

Ordered, that the resolution be transmitted to the Legislative Council, with a message requesting their concurrence.

ADJOURNMENT.

The House adjourned at 10:36 p.m. until the next day.

Legislative Council,

Wednesday, 26th July, 1899.

Question: Captain Douglas and Recognition of Bravery—Perth Mint Amendment Bill, third reading—Contagious Diseases (Bees) Bill, third reading—Criminal Appeal Bill, in committee, reported—Police Act Amendment Bill, second reading; division—Wines, Beer and Spirit Sale Amendment Bill, second reading—Evidence Bill, second reading—Adjournment.

THE PRESIDENT took the Chair at 4:30 o'clock p.m.

PRAYERS.

QUESTION—CAPTAIN DOUGLAS AND RECOGNITION OF BRAVERY.

HON. A. B. KIDSON asked the Colonial Secretary whether the Government intend taking steps to have the bravery displayed by Captain Douglas, of the s.s. "Dunskey," in rescuing, at the risk of his life, the survivors of the "City of York," recognised in the proper quarter.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY (HON. G. RANDALL) replied: The usual course pursued in this country has been for the facts of the case to be brought under the notice of the Government, so that a statement may be forwarded to the proper quarter. The Government cannot take notice of statements in the newspapers, unless distinctly brought under their notice. Perhaps the hon. member could arrange for a statement of the case to be made out. The reply to the question is: The Government would be glad to make representations in the proper quarter, if the facts were placed before them.

PERTH MINT AMENDMENT BILL.

Read a third time, on motion by the COLONIAL SECRETARY, and passed.

CONTAGIOUS DISEASES (BEES) BILL.

Read a third time, on motion by the COLONIAL SECRETARY, and transmitted to the Legislative Assembly.

CRIMINAL APPEAL BILL.

IN COMMITTEE.

On motion by the HON. A. B. KIDSON, the House resolved into committee to consider the Bill.

Passed through committee without debate, reported without amendment, and report adopted.

POLICE ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

SECOND READING.

THE HON. F. M. STONE (North), in moving the second reading, said: The Bill I now ask members to read a second time contains a section which we repealed last session, and I regret to say I was one of the members who either voted for that repeal or said I would not vote against it. Since that time I have exceedingly regretted my action on that occasion, having seen the consequence of the repeal. Sports of any kind cannot now be carried on unless we have the "bookie" element in it, and the sports are ruined. Having heard that this element had got into sport, I went down to some school sports to see how they were carried on, and I never saw such a disgraceful proceeding. Certain men were really riding "crooked" in the interests of the bookmakers, and although the Cricket Association endeavoured, I believe, to stop it in every way, they were unable to do so. They were defied by the bookmakers, the consequence being that those sports, which should have been of benefit to the community, and a pleasure, were simply ruined. If anyone went to that recreation ground, he could see the crooked riding, for it was really done almost openly.

HON. R. S. HAYNES: That would soon effect its own cure, because it would stop betting.

HON. J. W. HACKETT: The bookmakers had barred a man in every case, except one, and in that case there was a "fall."

HON. F. M. STONE: Almost two-thirds of the tobacconists' shops are "tote" shops, open places for betting. You can look down a newspaper and see columns of it; and you will see it openly advertised.

HON. R. S. HAYNES: Shocking.

HON. F. M. STONE: My friend says "shocking." I do not know whether he has an interest in those places.

HON. R. S. HAYNES: I was saying "shocking" for the newspapers to do it.

HON. F. M. STONE: I beg your pardon. If we pass the Bill, we will go against the newspapers, and stop the open betting that is carried on.

A MEMBER: We tried to do it before.

HON. F. M. STONE: But the wrong method was adopted, and there is a very easy way of dealing with the question if we only adopt a proper system. When this section was on the statute book, if there was any betting, it was done quietly.

HON. F. T. CROWDER: And that is the worst way.

HON. F. M. STONE: I do not think so. You cannot stop betting, though I should like to see it stopped, for I am not a betting man, and do not believe in it; but though it cannot be absolutely stopped, I would like to see it prevented as far as possible. Stop it from being an open disgrace, as it is now, and make these sports as legitimate as you can, so that one may go to them without finding a howling crowd, as at the present time. In the event of this Bill being passed, any association wishing to stop betting will be enabled to do so; for any person betting will be liable to be prosecuted; and, under Clause 2, any person found betting can be removed and prevented from coming to those grounds. I have been spoken to by several prominent members of the West Australian Turf Club, and they tell me the club are in favour of this Bill. I believe that last year they were instrumental in getting the section repealed, but having now found how the change has worked, they wish the section to be again placed on the statute book.

HON. R. S. HAYNES: They do not know their own mind.

HON. F. M. STONE: They have found the evil of the alteration, and I think hon. members have found the evil of it. I have certainly seen it, and I

think no one who has been to any sports can have failed to see it.

HON. J. W. HACKETT: How does the Bill touch the tote shops?

HON. F. M. STONE: Directly betting is stopped, you can "go for" the tote shops.

HON. R. S. HAYNES: You can prosecute them now. Five persons have been prosecuted and convicted, and the places have been shut up.

