

applicant union can conveniently belong, the registrar may refuse the registration. In an amendment on the Notice Paper I am suggesting that we should strike out the word "may" and insert the word "shall." If a union, the members of which can conveniently belong to another union, applies for registration, the registrar under this Bill will be compelled to refuse the application. This would prevent the overloading to which the hon. member referred. I cannot follow the arguments of those who oppose the suggestion to bring insurance agents under the Bill. An insurance agent works under an agreement. The whole matter has been heard and determined in Queensland already. There is no question of exercising any supervision or control, or of regulating the hours of insurance agents. All that is proposed is to fix the amount of the agent's commission. It may be argued in the Arbitration Court that the amount of commission now allowed is unfair, and then the court will be asked to fix the rate of commission.

Mr. George: I thought you said piece work was unfair?

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: Some trades will not work except on piece work. The trade union movement is not opposed to piece work. The question depends entirely on the conditions under which piece work operates.

Mr. Davy: Do you propose to fix the hours too?

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: Yes. The Queensland award says that for a term of 44 hours the commission shall be so much. I do not know any industry to which one could not apply the argument that at the same rate of piece work one man will earn only £4 a week while another will earn, say, £15. There are freaks in every trade. Some men are born to a trade, and can necessarily earn big money at it. It is no use saying that the proposal to regulate the terms of employment of insurance agents is impracticable, since it is operating in Queensland, and has operated there for years. We are apt to say a thing is impossible because it is not done in Western Australia. Conditions here are not very different from those of Queensland. As regards the 44-hour week, the member for Subiaco (Mr. Richardson) said the boundary rider could not possibly do his work under a 44-hour week. Then the hon. member went on to say that 20 years of his life had been spent in the pastoral industry. I am afraid it is considerably more than 20 years since he was engaged in that industry. Nowadays the boundary rider leaves the home in a motor car or on a motor bicycle, and with the aid of such a conveyance, examines the windmills and fences. The times and conditions which the member for Subiaco has in mind are utterly gone, and it is up to Parliament to

keep abreast with progress. Other points which have been raised I will reserve for the Committee stage, where I hope good progress will be made, so that the measure may speedily reach another place. I agree that this Bill is perhaps the most important Bill to come before Parliament during the present session, since industrial peace means everything. I am most anxious to see our secondary industries grow and expand, but they cannot do so unless we have in them a healthy and contented body of workers. I am most anxious, too, that our legislation should promote the smooth running of the wheels of industry, by permitting the grievances of workers to be readily redressed, and justice to be done to all parties.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Mr. Lutey in the Chair; the Minister for Works in charge of the Bill.

Clause 1—agreed to.

Progress reported.

House adjourned at 11.55 p.m.

Legislative Council,

Wednesday, 24th September, 1924.

	PAGE
Questions: Meat Supply, Kalgoorlie ...	949
Federal loan and future borrowing ...	950
Standing Orders Revision ...	950
Bills: Trade Unions Act Amendment, 3a. ...	950
Electorate Act Amendment, 2a., defeated ...	950
Bunbury Road District Rates Validation, 1a. ...	961
Jury Act Amendment, 1a. ...	961
Motion: Health Act, Food and Drugs regulation ...	961

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

QUESTION—KALGOORLIE MEAT SUPPLIES.

Hon. J. R. BROWN asked the Colonial Secretary: With a view to securing meat at a reasonable price for the people of Kalgoorlie and Boulder, will the Government permit cattle to arrive in Kalgoorlie from

South Australia, provided they are trans-trained at Parkstown and delivered direct to the abattoirs without coming into contact with the ground?

The COLONIAL SECRETARY replied: At the request of the goldfields butchers, and in order that an ample supply of fresh meat shall be available for residents on the fields, the Government have already agreed to allow South Australian cattle to be killed at Loongana under adequate supervision. The details in connection with this proposal are at present being finalised.

QUESTION—FEDERAL LOAN AND FUTURE BORROWING.

Hon. J. W. KIRWAN asked the Colonial Secretary: 1, Does the fact that Western Australia is receiving a proportion amounting to £1,200,000 of the £10,300,000 loan, now being raised by the Commonwealth, limit, in any way, the State's borrowing powers? 2, What arrangement, if any, has been entered into between the Commonwealth and Western Australian Governments regarding future loans?

The COLONIAL SECRETARY replied: 1, The whole of the States and the Commonwealth have agreed not to raise within Australia during the current financial year more than £10,300,000, now being raised, except for conversion purposes. The States have further agreed to limit their overseas borrowings during the same period, except for conversion purposes, to an amount agreed upon at the last Premier's Conference, viz., £27,948,000. Western Australia's proportion is £2,300,000. 2, No arrangement has been entered into beyond the present financial year.

STANDING ORDERS REVISION.

Hon. J. W. KIRWAN brought up the amended Standing Orders as agreed to by the Standing Orders Committee in pursuance of instructions by the House.

BILL—TRADE UNIONS ACT AMENDMENT.

Read a third time and transmitted to the Assembly.

BILL—ELECTORAL ACT AMENDMENT.

Second Reading—defeated.

Debate resumed from the previous day.

Hon. E. H. GRAY (West) [4.39]: I support the second reading of the Bill and congratulate Mr. Ewing on the progressive thought he expressed during his speech in placing the Bill before hon. members. Obviously the Bill has certain defects, because it

would be impossible to impose the compulsory voting provisions set out in the measure as it applies to this Chamber. If the Bill passes the second reading stage I shall move, when we are considering it in Committee, in the direction of confining the compulsory clauses to resident electors. The debate has shown how unfair is the present basis on which rests the franchise of this Chamber. It would be almost impossible to enforce those particular provisions as was pointed out by Mr. Kirwan, particularly where people may have sufficient money to possess qualifications in every province throughout the State. The debate has also shown that it is high time we altered the basis of our franchise. A minister of the Gospel, who may possess no land, can exercise only the vote for the province in which he resides. On the other hand, an unscrupulous owner of property such as the individual who owns houses of ill-fame in every part of the metropolitan area, has the right to vote in the three provinces concerned.

Hon. J. Cornell: Need he be unscrupulous?

Hon. E. H. GRAY: I should say an individual was unscrupulous if he owned houses of ill-fame. Should that individual own houses of that description in each of the other provinces, he would be entitled to vote accordingly. That shows how unjust the franchise is. Mr. Kirwan's speech drew attention to the fact that not only is it high time that such a Bill should be passed, but that it is time we seriously considered extending the franchise so that each adult person in the State should have the right to vote for a candidate for a seat in this Chamber rather than to continue our present restricted franchise.

Hon. J. E. Dodd: How could you keep out the immoral elector?

Hon. E. H. GRAY: I would cut him out.

Hon. J. Cornell: After all, morality is only a question of degree.

Hon. E. H. GRAY: There is a big difference between ordinary people and those who may own houses of ill-fame in each province. It is unfair and unjust to extend the franchise to a person merely because he manages to get together a few pounds irrespective of how he got the money or how he has used it. The ordinary citizen who is 21 years of age should have extended to him the qualification as an elector of this Chamber. I am sure no member would desire to sit here unless he represented the majority of the electors in his province. If we extended the franchise we would have more progressive thought disclosed in the debates here. It is because we have not that extended franchise that we are so restricted in our thought.

Hon. G. W. Miles: That is your opinion.

Hon. E. H. GRAY: Personally I live in trepidation that I shall offend members although I am the most docile member here.

Hon. A. J. H. Saw: On what franchise were you elected?

Hon. E. H. GRAY: Not on an adult franchise.

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

Hon. E. H. GRAY: I was endeavouring to point out that when we come to consider the compulsory clauses we realise that the qualification is too restricted, and that it will be impossible to give full effect to them.

Hon. J. Cornell: Why not disqualify for the Legislative Assembly the people you refer to?

Hon. E. H. GRAY: Because the bigger proportion of those people, owing to the unjust franchise, vote for members in this Chamber.

Hon. J. Cornell: Then you claim this is an immoral Chamber.

Hon. A. J. H. Saw: Is it immoral to own property?

Hon. E. H. GRAY: It is immoral to own some property in view of the use that property is put to.

Hon. A. Lovskin: If a person has a house worth 6s., you give him a vote. Do you want the person owning a pigstye to have a vote?

Hon. E. H. GRAY: Any number of people pay 6s. a week for their houses; yet their wives or their husbands, as the case may be, have not the vote. I am sure that no hon. member living in the present democratic age believes that simply because a man owns a block of land in each province he should have a vote in each province, while the man who is good enough to perform valuable public services, according to the views hon. members hold on this question, shall be restricted to one vote, while many thousands of good citizens have not the right to vote at all. No man should be allowed to have more than one vote for this Chamber.

Hon. J. Cornell: The argument of the Bill is that men will not use the vote they have.

The PRESIDENT: The question before the House is that of compulsory voting.

Hon. E. H. GRAY: I was drawn off the track by the interjections of members.

Hon. J. Cornell: You brought it all on yourself.

Hon. E. H. GRAY: I am always fearful of rousing the ire of members because of the false atmosphere here in which we live. I do not consider that Mr. Kirwan put forward a good case when he ridiculed the Bill. We live under compulsory health provisions. A citizen is not permitted to live in a filthy state, even if he wishes to do so.

Hon. A. J. H. Saw: But Mr. Nicholson is moving to disallow that.

Hon. J. Cornell: We have compulsory military training, too.

Hon. E. H. GRAY: And I am absolutely opposed to it. We have compulsory traffic laws, compulsory education and a thousand and one things necessary in any decent society and under any Government. No one could advance any serious argument against

any compulsion that is for the good of the community at large.

Hon. J. W. Kirwan: In no other circumstances do we compel people to do something they are unfit to do.

Hon. E. H. GRAY: That is only a matter of opinion. The hon. member used an argument about doctors and lawyers concentrating on certain things that are good for the community. A doctor concentrating on public health, one would think, would desire to vote for members of Parliament; he should be prepared to vote for members who would come here and advocate his particular ideas.

