

The Minister for Agriculture: It goes in cycles.

Mr. TROY: I know that the growers will come here again asking for assistance and bonuses.

Mr. Latham: They have never done that in the past.

Mr. TROY: Anything they have done in the past is no criterion of what they will do in the future. A statement has been made that the Government should have made advances on the wheat at a time when, as a matter of fact, wheat was not worth 1s. a bushel.

Mr. A. Thomson: At the same time it helped the Government in their financing.

Mr. TROY: Without the assistance of the people of Australia and the security of the Commonwealth the farmers would not have been able to hold their wheat.

Mr. Latham: God help the state that did not do that.

Mr. TROY: On the other hand, the State and the Commonwealth helped the wheat growers and nursed the producers for the time being, securing the best markets and prices, which enabled them to carry on.

Mr. Latham: And W. M. Hughes allowed our wheat to go out at less than it cost to produce.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: That is quite out of order.

Mr. TROY: I support the motion.

On motion by the Colonial Secretary debate adjourned.

#### BILL—ADOPTION OF CHILDREN ACT AMENDMENT.

Returned from the Council with amendments.

#### RESOLUTION—FEDERATION AND THE STATE.

Council's Select Committee.

Message received from the Council notifying that it had concurred in the resolution submitted by the Assembly and that it had appointed five members of the Council to act on behalf of that Chamber on the joint select committee, the members being the Hons. J. Ewing, J. W. Kirwan, A. H. Panton, A. Sanderson, and H. Stewart.

*House adjourned at 10.23 p.m.*

## Legislative Council,

*Thursday, 29th September, 1921.*

	Page
Questions: Engine Drivers Certificates ...	1029
Irwin River Coalfield—1, Professor David's inspection; 2, provision for boring ...	1029
Old Women's Home ...	1030
Leave of Absence ...	1030
Bills: Electoral Act Amendment, 3a., passed...	1030
Building Societies Act Amendment, report ...	1030
Inspection of Machinery, 2a. ...	1030
Adjournment: Royal Show ...	1030

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

#### QUESTION—ENGINE-DRIVERS' CERTIFICATES.

Hon. E. H. HARRIS asked the Minister for Education: 1, What is the approximate number of first-class unrestricted engine-drivers' certificates in force, and issued under the following Acts:—(a) The Mines Regulation Act of 1895; (b) The Mines Regulation Act Amendment Act of 1899; (c) The Coal Mines Regulation Act of 1902; (d) The Inspection of Machinery Act of 1904? 2, What is the number of first-class restricted engine-drivers' certificates in force, and issued under the following Acts:—(a) The Mines Regulation Act of 1895; (b) The Mines Regulation Act Amendment Act of 1899; (c) The Coal Mines Regulation Act of 1902; (d) The Inspection of Machinery Act of 1904?

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION replied: 1, (a) 1408; (b) 653; (c) 3; (d) 128. 2, (a) Nil; (b) Nil; (c) Nil; (d) 71. Re Clause (a), paragraphs 1 and 2. All certificates issued under the Mines Regulation Act of 1895 were known as "Certificates of Competency," and were not graded into classes. These certificates were recognised under the 1904 Act as first class certificates except those which were endorsed "Not to drive a winding engine except as an assistant," and these have been recognised under the 1904 Act as equivalent to second class.

#### QUESTIONS (2)—IRWIN COAL FIELD.

*Professor David's Inspection.*

Hon. J. W. HICKEY asked the Minister for Education: In view of the fact that Professor Sir Edgeworth David has made an inspection of the Irwin coal district, will the Government ask him if he would submit a report of his inspection, having in mind the great importance of the inspection from a State standpoint?

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION replied: The Government have already explained that Professor David is visiting this