Hon. J. W. Kirwan: But he may not care to mix up with party politics.

Hon. F. E. S. Willmott: That is why he has a vote for this House. We have no party politics.

Hon. E. H. GRAY: The talk about this being a non-party House is amusing. Every member here belongs to some party, even if it is only an independent party of one. The franchise for the lower House was won by the self-sacrifice of people in the olden times, and the people of to-day ought to be compelled to stand up to their duties as citizens. If this were done it would be a good thing for the State. I have no fear that it would exercise any evil effect on the country. What we should desire is a well educated public opinion, and that every citizen should go to the poll and be compelled to exercise his right as a citizen. As a man has to live under the laws of the country, he should be required to take part in the selection of the law makers. If members take a broad-minded view and permit the Bill to pass its second reading, the necessary amendments can be made in Committee, and Mr. Ewing will then have the distinction of being the first man to bring this question before the Parliament, and as such I think it will redound to his credit for all time.

Hon. J. E. DODD (South) [4.50]: I am sorry for several reasons that I cannot support this Bill. One of the reasons is that the mover of it was so obviously sincere in his advocacy of the Bill. Another is that there is no party bias behind it. Right through Australia almost every party seems to be in favour of compulsory voting. Another reason is that the end sought is a very desirable one. It is very desirable indeed to secure the vote of every person entitled to vote. There is an old saying that the road to Hades is paved with good intentions, and it may well be said of this Bill that it is characterised by good intentions. Some reference was made to the Federal debate. Mr. Ewing said that two or three members spoke in the Senate, and that Senator Lynch opposed the Bill. That is hardly correct. Senator Lynch did not oppose the Bill; he was rather satirical at the expense of Senator Gardiner. Senator Gardiner supported the Bill, but only because it was on the platform of his party. He said he was opposed to the principle of

compulsory voting, but because it was on the platform of his party, he would support the Bill. Senator Findley was also very half-hearted about it. Only four speakers addressed themselves to the Bill and no division was taken. The Bill was sent to the House of Representatives where the member for Perth (Mr. Mann) was its sponsor. There was only one other speaker, Mr. Duncann Hughes, and he received a good few interjections, simply because the time for the debate on the Bill was very limited. Had he spoken a little longer, the Bill would have been talked out. One does not like to reflect upon the doings of another Parliament, but when we consider the importance of the Bill and the fact of its going to cost so much to enforce compulsory voting—as Mr. Hughes pointed out, it would have the effect of bringing to the booths another 1,200,000 voters if everyone voted—we cannot say very much for the Federal debate, seeing it was hurried in such a manner. The proposal of Mr. Ewing is to remedy apathy and indifference by compulsion. We are told that compulsory voting is the corollary of compulsory enrolment. There is really no connection. The word "corollary" is very often used without regard to its correct meaning. There are a number of words that become blessed words, such as "Mesopotamia" and "potentiality." I remember an old preacher in South Australia who, when he got stuck for a word, always shouted "Hallelujah!" and having used that word, he got an inspiration to go on again. That seems to be what has happened with the word "corollary." The Leader of the House will remember a word that used to come up often at the Cabinet meetings of the Scaddam Government—"ultimately." Whenever a report was asked from a civil servant covering any particular work, we found that the expenditure would always be justified by the "ultimate" good that would accrue. That word "ultimately" got on the nerves of the Treasury, and I think the Treasurer had some strong remarks to make about its misuse. There is no corollary between compulsory voting and compulsory enrolment. I have two or three definitions of the word "corollary." Webster says "corollary" is something that follows from the demonstration of a proposition; an additional inference or deduction from a demonstrated proposition; a consequence. Because compulsory enrolment is the law, can we logically argue that compulsory voting is an inference or deduction or even a consequence? Chambers says it is a proposition the truth of which appears so clearly from the proof of another proposition as not to require similar demonstration. Can we affirm that the truth of compulsory voting is so clear as to require no further proof because of compulsory enrolment? The whole thing is absurd. Now let us take a mathematical definition—a statement, the truth of which follows readily from an established proposition; it is therefore ap-

pendent to the proposition as an inference or deduction which usually requires no further proof. Can we say that the argument in favour of compulsory voting needs no further proof because we have compulsory enrolment? I do not think there is the slightest connection. The enrolment is simply an act for the benefit of statistics. We enrol births, marriages, deaths and a hundred other things for the benefit of the statistician, but voting is the exercise of intelligence. It is a much easier thing to go down and register the birth of a child than to vote for some individual. The voter has to exercise intelligence and reason as to whom and what he is voting for, and some people have not the faintest conception of what they are to vote for. Compulsory voting would be a most unwarrantable interference with liberty. I suppose all members have read something of the French Revolution. I believe there was a time when the French people set up a Goddess of Reason, who was a fallen woman placed on a pedestal to represent the people. Are we going to make a new Goddess of Reason of apathy, indifference, and ignorance? That is practically what this Bill means. We are going to put apathy, indifference, and ignorance on a pedestal and say we are going to make people vote. I do not say all voters are educated or intelligent, and I should not like to say that all non-voters are ignorant. Nevertheless, those who go to the polls and vote are more likely to give an intelligent vote than are people who are forced to go, who otherwise would be too apathetic to go, and who know nothing about politics. The corollary of compulsory voting is political education. It will be asked, "Who are going to be the teachers?" We have quite a number of different cults in Western Australia—Nationalist, Socialist, Labour, Communist, Country Party and others, but I should like to know who are going to be the teachers to teach the people how to vote. An argument that might be used is in regard to women voting. Only a few sessions ago we gave women the right to sit in Parliament. Should we therefore say that the corollary to that is that all women should stand for Parliament? There is just as much reason in declaring that all women should contest seats in the Legislature as there is in saying that every person should vote, merely because we give them that right. Do what we will, we shall never be able to compel people to vote. We have quite enough ignoring our laws without putting any more on the statute-book to be ignored. Any person has the right to make his vote informal, and will not many do that if we compel them to go to the booth? Let me quote a couple of instances to illustrate why people sometimes do not vote. I recall an election that took place on the goldfields for the South Province in 1908. There were only two candidates, and both are now members of this Chamber. One

is the Chairman of Committees and the other "a sort of permanent chairman." I well remember that election because canvassers of the one candidate, in the course of their duties, came across some voters who declined to go to the poll. One was a lady and when I tell the House the reason why both refused to vote, hon. members may be amused. Both refused to vote for the simple reason that they declared the two candidates to be such good men that they could not separate them, and that they would just as soon see one in as the other. Are we to tell people who hold such views, and especially women, that they must exercise a preference? That is an argument why we should not have compulsion in voting. Take another instance. I remember a body of men and women who belonged to an organisation on the goldfields known as the Land Values Taxation League, and in connection with the Federal elections quite a number of them refused to vote, and they refused for a reason that was exactly opposite to that I have quoted, namely, that of all the candidates there was not one they could agree to support. Therefore they decided to stay away from the polling booth. I do not know why we should compel individuals to exercise their right to vote when they have no wish to do so. Do we wish to take away their freedom altogether? The Bill, to my mind, will be another step towards the reign of officialdom. There is no doubt about that. I am afraid we are getting that way in almost every step that we take. I think it was Rousseau who said "Men and women are born free, but everywhere they are in chains." I am afraid that to-day, although we are getting liberty and freedom in many respects, we are simply handing back that liberty and freedom to officialdom. We find that in Bill after Bill that comes before this House. It is the big end of the stick and it was in evidence not so very long ago. Once we give officialdom the thick end of the stick, they will not hesitate to use it. I was much struck the other day in reading in the "West Australian" a report on the fruit pool. Two speakers had expressed the opinion that a referendum of the growers would be against the compulsory fruit pool. Is there any democracy in saying that we shall force certain things on the people? Where shall we be landed if we continue like that? Regarding the matters referred to by Mr. Gray, that we are compelled to do this and compelled to do that, we know that there is a great deal of difference between compulsion where you are interfering with liberty and compulsion where you are going to compel people to exercise their intelligence. A person has the right to do what he likes provided he does not infringe the right held by others. If a person exercises his intelligence with reason, there is no justification for telling him that we are going to compel him to belong

to a particular religion. Sometimes, perhaps in an emergency, we are entitled to use compulsion. I should say that, if we were threatened with invasion, we should be entitled to use compulsion to save the country. To attempt to use compulsion in connection with voting is, to my mind, altogether wrong. I ask Mr. Ewing whether he really thinks that we shall have better legislators, or even better legislation as the result of compulsory voting. If that could be brought about, there might be some justification for it. Is it likely to get us anywhere? In Queensland there is compulsory voting but I do not think that the legislators are any better or any worse than the legislators in Western Australia or in any other part of Australia. Is he aware that at the very last by-election held in Queensland no fewer than 1,500 persons did not exercise the franchise. What was compulsory voting doing on that occasion? Does he realise what compulsory voting will mean in the way of additional work for the department? Look at the number of notices that would have to be sent out to all those people asking them why they did not vote. The proposal does not appeal to me. It is an unwarranted interference with liberty and freedom. We are getting that way that I do not know where we are going to land with regard to rule by officials. I have nothing whatever to say against officials as a whole, and no doubt if I were one myself I would do precisely what they are doing. Give a person power and he will use it. I oppose the second reading of the Bill.

Hon. E. H. HARRIS (North-East) [5.10]: Mr. Ewing has not convinced me that his desire is compulsory enrolment. What he wants is compulsory voting for those who happen to be on the roll. When introducing the Bill he said that compulsory voting was good for the country and that the figures he quoted proved his case. Mr. Ewing quoted the percentage of votes cast in Queensland since compulsory voting has been in force. That was all we had from the hon. member in support of his argument. I, too, have some figures that I desire to quote. In 1915 a compulsory enrolment Bill was passed in Queensland, and at the first election after that the percentage of votes cast was as high as 88.14. That showed an increase on the previous year, when there was no compulsory voting, of 13 per cent. At the following elections the percentage dropped to 80 and in the third year it dropped still another 8 per cent. Again later it increased by 6 per cent. These figures cover a period of nine years of compulsory enrolment and the average increase amounts to 7 per cent. of the people enrolled.

Hon. J. J. Holmes: Queensland is the last place that anyone should follow.

Hon. E. H. HARRIS: Taken over the full period, the average increase amounted

to nearly 7½ per cent., while 17½ per cent. of the people enrolled apparently had valid excuses for not voting.

Hon. J. R. Brown: What was the amount of the fines that the Treasury collected?

Hon. E. H. HARRIS: I cannot tell the hon. member. The figures I have quoted disclose that in Queensland the electors do not take their politics any more seriously than do we. The average for the whole State of Queensland for the four elections came to 62.99, while in Western Australia the average was 62.28, which is a very fair comparison when the figures of the other States are quoted.

Hon. J. Ewing: Queensland's average was 85 per cent.

Hon. E. H. HARRIS: Does the hon. member mean that that was the average over the four periods?

Hon. J. R. Brown: That is why they have a Labour Government there.

Hon. E. H. HARRIS: Those who were opposed to the Labour Party and had got a taste of their legislation came along afterwards and voted eagerly against them. That was why there was a larger vote.

Hon. J. R. Brown: There are 5,000 more voters on the Queensland State roll than on the Federal roll.

Hon. E. H. HARRIS: Under a Labour Government Queensland has recorded a higher percentage of votes, and when the people of Western Australia have had a Labour Government for three years they, too, probably will record a heavier poll than they did on the last occasion.

Hon. A. Burvill: Then you think the people will wake up?

Hon. E. H. HARRIS: Under the Labour Government, yes, and will then go to the poll in greater numbers.

Hon. J. Ewing: The poll at the last elections was bigger than that on the preceding occasion.

Hon. E. H. HARRIS: It was nothing of the sort. At the last elections it was 62.32 of the enrolments as against 67.34 at the previous elections. To an extent it is the duty of every citizen to study politics and so be able to cast an intelligent vote at the elections. But there is a large percentage of people who do not bother their heads about politics.

Hon. J. Ewing: Why shouldn't they?

Hon. E. H. HARRIS: Why should they? The hon. member brings down this Bill providing for compulsory voting. Yet on looking up the records I find that he held a entirely different view when a similar Bill was before us in 1922.

Hon. E. H. Gray: He is showing signs of progress.

Hon. E. H. HARRIS: Not necessarily. He would have a person forced to give an opinion at the polls on an important subject without previous consideration. Yet if the hon. member were asked to express an opinion about something of which he knew nothing, he would decline to do it until he

had looked up the matter and considered it. There are in Western Australia plenty of people who take so little interest in politics as to be unable to declare positively whether Sir James Mitchell or Mr. Collier is Premier to-day. It is bad enough that we should drag nearly 70 per cent. of the electors to the polls to-day; if we drag up the remaining 30 per cent. I do not see how it will benefit either them or the contending parties. The net result will be that we shall get a larger percentage of votes. Mr. Dodd pointed out that, notwithstanding the increased number of votes cast in Queensland, it was questionable what the result had been in respect of members elected. In my opinion the increased percentage of votes will be about equally distributed over the contending parties; I am doubtful whether the increase will have any effect on the calibre of the men elected. I have here an extract from a note I made during the Council elections. On the 23rd April one McCallum was speaking at Fremantle in support of the candidature of Mr. Kitson when he said:—

I have resided in this electorate for 27 years and am, as you know, now to be a Minister of the Crown and eligible in another sphere for the highest office in the Commonwealth. Only a few days ago His Excellency the Governor, speaking in His Majesty the King's name, described me as his well beloved and trusty Alexander McCallum. Yet I don't possess a vote for the Legislative Council. What a farce it is! What logic or commonsense can be found in circumstances of that sort?

The beloved and trusty Alexander McCallum tells the people he has lived here for 27 years and has not a vote for this House. Are we to understand that he has not lived in a house for which rent has been paid to the extent of 6s. 8d. per week, or that he is not a freeholder to the extent of £50?

Hon. J. J. Holmes: He has at Pinjarra a farm in his wife's name.

Hon. E. H. HARRIS: I am not concerned about that. I am merely pointing to a public man whom Mr. Ewing is desirous of compelling to go to the poll and record his vote.

Hon. A. Lovekin: His wife votes for him, and presumably they don't believe in plural voting.

Hon. E. H. HARRIS: The Bill provides that within the prescribed time the voter shall fill in a form, sign it, and do other things. Why "within the prescribed time"? Why not set out in the Bill in what period it has to be done? In the existing statute it has to be done within 21 days. The Bill further provides that lists shall be prepared of those who fail to record their votes. The returning officer shall send them notices, after which the delinquents shall give reasons why they do not vote. Then the returning officer shall

express his opinion as to whether the reason given is valid, and will send it on to the Chief Electoral Officer. There, I suppose, it will be pigeon-holed away.

Hon. T. Moore: Don't you think they will use discretion?

Hon. E. H. HARRIS: Such discretion have they used in the past that, since we have had compulsory enrolment for the Assembly, nobody has been prosecuted.

Hon. J. R. Brown: Yes, there have been prosecutions.

Hon. J. Cornell: People in Kalgoorlie were fined for being on the roll.

Hon. E. H. HARRIS: For being illegally on the Council roll when, in 1918, the roll for the North-East Province was stuffed with 336 voters' names. Prosecutions were then brought against people illegally on the roll.

Hon. T. Moore: The part you took up was not nice; you had a few unfortunate people fined.

Hon. E. H. HARRIS: If it comes to a nice point, you people promised to stand by the fines, but in the end refused to pay them. I have been to the trouble to look up the population of Western Australia as quoted from the "Quarterly Statistical Abstract" to June 1924, and I have been to the State Electoral Department and learned the number of people who were on the roll at the respective periods before and after compulsory enrolment. Let me quote the two years before and after: In 1918 the population was 310,183 and the enrolments 145,144, or 53.29 per cent. of the population. In 1919 the population was 317,860 and the enrolments 155,100, or 46.70 per cent. of the people. After the Bill was passed, in 1920, the population was 331,323 and the enrolments 155,200 or 46.42 per cent. of the people. In 1921 the population was 335,715 and the enrolments 173,964, or 51.81 per cent. of the people. Taking the aggregate of the population and of the enrolments before compulsory enrolment, I find that for the four years 1916 to 1919 inclusive, the population was 1,261,586, and the enrolments 658,059, was a percentage of 52.16. This is an important part I want to impress on Mr. Ewing: In the subsequent period, since we have had compulsory enrolment, for the years 1920 to 1923 inclusive, the aggregate population was 1,364,461, and the enrolments 680,096, or a percentage of 49. In other words, we have dropped 3 per cent. since we have had compulsory enrolment.

Hon. T. Moore: Perhaps we have had cleaner rolls. Has that struck you?

Hon. E. H. HARRIS: It has struck me that they may have been fairly dirty before, and that they are not up to much now. The Electoral Department does its best in the circumstances, but it has been starved.

Hon. J. R. Brown: That is the necessity for this Bill. It is to save the country money.

Hon. E. H. HARRIS: Mr. Ewing says that compulsory enrolment should be applied to the Legislative Council. In the case of the Assembly everyone who reaches the age of 21 is entitled to vote. We have a different franchise for this House.

Hon. J. R. Brown: We want to liberalise it.

Hon. E. H. HARRIS: This Bill will not liberalise it. The remarkable feature of it is that no machinery is provided for making out any list of persons eligible to be put on the roll in order that they might bring revenue to the State in the form of a £2 a head penalty if they do not vote. We have four franchises, the freehold, the leasehold, the household and the ratepayer. There are in this State 15 municipalities and 128 road boards. There are thus 143 rolls to be compiled. I suppose the smallest roll will have 200 or 300 names on it. Each one of these rolls would have to be checked to ascertain whether the ratepayer was entitled to be enrolled in respect of any of the ten provinces. I have a copy of the annual report of the Department of Land Titles. I find that for the year ended June 1923 and that ended June 1924 the transfer of freeholds was 9,440 and 8,315 respectively, and of Crown leaseholds 1,314 and 2,347 respectively. This gives an average of 10,600 transfers in the Titles Office in each of those years. As I have said, there are 143 road boards, each of whose rolls would have to be kept, to say nothing of the various persons who would be eligible to be enrolled as leaseholders and such like in the commercial centres. There is another important point in regard to enrolment. It is impracticable, without a huge staff in the Electoral Department and a large amount of money being spent upon checking, to have compulsory enrolment for this House. It is mere piffle for anyone to say that this Bill will reduce the cost, or will bring in any revenue to the State.

Hon. J. Ewing: That is not the opinion of those who have to deal with the matter.

Hon. E. H. HARRIS: Mr. Ewing will no doubt tell us what the Electoral Department really think.

Hon. J. Cornell: I will tell you what it did.

Hon. E. H. HARRIS: I wish to confine myself to the Bill. It is such a simple matter to become enrolled for the Legislative Assembly that everyone knows his qualification. Thousands of people, however, do not know whether they are eligible or not to be put on the Legislative Council roll. Last night Mr. Kirwan illustrated the case of half a dozen persons owning a freehold block or a piece of land, and asked which of these could be prosecuted for failure to enrol. I am one of eight persons who own a leasehold. Which of the eight would be summoned for not being on the roll for this mining tenement?

Hon. E. H. Gray: Whom would you summon if you issued a summons for rates?

Hon. E. H. HARRIS: There may be a number of registered leaseholders who pay a certain sum of money, and one or two of these would be entitled to be on the roll. How is the department to find out who these are? We find from the road board rolls that certain rates are paid in to the name of, say, Smith, and that subsequently the house in question is sold. Unless the individual who has to pay the rates notifies the authorities when they have been paid, the old name is continued on the register that was there before. This sort of thing may result in someone being brought before the court for failure to record his vote, and may cost him £5 to prove that he was not eligible to vote and that his name should not have been put on the roll. I submit that the Bill is impracticable unless there is a common franchise for the two Houses. Unless Mr. Ewing can convince me to the contrary I cannot support the Bill. Perhaps, after he has heard other members, he will see the wisdom of withdrawing it.

Hon. J. Ewing: I will not withdraw it.

Hon. J. CORNELL (South) [5.35]: I would go a long way towards forwarding the proposal brought in by Mr. Ewing, but cannot support him in this Bill.

Hon. J. Ewing: You cannot do so?

Hon. J. CORNELL: No. The impracticability of compulsory enrolment for the Legislative Council has been pointed out. I make this challenge that there is not 20 per cent. of members who can determine on the qualifications that exist to-day how many persons are entitled to be registered on the roll for the Legislative Council for one qualification. I will not, however, give away the secret. This shows the inefficacy of telling a person he should be enrolled for the Legislative Council when he does not know if he possesses the qualification.

Hon. J. R. Brown: It is like a man with appendicitis.

Hon. J. CORNELL: That leads me to the point that if Mr. Ewing's Bill became law, and there was compulsory enrolment for all who possessed the necessary qualifications, a large section of the community would have to see a political doctor to decide the debatable question as to whether or not they possessed the qualification.

Hon. J. W. Kirwan: And doctors disagree.

Hon. J. CORNELL: I will illustrate what I mean by political doctor. I looked forward to my recent contest being a keen one, and it was so.

Hon. J. R. Brown: You were lucky, were you not?

Hon. J. CORNELL: About as lucky as the hon. member. I scrutinised fairly closely the enrolments that were not made by myself or my friends, but made by my opponent. I picked out the names of 18 persons who had been advised by their political doctors that they possessed the necessary qualifications. None of

these was a native of Australia, but all were foreigners. I took the precaution of submitting the names to the Department of Home and Territories to find out whether they were naturalised British subjects. I received certain information back, and went to the person in this State charged with the responsibility of knowing about these things. He could trace some, but not all of them. I started to work at once, and made the astounding discovery that, acting on the advice of a political doctor, a certain lady had been enrolled with the freehold qualification in Kalgoorlie under a foreigner's name. I did not put her on the roll. The matter was followed up, and the alleged husband of the lady was told that if he did not report to the proper authority, the police would intervene. He did report, and this is what he said: He stated that he lived in the house, for which this lady was enrolled and that this lady lived with him; they were the only persons who had resided there for the previous six months. Although his name was the same as that of the woman who appeared on the roll, his lady-love was not entitled to that name. He said it had occurred to him that it might have stood for Tony So-and-so at Summerville, but even that he said could not be so because Tony was in the same boat as himself. I will not say whether or not the lady voted. I do not wish to be a party to landing her in the Police Court, because I believe she acted on the advice of a political doctor. Another man reported himself to the nationalisation officer and said, "If I am on the roll I am not naturalised, and have not applied for naturalisation." These are two illustrations of what occurs on the advice of political doctors. Needless to say, when I saw I was faced by a keen contest, I took precautions to do my best to scotch the political doctor, and had most of those electors with foreign names starred on election day. When they went to vote, they had to make a declaration. I will not be a party to prosecuting such people, because I know they were enrolled by a political doctor. This sort of thing will be the outcome of compulsory enrolment for the Legislative Council on the present franchise. For that reason alone, that portion of the Bill is absolutely impracticable. If we are going to tackle the question of the franchise of this House, any hon. member is at liberty to attack that question fairly and squarely, on the principle itself, by bringing down a Bill as Mr. Ewing has done. I notice that recently a person in Boulder was fined £5 for having voted twice.

Hon. W. H. Kitson: Did he vote for you?

Hon. J. CORNELL: I believe he did. However, the marked roll I got from the Electoral Department shows that another fellow voted twice for another candidate. I hope that eventually this other fellow will be brought to book. However, I must seriously pay this tribute to both the double

voters, a tribute which I will extend to all the electors of this country, that my political experience of 30 years has failed to disclose, even during the height of political controversy and struggle, any person who deliberately voted twice and thus abused the franchise.

Hon. W. H. Kitson: Did this man who was fined vote twice by accident?

Hon. J. CORNELL: The Leader of the House and other members will recollect that at one time we had an esteemed fellow member, now deceased, who voted twice at one election. He voted in the morning, and again in the afternoon. The explanation he offered from his seat here was that he had forgotten having voted in the morning; and everyone who knew the man believed him. I believe that in the case of the man who was fined, and in the case of all electors similarly circumstanced, irrespective of party, such an occurrence is the result either of ignorance or of lapse of memory. I firmly believe in the probity of our electors. Isolated cases, therefore, should be given the benefit of the doubt, because if we impugn one elector, we impugn the whole electorate. Queensland has a measure making voting compulsory, but in my electoral researches, to which I have devoted some time, I have been able to find only one example of a somewhat similar attempt, though not fully on the lines of compulsory voting, among European countries. That was in Belgium. The Belgian law, while not providing for compulsory voting absolutely, and while recognising that there are two sides to the question of compulsion, requires that every person qualified to vote shall receive a notification that an election will occur on a certain day. Non-receipt of the notification is a valid excuse, but every elector who receives the notification is bound to present himself at the polling booth on polling day and produce the notice sent to him. That notice is then signed by the presiding officer, and the fact of his signature being on it constitutes *prima facie* evidence that the elector has obeyed the summons. He is handed a ballot paper, and then can please himself whether he votes or not. What Mr. Ewing aims at is more or less hypothetical. He says that by compelling people to vote we shall get a better poll. But under compulsory voting, it is to be inferred, people would go to the polling booth primarily to escape being fined, and not for the special purpose of electing a particular candidate. The fact of a man going to the polling booth, when he will be fined for not going there, is no proof that he will cast his vote. No power on earth can compel a man to vote and at the same time can maintain inviolate that secrecy of the ballot for which we are all deeply concerned. A measure for compulsory voting interferes with the liberty of the subject. When a Parliamentary election occurs, various candidates offer themselves; for the great majority of seats, only two candidates. On

polling day the elector, under a compulsory voting system, would say, "If I don't present myself at the polling booth, I shall be fined. Still, I am unable to make a choice; I cannot differentiate between the candidates." It will take a lot to convince me that such a process of reasoning will tend to improve the personnel of Parliament. I have heard it argued, and very logically, by Labour members and other thinking men, that what is really needed, to judge by the doings at times of Parliament, is an intelligence test for the elector, with the object of obtaining some guide as to whether he is endowed with sufficient intelligence to recognise a reasonable candidate when he sees one. On the other hand we have here Mr. Ewing's Bill, which is a direct negation of the theory of electoral intelligence. If history teaches one thing more than another, it is that the continuity of our arts and our sciences are the result of the thinking and the working of a very few. We shall not attain the end we seek by endeavouring to coerce the many to vote at Parliamentary elections. If that is so, there is no valid reason why we should agree to the Bill. Mr. Dodd quoted history, touching on the French Revolution. I think it may safely be said that whatever the result of their actions, no better-meaning body of men than the French revolutionaries ever set out on a mission in this world. They started in a humble way and on a broad democratic basis; and presently they discarded the ballot box and the system of secret tribunals for chopping people's heads off. One of the sponsors of the Revolution, one of the men who rose to the top during the revolutionary era, Danton, when his turn came to be decapitated, uttered these last words, "Were I to live again"—and he knew he was about to die—"rather than aspire to rule my fellow man I would be a humble fisherman." Much might he similarly said to-day in criticism of our Parliamentary institutions. Our politics and our methods have got down to a set of circumstances which are of such a nature that many men who would be an honour to this or to any Parliament will not touch politics with a stick. That fact constitutes one of the saddest blot on the evolution of Parliamentary institutions in the Commonwealth, if not throughout the British Dominions. What Mr. Ewing aims at, however worthy his sentiments and his motives, cannot achieve the object he has in view. I opposed compulsory enrolment. My remarks in that connection were something to the effect that in Parliamentary government the only things that matter are sincerity of purpose and intelligence. I also said that if an elector did not take sufficient interest in public affairs to become enfranchised, he deserved to remain, or to be, disfranchised. Making enrolment compulsory, I urged, would in no way alter such a man's mentality, since he would become enrolled merely to escape a fine. If we put the acid

test on Queensland and its politics, or on the Federal Parliament and its silent salary grab, we must realise that the same line of argument as I applied to compulsory enrolment will apply to compulsory voting. If hon. members who are imbued with the highest motives wish to promote the continuity of this State and its Parliamentary institutions would endeavour, calmly and dispassionately, by pen or by voice—

Mr. Ewing: The electors will not even attend meetings to listen to you.

Hon. J. CORNELL: We should encourage the people to take an intelligent interest in the affairs of State and of Parliament and tell them calmly, plainly and bluntly that Parliaments are what the people make them, and that the people deserve what they get. If we did that, a much better purpose would be served. In suggesting such a course I am perhaps asking members to tread a much more difficult path, but it will be preferable to pursue that course than to force people to the polls without giving them an adequate reason for so doing.

Hon. W. H. KITSON (West) [6.0]: I support the Bill and congratulate Mr. Ewing on his speech when introducing it. Those who have had experience of elections during recent years, particularly the elections for the Legislative Council, will agree that the apathy of electors entitled to vote for this Chamber is at times something astounding. The argument has been used that if an elector does not desire to record his vote we should not take any notice of that fact. In my opinion it is the duty of every man and woman who possesses the necessary qualification to record his or her vote for this or any other Chamber. The compulsory provisions of the Bill will have the effect of making a large number of people take more interest in the political life of the State than they do to-day. If it has that effect alone, the passage of the Bill will be well worth while. One argument used against the Bill is that it will occasion much expense in connection with the supervision of the rolls, including those of municipalities and road boards.

Hon. E. H. Harris: Do you dispute that?

Hon. W. H. KITSON: Not altogether. While it may be necessary to increase the staff of the Electoral Department, there would be little difficulty once the rolls were compiled. While more expense might be incurred during the initial stages of the work, that expenditure would not recur and the position would be far more satisfactory. Many complaints may be laid against the present methods of compiling rolls, and undoubtedly there is room for improvement. If we could have one joint roll compiled to serve all purposes, the position would be more satisfactory than it is at the present time. No doubt it is possible for the electoral authorities to establish a system under which little difficulty will be experienced re-

garding the rolls in future. For instance, if there were fewer cards to be filled in, there would not be so many complaints regarding the names of the people entitled to be enrolled not appearing on those rolls. It has also been argued that compulsory voting will destroy the secrecy of the ballot. I cannot see any logic in that contention.

Hon. E. H. Harris: Who used that argument?

Hon. W. H. KITSON: Mr. Cornell said that some electors would take their ballot papers and write rude words on them, or take some other action that would render their votes informal.

Hon. E. H. Harris: You misunderstood him.

Hon. W. H. KITSON: At any rate that was what I understood him to say. The records of percentages of voters at recent elections, which have been placed before members during the debate, provided sufficient argument for the establishment of different methods. It is not fair that members of this or any other Chamber should be elected by such a small percentage of the voters. In some instances the percentages were as low as 35 or 37 per cent. in certain districts. The effect of this is that some hon. members have been returned by a minority of the voters in their provinces. Compulsory voting would obviate such a position and we would at least assure that a fair majority of those entitled to vote would exercise the franchise. When that result is reached, the people of Western Australia will take more interest in our political life. I do not know if some hon. members are afraid of compulsory voting because people who do not record their votes now will be required to do so at future elections. The experience of Queensland is one that may well be noted by hon. members. I accept the figures as quoted by Mr. Harris and they show that there has been a considerable increase in the number of persons who recorded their votes. The Bill provides that people who fail to exercise the franchise may escape the penalty provided they are able to give a reasonable excuse for not having recorded their votes. There is nothing to complain of in that. On the other hand, if they cannot advance any reasonable excuse, the defaulting electors should be penalised. The more they are penalised the quicker will the electors realise that it is necessary to do their duty and to record their votes.

Hon. E. H. Harris: There is no provision in the Bill to enable a list of those who fail to record their votes being compiled.

Hon. W. H. KITSON: There is no difficulty in getting over that. I do not know it is absolutely necessary to deal with machinery clauses of that description at the present stage. I trust the second reading of the Bill will be agreed to and that any amendments that are necessary will be dealt with in Committee. I shall watch the experiment in connection with the Federal

elections with much interest. I believe that, as a result of the application of compulsory voting, bearing in mind the more democratic franchise that applies to Federal contests, it will be possible to evolve from the rolls that will be provided for the Federal elections a joint roll that will be of considerable advantage to the electors of Western Australia.

Hon. E. H. Harris: Would you say that the Federal roll is more accurate than the State roll?

Hon. W. H. KITSON: In some instances it is; in other instances it is not. If we have such a joint roll, the application of the compulsory voting clauses will be made much easier.

Hon. J. EWING (South-West—in reply) [6.12]: The Bill has been fairly debated and I desire the motion for the second reading of the measure to go to a division. Before we reach that stage I would like to reply to some of the arguments advanced against the Bill. Mr. Kirwan seems to be the leader of the opposition in this instance. He has made up his mind that the Bill is not in the interests of the State. He advanced arguments that were futile and childish. They will not hold water for one moment. Other arguments have been advanced that were far more tangible. Mr. Kirwan argued that because a man was highly educated, such as a doctor, a lawyer, or some other learned man, he would be so self-centred and self-satisfied that he would not take any interest in the affairs of the country. I would be bereft of reason if I believed that.

Hon. J. W. Kirwan: I did not say anything like that.

Hon. J. EWING: The hon. member said that a doctor or a lawyer, or a person occupying a high position, would be so absorbed in his own business that he would not take an interest in politics.

Hon. J. R. Brown: He classed the doctors and lawyers as the most ignorant voters in the country.

Hon. J. W. Kirwan: I said nothing of the kind.

Hon. J. EWING: The hon. member said that these learned persons would be so possessed of their own importance and so satisfied, that they would sit down in their chairs after finishing their work and would think of nothing else but their labours.

Hon. J. W. Kirwan: Mr. Ewing has so grossly misrepresented what I said that I trust you, Mr. President, will permit me by way of personal explanation to outline what I said last evening. I contended that there were many professional men in Western Australia, as elsewhere, who, although very able men in their own professions, took little or no interest in politics, and who regarded themselves as not qualified to exercise the franchise when necessary and therefore refrained

from voting. Further, I said—I am not saying anything now what I did not say last evening—that the best work throughout the world was done by men who concentrated on some particular task, and that men who had gained knowledge by research work and had concentrated in one direction were of great service to humanity. I claimed that it would be wrong to take them away from that work and to insist upon them becoming interested in politics.

Sitting suspended from 6.15 to 7.30 p.m.

Hon. J. EWING: Before tea I was speaking of Mr. Kirwan's comments and taking exception to his statement that doctors, lawyers and professional men, concentrating on certain activities, were so much absorbed that they should not be disturbed to express their opinions at election time. They should not be called upon to express an opinion upon matters of the greatest importance in the life of the country, namely those to whom the affairs of the country should be entrusted. The hon. member was referring to what might be termed the cream of the community, men who have had university training and should therefore be in a better position to judge of national affairs than are other people. Yet he proposes that such men should be set aside and should be permitted to sit in their arm-chairs and smoke their cigars—

Hon. A. J. H. Saw: Would you call that concentration?

Hon. J. EWING: Perhaps relaxation would be a better term. These men are not to be asked to consider questions of the greatest interest to the country. During their hours of relaxation surely they could give some consideration to national affairs, and why should not they exercise their vote and influence just as do other members of the community. That argument is fallacious.

Hon. J. W. Kirwan: That is not the argument I advanced at all.

Hon. J. EWING: The argument of the hon. member was that such people are inefficient.

Hon. J. W. Kirwan: It was not.

Hon. J. EWING: Inefficient because they had not given consideration to the affairs of the country. They had not studied politics. Dr. Saw and Mr. Nicholson are members of learned professions, and the very fact of their being members here shows the great amount of consideration they must have given to the affairs of the country.

Hon. J. W. Kirwan: I said nothing of the kind.

Hon. J. EWING: But the hon. member did. He said professional men should be allowed to stand aside and work for the benefit of the community in the particular directions on which they were concentrating. If ever a weak argument was offered in

opposition to a Bill, this is the weakest. The hon. member said those who did not take an interest in elections were unfit, and he asked why we should be governed by the unfit. Who are the unfit? Let me point out that at the last elections only 62 per cent. of the Assembly electors and 44 per cent. of the Council electors cast their votes. Thus 50 per cent. of voters did not go to the poll. These are the apathetic voters that I want to get at.

Hon. V. Hamersley: They did not want to vote for the Labour Party.

Hon. J. EWING: I shall tell the hon. member something about party. I claim his vote because compulsory voting appears on the platform on which he was elected. For this reason members of the Country Party must vote with me. However, what I am most concerned about is the apathetic voter, the man who knows all about politics, but because he has married a wife or wants to play golf, will not trouble to go to the poll. I was astonished to hear Mr. Dodd say that a man might not want to vote because there were two good men, Mr. Kirwan and himself, going up for election. Is there any argument in that? Electors must consider the qualifications of the two candidates and make their choice. It is no excuse for electors not doing their duty.

Hon. T. Moore: The hon. member must have a joke sometimes.

Hon. J. EWING: Members have asked me to interpret "reasonable excuse." This Bill contains a clear interpretation of "reasonable excuse," and if such is forthcoming the elector will be excused for not casting his vote. If a man is 50 miles distant from a polling booth and if no provision is made for him to cast a postal vote, it will be a reasonable excuse and he will not be troubled. Members interested in the North may feel concerned, but last year when I was administering the Electoral Department, I know there was a postal officer at every station in the North where there was any possibility of getting four, five, or half a dozen votes. All possible provision was made for postal voting, and adequate provision can be made in future. Therefore that argument falls to the ground.

Hon. J. Cornell: Would the conditions permit of you getting his vote in time?

Hon. J. EWING: I have been told by interjection and innuendo that I am supporting something that is on the platform of the Labour Party. All I can say is if it is good, I shall support it every time, irrespective of what platform it appears on. I care not what party supports or opposes this principle. The platform of the Country Party distinctly declares in favour of compulsory preferential voting.

Hon. E. H. Harris: Which country party is that?

Hon. A. J. H. Saw: Is it country party A or B?

Hon. J. EWING: I only know it is the platform of the Country Party.

Hon. A. Lovekin: I have just been informed by the leader that they have changed their opinion.

Hon. J. EWING: If a man thinks it right to change his opinion, he is at liberty to do so. However, that is part of the platform upon which Country Party members were elected, and they must give effect to it. The machinery necessary for compulsory enrolment for the Upper House can easily be arranged. It will not involve great expense, nor will it present any difficulty. The officials in charge of the Electoral Department can manage it easily. I hope members will not leave the Chamber before the vote is taken, because it is their bounden duty to express an opinion on this Bill. I thought Mr. Cornell favoured compulsory voting.

Hon. J. Cornell: You misunderstood me.

Hon. J. EWING: I am sorry for that. The hon. member said we must inculcate reason. That is being done every day through the Education Department. It is only fair and reasonable to ask members to vote for this Bill. If members say they are satisfied with a 62 per cent. vote for the Assembly and a 44 per cent. vote for the Council, I am not with them. This Bill is above party and is in the interests of the State, and it should be the desire of every member to support it as an educational factor.

Hon. J. H. Greig: What has caused you to change since last you spoke on this subject?

Hon. J. EWING: I am satisfied now that compulsory voting is right, just as I was satisfied previously that it was wrong. If members support the Bill they will be doing something to benefit the State. I am sure they will realise the seriousness of this principle. Every man and woman should do his duty on election day, and if they do not do it voluntarily they should be compelled to do it under the provisions of this measure.

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

Ayes	8
Noes	12
Majority against				4

AYES.

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

NOES.

Hon. J. Duffell	Hon. J. M. Macfarlane
Hon. J. A. Greig	Hon. G. W. Miles
Hon. V. Hamersley	Hon. J. Nicholson
Hon. E. H. Harris	Hon. A. J. H. Saw
Hon. J. J. Holmes	Hon. H. A. Stephenson
Hon. A. Lovekin	Hon. J. W. Kirwan
	(Teller.)

PAIRS.

AYES.	NOES.
Hon. H. Seddon	Hon. J. Cornell
Hon. W. H. Kitson	Hon. J. E. Dodd

Question thus negatived; Bill defeated.

BILLS (2)—FIRST READING.

- 1, Bunbury Road District Rates Validation.
 - 2, Jury Act Amendment.
- Received from the Assembly.

MOTION—HEALTH ACT, FOOD AND DRUGS REGULATION.

To disallow.

Debate resumed from 9th September on the following motion by Hon. J. Nicholson—

That Regulation 73 (declaration of certain drugs) promulgated under the Health Act, 1911-19, published in the "Government Gazette" of the 11th July, 1924, and now laid on the Table of the House, be and is hereby disallowed.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY (Hon. J. M. Drew—Central) [7.50]: Mr. Nicholson, in moving for the disallowance of Regulation 73 of the Health Act, gave his reasons at some length for so doing. It is my duty to give reasons why the regulation shall be preserved. I shall precede my remarks with a brief history of the origin of the regulation in question. An interstate conference was held in Sydney in September, 1922, and at that conference regulations were drawn up in regard to food and drugs. Among the regulations agreed to was one requiring the declaration of formulae of patent and proprietary medicines. The conference was attended by representatives from all the States and among those present were certain trade representatives, as well as medical officers and analysts. In New South Wales, Queensland and Tasmania the Health Acts have at present no provision under which it is possible to frame a regulation similar to that introduced by the present Government. The representatives of the States at the conference to which I have referred voted in favour of the regulation regarding patent medicines, and also signed the report. It is evident, therefore, that the expert advisers, including the trade representatives, were agreeable to the framing of the regulation requiring the formulae disclosure, and presumably would long since have adopted it in their States had there been legislation under which it would have been possible to frame such a regulation. It is necessary in the first instance to introduce an Act to make the necessary provision for the required regulation. In Victoria a regulation slightly differing from ours, but having exactly the same effect, has been framed and is now in operation.

Hon. J. Nicholson: Has it not been suspended?

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: I am not aware of that.

Hon. J. Nicholson: I am advised that it has been suspended.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: In South Australia no action has yet been taken, although it has been promised that at an early date effect will be given to the decision arrived at at the conference. Unfortunately, South Australia usually lags behind in matters of this kind. Mr. Nicholson urges that no action should be taken until uniformity is secured. Constitutionally, in regard to health matters the position is that each State is sovereign in its own sphere, and until health matters are specifically under the control of the Federal Administration the responsibility rests with each State Government to frame, not only legislation, but also regulations in accordance with the desire to achieve the best possible result for the community at large. That is one of the objects for which this particular regulation was framed. Mr. Nicholson referred to the promised appointment of the Federal Royal Commission to investigate the whole field of public health matters. Such a Commission has been talked of from time to time during the last two years, but little can be achieved by the Commission until the States come to an agreement and decide to hand over to the Federal Government, by means of an alteration of the Constitution, all public health matters of great magnitude. Despite the difficulties affecting the constitutional position a large measure of uniformity has been achieved as the outcome of the deliberations and discussions of the conferences. In view of the fact that we have not yet Federal control, it is only right that each State should take its own responsibility, and as all the States agreed, nothing remains now but for each State, if it is true to its principles, and true to the decisions arrived at at the conference, to introduce legislation and afterwards frame regulations in accordance with the statute. Mr. Nicholson urges that the powers already possessed are adequate. These are—

(a) Section 188 which gives the Commissioner power to examine and report on any doubtful food, drug, or appliance; such report may be published in the "Government Gazette" and any newspaper may republish such report.

(b) The Commissioner may prohibit the sale of any patent medicine or proprietary medicine which he regards as deleterious or dangerous to health.

(c) False or misleading statements regarding proprietary medicines are penalised.

(d) A declaration of the label of any patent or proprietary medicine is required of any drugs of a poisonous or potent character.

On the face of it, these provisions would appear adequate, but in practice they have been found insufficient to protect the pub-

lie not so much against danger as against imposition. Regarding the power to report upon any patent medicine, there is little to be gained by this unless the public Press will republish such reports for general information. The experience of the department is that the newspapers will not publish these reports, and as a consequence the public are not informed as to what is going on.

Hon. A. Lovekin: What reports are these?

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: Reports in connection with patent medicines and drugs that are published in the "Government Gazette" from time to time.

Hon. H. Seddon: Why do not the newspapers publish them?

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: I am not in a position to say. Section 189 gives very useful and necessary power, but the objection to most of the patent medicines is, not so much what they do contain as what they do not contain, when considered in the light of the numerous beneficial claims made in respect of them by the proprietaries and the agencies. Again, Section 190 with its penalty for the publication of a false statement looks very well on paper, but here we observe one of the characteristic features of patent medicines which is hard indeed to check. A very common practice is to work to a formula of a recognised aperient. The manufacturers know the wide-spread ill effects of irregular or infrequent bowel operation, and in their literature they first of all dilate on the evil effects of constipation. They know, too, that constipation may indirectly give rise to numerous physical ailments, and they make numerous extravagant claims for the beneficial effects that will follow the use of the particular medicine. Undoubtedly the drug does in many instances remove constipation for the time being, but a dose of Epsom salts would have practically the same results.

Hon. J. Nicholson: Why does not the "Gazette" publish that?

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: A large number of patent medicines on the market have originated with people who have no pharmaceutical training. With many of them the claim is made that the prescription has been handed down from remote generations, or has been revealed by some mysterious medicine man, and that his original formula has been repeated and preserved. The average patent medicine is quite satisfactory for certain plain simple ailments, but compared with the value of its ingredients it is sold at an exorbitant price, and generally most extravagant claims are made for its usefulness. Numbers of ointments, for instance, are put upon the market, the great bulk of which follow some well-known formula from antiseptic ointment. I have in mind two ointments that are widely advertised, but which are actually plain ordinary

eucalyptus ointment, according to the British Pharmacopœia. These patent ointments are sold at 1s. 6d. and 2s. 6d. a tin for quantities of one and two ounces, whereas the ordinary B.P. ointment can be purchased at any chemist's for about 1s. per pound. It is obvious that the prices charged to the public must include the heavy costs of advertising, upon which, for the most part, the goodwill of patent and proprietary medicines is based. As an indication of the huge sums spent in this way, it was publicly stated that 15 years ago in the United States, fully 40,000,000 dollars a year were spent in the advertising of patent and proprietary medicines. In many cases the cost of advertising equals or exceeds the other costs of production. Mr. Nicholson speaks of reputable patent medicine manufacturers, and urges that if their products be blocked by the regulation under discussion the general public will suffer, because they will have less satisfactory remedies foisted upon them. If that suggestion is correct, how is it that most of the best known drug firms make no secret of their formulæ? There are no firms that can compete, for instance, with Park Davis & Co. of the United States and England, and Burroughs Wellcome & Co., of England, in the quality of the drugs they put out, the wide range of products, and in the amount of research work that they undertake. Although those firms, and many others, have for years made a regular practice of putting complete formulæ of their preparations on the bottles, and each spends considerable sums in research work, nevertheless whatever new is discovered is promptly disclosed, and they depend for steady increase in their business upon quality of production. In contrast with this, the attitude of the patent medicine trade shows up badly. In the first place, there is little doubt that the great bulk of formulæ are quite of an ordinary character. It is possible that certain patent medicines do contain something beneficial, of a secret character, but this must be regarded as very doubtful. No doubt, in certain mixtures, while the ingredients are ordinary, the process by which mixture takes place may be secret. Any such process no manufacturer is called upon to disclose. Patent medicine manufacturers may not comply with the regulation; if so their goods will not be permitted to be sold in Western Australia. Our view is that no loss will be suffered by the community on that account. Among the numerous lines that are put up by reputable firms prepared to disclose the whole of the formulæ, can be found all the medicines that people may need to take in emergency and for simple ailments, and these numerous lines will, and can, be readily substituted or augmented by mixtures, ointments, pills, etc., put up by our own local chemists, both wholesale and retail. Assuredly, if the

regulation be enforced no harm will come to the public, and their pockets will be protected. Their health, too, will be protected in that the frequent repetition of symptoms, etc., a practice now followed by patent medicine advertisers encourages unnecessary self-drugging. It is considered that the principal reason for the protest by the patent medicine manufacturers against this regulation is the knowledge that if the formula be declared the absence of any special ingredients will at once be noted, the glamor of secrecy will be removed, and their much vaunted lines will have to take their proper place, alongside of the many quite ordinary lines of medicines, ointments and pills, which can be obtained to produce the same results at much less cost.

Hon. J. A. Greig: Do not chemists know the formulæ at present?

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: They have a pretty fair idea.

Hon. J. A. Greig: And why do not they make the stuff cheaply and supply it?

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: They do. Drugs are made up containing practically the same ingredients as are to be found in patent medicines.

Hon. A. J. H. Saw: But they do not put up misleading advertisements to gull the public.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: They can be purchased from the chemists at half the price. Mr. Nicholson's strong plea for uniformity is a clever strategical move. He knows that New South Wales, the home of the patent medicine trade in Australia, can do nothing. Hence "uniformity" means "follow New South Wales and do nothing." Victoria and Western Australia can logically claim that they are more actively pursuing uniformity, as both are following conference resolutions. It is the others, not Victoria and Western Australia, that are out of step. I hope, in the public interest, that Mr. Nicholson's motion for the disallowance of Regulation 73 will not be agreed to.

Hon. H. SEDDON (North-East) [8.10]: I also will oppose the motion. Health regulation No. 73 will be in the best interests of the people. After all, we have to recognise that the department is there to safeguard the people, and that its regulations are framed with that object. When such a regulation is framed we should scrutinise it from the standpoint that the department represents ourselves, and therefore we ought to support the department in any regulation, provided it does not interfere too much with public liberty. Considering the regulation under discussion we have to recognise that there are enumerated in the schedule certain drugs, many of which are extremely harmful to the human system. I look to Dr. Saw to explain the action of some of these drugs upon humanity and so convince members of the necessity for supporting the regulation.

Hon. J. Cornell: But these drugs, like beer, may act differently on different systems.

Hon. H. SEDDON: But when we get such drugs as sulphuric acid, hydrachloric acid and other acids it is necessary to exercise considerable supervision over their introduction into medicines, whether patent or proprietary lines. There is a good deal of misconception in respect to proprietary medicines. Generally they are referred to as patent medicines. They are nothing of the sort. If an article is patented, the method of making it has to be lodged with the Patent Department, whereas the proprietary lines are secret preparations known only to the manufacturers. If any of those materials are of such a nature as to be worth patenting the owner can patent them and so obtain protection. There are three main reasons why I oppose the motion. The first is that many of these proprietary lines are simply frauds. Others are harmful, and nearly all of them are pure swindles in respect of the value given to the public for the price charged. The drug habit in a good many instances has been formed as a result of the quantity of drugs included in some of these mixtures. I have here a book entitled "The Great American Fraud." It is a reprint of a series of articles that appeared in "Collier's Magazine" some years ago in which the patent medicine Peruna was exposed to the public. Statements were issued referring to a certain drug called Acetanilid. This drug will undoubtedly relieve headaches of certain kinds. We can well imagine what would happen to a person with a weak heart who took this medicine for the purpose of relieving his headache. Cocaine and opium are often introduced into these medicines, and these stop pain. Pain is a symptom of some disorder. It is a danger signal provided by nature to draw attention to the fact that there is something wrong with our system that requires attention. It is obvious that the use of opium and cocaine will tend to induce the drug habit. Many persons can contract this habit quite unknowingly by returning again and again to the use of some patent medicine. It has been found that the drug habit has been caused by persons taking such medicines.

Hon. A. Lovekin: Why do doctors use similar prescriptions?

Hon. H. SEDDON: A doctor makes up a prescription from knowledge of the condition of his patient. When a person is suffering from a headache and takes a certain drug or medicine to cure it, it may be that all the time the headache is a symptom of some special disorder, which his doctor can analyse and understand and prescribe for accordingly.

Hon. A. Lovekin: Would not that prescription also induce the drug habit?

Hon. A. J. H. Saw: No.

Hon. H. SEDDON: Some of these patent medicines are harmful. Others contain alcohol. There is a case on record of a patent

medicine that was well advertised in Western Australia some years ago. It was known as Peruna. It was glaringly advertised in the newspapers and on the hoardings and all its virtues were displayed. It was found subsequently that it contained 35 per cent. of alcohol.

Hon. J. Cornell: That is the stuff.

Hon. H. SEDDON: It is on record that a lady who was a prominent leader of the Women's Christian Temperance Union drank this medicine.

Hon. J. J. Holmes: She found what she was looking for.

Hon. H. SEDDON: She thought the medicine was doing her good, and contracted the habit of taking it. One day her brother, who was speaking to her, said, "You are drunk." It was afterwards found she was under the influence of liquor, because she had been taking large doses of this medicine. The trouble was that when an effort was made to restrain her from using this drug, it was found she had become a confirmed drunkard. That is one illustration of the harmful effects consequent upon the use of patent medicines.

Hon. A. J. H. Saw: I hope the Press will repeat the name of this drug.

Hon. H. SEDDON: Many of these medicines are pure swindles, because the cost of the ingredients used is so much below the price charged for them. A patent medicine known as Chamberlain's Remedy was examined by the Health Department. It was found that had the doses prescribed on the bottle been taken at the intervals stated, the dose might have been fatal. The matter was taken up and the firm concerned removed the drug from their remedy, which was then sold as if it contained all the virtues that were once claimed for it. This shows how little reliability can be placed on the advertisements regarding these medicines, which are apt to play such havoc with the public health.

Hon. A. Lovekin: The same sort of thing happened in connection with a doctor in Ballarat.

Hon. H. SEDDON: In that case the authorities would be dealing with a man who had passed some examination, and from his knowledge should know what he was doing. In the other case it was purely a matter of persons dealing out drugs in an irresponsible manner. When Zambuk ointment was analysed, it was found to be no more than an ordinary eucalyptus ointment known to the pharmacopoeia. Its active ingredient was eucalyptus, which is a strong antiseptic and to some extent an irritant, and which may produce redness of the skin. It may be considered to be a counter-irritant, in consequence of which pain may to some extent be alleviated.

Hon. J. Cornell: It is the rubbing in that does it.

Hon. J. J. Holmes: What about Goanna Salve?

Hon. H. SEDDON: No doubt we shall hear later on the ingredients of which that consists. Rexona ointment, according to the analysis, is a similar preparation to Zambuk. Its virtues have been grossly exaggerated. Here are some samples of the advertisements concerning it, "The last word science has to utter in regard to healing agents" (Misleading and gross exaggeration); "Not only capable of curing every kind of skin disease" (absolutely misleading and untrue); "Rexona is as different from many old-fashioned ointments as chalk is from cheese." According to the analysis, Laxo-Tonic pills contain aloes, liquorice, car-damom, oil of peppermint, and starch. Such drugs would act as laxatives and in large doses as purgatives, and would to some extent constitute a bitter tonic so far as the stomach and intestines are concerned. Zambuk pills, according to the analysis, consist of aloes, capsicum (?) and calcium sulphate. Hearne's bronchitis cure contains, with the exception of a little chloroform, none of the enumerated drugs alleged of it. The medium contains a little acetic acid, a little alcohol and a little sugar.

Hon. J. Cornell: That is the only thing I would have in my house.

Hon. H. SEDDON: Indian Root Pills contain gambouge, which should not be given to children or elderly persons. I have here a book called "Secret Remedies," published in the Old Country some time ago. It deals with several of the more commonly used patent medicines.

Hon. A. Lovekin: A hundred of these are unknown.

Hon. H. SEDDON: In this book Kenting's cough lozenges are said to be sold from an address in London in boxes, price 1s. 1½d., 2s. 9d., 4s. 6d., and 11s. per box. The small size contains 50 lozenges. The proportions of the various ingredients found corresponded to—morphine .007 grains, ipecacuanha .07 grains, extract of liquorice 2.1 grains, sugar 13 grains, in one lozenge.

Congreve's balsamic elixir: This preparation advertised from an address in London is sold in bottles, price 1s. 1½d., 2s. 9d., 4s. 6d., 11s., and 22s. The "elixir" was a bright red liquid; analysis showed it to contain 28.5 per cent. by volume of alcohol and 2 per cent. of total solids; the latter consisted of resinous constituents, sugar, a little tannin, colouring matter and extractive.

Hon. A. Lovekin: Very few of those medicines are known.

Hon. A. SEDDON: The book goes on—

Doan's backache kidney pills, sold in boxes, price 2s. 9d. The following formula gives a similar pill:—oil of juniper, 1 drop; Hemlock pitch, 10 grains; potassium nitrate, 5 grains; powdered fenugreek, 7 grains; wheat flour, 4 grains; maize starch, 2 grains; in 20 pills. The estimated cost of the materials of the 40 kidney pills and four dinner pills, ½d.

Warner's safe cure, sold in a bottle holding about 8 fluid ozs. at the price of 2s. 9d. The following formula gives an almost identical mixture:—potassium nitrate, 50 grains; oil of gaultheria, 1/3rd minim; rectified spirit, 5 fluid drams; liquid extract of taraxacum, 10 fluid drams; glycerine, 4 fluid drams; water to 8 fluid ounces.

Hon. J. Nicholson: Do members know what all these mean?

Hon. H. SEDDON: I am looking to Dr. Saw for an explanation of them. Taking the quantity here given, the estimated cost of the drugs for one bottle of the mixture is 5½d.

Hon. A. Lovekin: It is 10 per cent. alcohol.

Hon. H. SEDDON: The book continues—

Cuticura remedies: Cuticura resolvent, price 2s. 6d. per bottle containing 6½ fluid ounces. Analysis showed the composition of the mixture to be potassium iodide, 17 grains; sugar and glucose, 486 grains; extractive, 8 grains; alcohol, 10 fluid drachms; water, to 6½ fluid ounces.

Stedman's teething powders, sold in boxes, prices 1s. 1½d., 2s. 9d., 4s. 6d., and 11s. When a child is under three months of age the third of a powder only is to be given; from three to six months half a powder may be used; when above six months a whole powder may be taken.

Hon. A. Lovekin: A doctor sometimes orders these.

Hon. H. SEDDON: Very likely.

The average weight of one powder was 2.4 grains; 12 powders weighed singly had weights varying from 2.25 to 2.6 grains. Analysis showed the powder to be composed of calomel 29 per cent., sugar of milk 71 per cent.

Williams' pink pills for pale people. Sold at 2s. 9d. a box containing 30 pills. The quantities of the different ingredients found indicated the following formula:—exsiccated sulphate of iron, .75 grains; potassium carbonate, anhydrous, .68 grains; magnesia, .09 grains; powdered liquorice, 1.4 grains; sugar, .2 grains; in one pill. The estimated cost of the ingredients for 30 pills is one-tenth of a penny.

Beecham's pills: A box of these pills, advertised to be worth a guinea, is sold for 1s. 1½d. and the prime cost of the ingredients of the 56 pills it contains is about half a farthing. The quantities were approximately as follows:—Aloes, .15 grains; powdered ginger, .55 grains; powdered soap, .18 grains in one pill.

Mother Seigel's syrup: The price of a bottle containing three fluid ounces is 2s. 6d. Analysis—dilute hydrochloric acid, 10 parts by measure; tincture of cascara, 1.7 parts; aloes, 2 parts; treacle 60 parts; water to 100 parts by measure. The estimated cost of the ingredients for 3 fluid ounces is one-third of a penny.

I would instance the preparations quoted by the Minister. I have here a bottle containing one of a series of tablets. It is labelled:

Ammoniated quinine tincture, equivalent to 1 fluid drachm (3.5 C.C.). Dose: one, or as prescribed.

The constituents, and the quantities of the various constituents, of the tablets are stated on the bottle: sodium carbonate, ammonia, bi-carbonate, oil of menthol, and so forth.

Hon. J. Nicholson: Do you derive much information from reading those particulars?

Hon. H. SEDDON: The public will derive a certain amount of satisfaction from being furnished with those particulars, because they will know what they are taking, and they will distinguish such a medicine from certain patent medicines which are recognised to be frauds.

Hon. J. Nicholson: Can you find all those names in the British Pharmacopœia?

Hon. J. J. Holmes: Will the public be any wiser as to whether the medicine is good or bad after reading those particulars?

Hon. H. SEDDON: The public will be able to see that they are not being taken down. At present they are being misled by glaring and untruthful advertisements. The bottle of pills which I hold in my hand is a recognised remedy, approved by the medical fraternity. The composition of the remedy is proclaimed on the bottle, in contrast to the practice adopted in connection with patent medicines.

Hon. J. Nicholson: But what is the cost of the ingredients?

Hon. H. SEDDON: Here we have all sorts of stuff put up by patent medicine firms who proclaim the enormous worth of their remedies and the wonderful results being obtained from them. If the ingredients of those patent medicines were printed on the bottles, the people could obtain the results by purchasing the drugs undiluted. I followed the Minister for the purpose of pointing out that a considerable amount of money is being spent in America to advertise patent medicines. I think it wise that we should take action before the evil becomes as bad here as it is there. In America not only was a considerable amount of money spent in advertising, but many American newspapers were cleverly duped by the owners of proprietary medicines. The advertising contracts used in America by the proprietors of those medicines contained certain clauses. Here is an example of one such clause—

First—It is agreed in case any law or laws are enacted, either State or National, harmful to the interests of the Munyon's H. H. Remedy Co., that this contract may be cancelled by them from date of such enactment, and the insertions made paid for pro rata with the contract price. Second—It is agreed that the Munyon's H. H. Remedy Co. may cancel this contract pro rata in case advertisements are published in this case in which their products are offered, with a view to substitution or other harmful motive; also, in

case any matter otherwise detrimental to the Munyon's H. H. Remedy Co.'s interests is permitted to appear in the reading columns, or elsewhere in this paper.

That is bringing influence to bear on the Press, an influence which is likely to be harmful.

Hon. A. Lovekin: Do you think there is anything like that here?

Hon. H. SEDDON: I am not suggesting anything of the sort; I am merely pointing out what has actually occurred in America, as a warning against an evil which is possible in this country unless our Press is warned. Here is a telegram which was sent to an American legislator and newspaper proprietor—

House Bill eight hundred and twenty-nine discriminating against proprietary medicines passed lower house. Up in senate Monday. Quick work necessary. Use your influence.

Hon. A. Lovekin: What do you think would happen if that telegram were sent here?

The PRESIDENT: Order! Please let the hon. member put his case.

Hon. H. SEDDON: I am not inferring for a moment that that would take place here; I am merely stating what has taken place in America.

Hon. A. Lovekin: The inference is that it might happen here.

Hon. H. SEDDON: That is why I wish to warn hon. members. Here is another contract—

J. C. Ayer Co., Manufacturing Chemists.
... First—It is agreed in case any law or laws are enacted, either State or National, harmful to the interests of the J. C. Ayer Co., that this contract may be cancelled by them from date of such enactment, and the insertions made paid for pro rata with the contract price. Second—It is agreed that the J. C. Ayer Co. may cancel this contract, pro rata, in case advertisements are published in this paper in which their products are offered, with a view to substitution, or other harmful motive; also, in case any matter otherwise detrimental to the J. C. Ayer Co.'s interests is permitted to appear in the reading columns, or elsewhere, in this paper.

Hon. J. Nicholson: Have you seen any evidence of such a thing in Western Australia.

Hon. H. SEDDON: No, I certainly have not. I am not imputing anything to our newspapers at the present time; I am merely warning them of what has taken place in another country. These articles were originally published in "Collier's Weekly" years ago, and they were largely instrumental in promoting legislative action against the patent medicines. Here is a statement from Mr. Cheney, writing to Mr. William Allen White, editor of the "Gazette," Emporia, Kansas—

I have read with a great deal of interest, to-day, an article in "Collier's" illustrating therein the contract between your paper and ourselves. Mr. S. Hopkins Adams endeavoured very hard (as I understand) to find me, but I am sorry to say that I was not at home. I really believe that I could have explained that clause of the contract to his entire satisfaction, and thereby saved him the humiliation of making an erratic statement. This is the first intimation that I have ever had that that clause was put into the contract to control the Press in any way, or the editorial columns of the Press. I believe that if Mr. Adams was making contracts now, and making three-year contracts, the same as we are, taking into consideration the conditions of the different legislatures, he would be desirous of this same paragraph as a safety-guard to protect himself, in case any State did pass a law prohibiting the sale of our goods. His argument surely falls flat when he takes into consideration the conduct of the North Dakota legislation, because every newspaper in that State that we advertise in had contracts containing that clause. Why we should be compelled to pay for from one to two years' advertising or more, in a State where we could not sell our goods, is more than I can understand.

Hon. A. Lovekin: That is fair, isn't it?

Hon. H. SEDDON: Yes; but I am going to read something more presently. Mr. Cheney's statement continues—

As before stated, it is merely a precautionary paragraph to meet conditions such as now exist in South Dakota. We were compelled to withdraw from that State because we would not publish our formula, and, therefore, under this contract, we are not compelled to continue our advertising. To illustrate: There are 739 publications in your State—619 of these are dailies and weeklies. Out of this number we are advertising in over 500, at an annual expenditure of 8,000 dollars per year (estimated). We make a three-year contract with all of them, and, therefore, our liabilities in your State are 24,000 dollars, providing, of course, all these contracts were made at the same date. Should these contracts all be made this fall and your State should pass a law this winter (three months later) prohibiting the sale of our goods, there would be virtually a loss to us of 24,000 dollars. Therefore, for a business precaution to guard against just such conditions, we add the red paragraph referred to in "Collier's." I make this statement to you, as I am credited with being the originator of the paragraph, and I believe that I am justified in adding this paragraph to our contract, not for the purpose of controlling the Press, but, as before stated, as a business precaution which any man should take who expects to pay his bills. Will

you kindly give me your version of the situation. Awaiting an early reply, I am sincerely yours, Frank J. Cheney.

As Mr. Lovekin has said, on the face of it that statement is perfectly reasonable. But parallel with it was published an extract from a speech delivered before the Proprietary Association of America—the owners and manufacturers of proprietary medicines—by the same Mr. Cheney—

We have had a good deal of difficulty in the last few years with different legislatures of the different States. I believe I have a plan whereby we will have no difficulty whatever with these people. I have used it in my business for two years, and I know it is a practical thing. I, inside of the last two years, have made contracts with between fifteen and sixteen thousand newspapers, and never had but one man refuse to sign the contract, and by saying to him that I could not sign a contract without this clause in it he readily signed it. My point is merely to shift the responsibility. We to-day have the responsibility of the whole matter upon our shoulders. . . . There has been constant fear that something would come up, so I had this clause in my contract added. This is what I have in every contract I make: "It is hereby agreed that should your State, or the United States Government, pass any law that would interfere with or restrict the sale of proprietary medicines, this contract shall become void." In the State of Illinois a few years ago they wanted to assess me three hundred dollars, I thought I had a better plan than this, so I wrote to about forty papers, and merely said: "Please look at your contract with me and take note that if this law passes you and I must stop doing business, and my contracts cease." The next week every one of them had an article. I have carried this through and know it is a success. I know the papers will accept it. Here is a thing that costs us nothing. We are guaranteed against the 75,000 dollars loss for nothing. It throws the responsibility on the newspapers. I have my contracts printed and I have this printed in red type, right square across the contract, so there can be absolutely no mistake, and the newspaper man can not say to me, "I did not see it." He did see it and knows what he is doing. It seems to me it is a point worth every man's attention. I think this is pretty near a sure thing.

Hon. A. Lovekin: If anyone wrote a letter to the papers here on those lines, I know what the reply would be from every paper in the State.

Hon. H. SEDDON: I do not doubt it, and that is why I took the opportunity of following the Leader of the House, in order that other members might give us their version of the condition of things in

this State. However, I have only described what has occurred in America.

Hon. A. Lovekin: We are not in America.

Hon. H. SEDDON: America is a very big country, and this evil has existed there widely.

Hon. A. Lovekin: America is noted for graft.

Hon. H. SEDDON: I would not be doing my duty as a member of this House if I did not state what has occurred elsewhere in order that we may have the matter clearly and satisfactorily dealt with so far as Western Australia is concerned. Having read out those extracts and pointed out the evils and dangers existing in other countries, I will close by saying that I consider the best interests of our people will be served by dealing as indicated with the proprietary medicine companies, and making them print on their bottles and packages exactly what is contained in them. If any of those proprietary remedies are of real benefit, the makers of them can take advantage of the patent laws to secure protection for what they are manufacturing. In my opinion the best interests of the people of this State will be served by the maintenance of the regulation, and therefore I oppose the motion.

On motion by Hon. A. Lovekin, debate adjourned.

House adjourned at 8.45 p.m.

Legislative Assembly.

Wednesday, 24th September, 1924.

	PAGE
Select Committee, Metropolitan Markets, extension of time	963
Leave of absence	963
Papers: Sandalwood dealing	963
Bills: Jury Act Amendment, &c.	963
Bushbury Road District Rates Validation, &c.	
Trade Unions Act Amendment, &c.	963
Motions: Radiographer, compensation	965
Revenue, protecting the States' interests	970
Group Settlement, Personnel of Royal Commission	980

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