HON. F. M. STONE: If this Bill be passed, I propose to take other measures to stop these tote shops. I hope those members who last year voted for the repeal of the section will see the error of their ways, the same as I have done, and now vote for the Bill.

HON. F. T. CROWDER (South-East): I second the motion, and I may say I agree with every word that has fallen from the hon. member who moved it. I do not wish to take up the time of the House by following on his arguments, but will simply say I think the other members of the House, as well as myself, believe his remarks to be true; and, if they are true, we should pass this Bill.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY (Hon. G. Randell): I heartily support the Bill which the hon. member has introduced.

HON. R. S. HAYNES: You opposed the repeal of the section.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: Yes; I opposed the repeal; and I think certain members will agree with me in saying that the Legislative Council, being a calm and deliberative assembly, are expected to a large extent to protect the best interests of the country morally as well as financially and physically. I wish particularly to say it appears that throughout Australia, and not only here, but in the old country, at the present moment, public feeling is being largely roused in the direction to which this Bill points. The evil of gambling and other things associated with it has become so rampant, and is so undermining the moral welfare of the community at large, inducing as it does so many of our young people to engage in it, that it is desirable the Legislature should take cognisance of these things, and set their faces against them. There is a great difference between knowing that such things take place, and their being

countenanced by the Legislature or other bodies. I have always felt we should draw a distinction between these two things. We may fail, perhaps, in legislating in certain cases, and we shall not be able entirely to destroy the evil which exists, but, at any rate, our action, as a legislature, exhibits to the people at large our feelings on the matter, and has a great moral influence. Whenever an opportunity arises for the Legislature to express itself in this direction, it should take advantage of that and do so. I believe the gambling evil in this country is a great one, leading to many things we all deplore, and the sooner we can instil into the minds of our young people especially the danger of engaging in these things, the better for us. When we find, from the case cited by Mr. Stone, that the authorities of the Association ground in Perth have been unable to stop this outrage, on common decency, of shouting "odds," I believe it is called—

HON. R. S. HAYNES: There is nothing indecent in shouting the odds.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: These men are not of very high character, and I understand the shouting of odds is associated often with strong and peculiar language, which is not of a polite nature.

HON. R. S. HAYNES: "Two to one bar one."

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: It is not nice language for polite people to hear, and I think the sooner it is stopped the better. It is stated that those who own these properties cannot stop the evil, and it is admitted on all sides that it has a most disastrous effect on true sport; therefore, I hope the House will agree to the Bill. Mr. Stone tells us he has seen the evil wrought through the removal of this section from the Police Act. I desire to congratulate him on showing the moral courage to come forward and introduce an amending Bill for the purpose of doing away with the evil. I have strong feelings about this matter, and there are many other things in the city which have, I think, developed to such an extent that the best and highest interests of the community at large are threatened. If we want a nation to be established in everything that is best, we should set our faces against such an evil as that of gambling.

HON. R. S. HAYNES: I am always glad to know Mr. Stone has introduced a Bill, because, as a rule, it is well thought out before he brings it forward; and it is generally one that is acceptable to the majority of the members of the House.

HON. W. T. LORON: Does that apply to the Bill introduced last year?

HON. R. S. HAYNES: I do not say it applies to every Bill, for there are exceptions to every rule, and there was one last year; but some people never introduce anything at all.

HON. J. W. HACKETT: Some introduce too many things.

HON. R. S. HAYNES: That may be. The proper way is to take the middle course, and to think out the Bills that are introduced. I have listened to the remarks of my friend, Mr. Stone, and have paid great attention to them, but I do not think they are such as to make out a case to alter the Act. As to the harm of gaming, which the leader of the House spoke about, a reference to the subject is no doubt very good in its proper place, but I do not know that this is the proper place for it. The hon. gentleman seems to know a great deal more about that than he did about the Criminal Appeal Bill last night. He takes a great interest in this Bill, which is a very minor one.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: Not the Bill, but the subject.

HON. R. S. HAYNES: Exactly, the subject; he is quite *au fait*. The hon. gentleman tells us the bookmakers call out the odds, and that it is outrageously indecent.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: So it is.

HON. R. S. HAYNES: The highest persons in this land, or any other land, are present whilst this "outrageous indecency" is being practised.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: I very much regret it.

HON. R. S. HAYNES: His Royal Highness the Prince of Wales and various crowned heads attend races where the odds are called out. I do not think the leading people would tolerate outrageous indecency, and, in my opinion, the hon. gentleman was carried away in his remarks by his excessive zeal in opposition to gaming. I see nothing outrageously indecent in a person betting, and I do not think the term "outrageously in-

decent" is applicable. However, that is a little beside the mark. The Colonial Secretary congratulated my friend, Mr. Stone, on coming to the House and asking for the repeal of the present Act, and he seemed to say that, owing to the facts referred to having been brought to his knowledge, he would now vote for the repeal of the section. I would remind the hon. member that it is not in consequence of new facts that have come to his knowledge that he is in favour of the Bill, and that he was previously opposed to the repeal of the section in question. The hon. gentleman says that betting is an evil, and, if that be so, I tell him that it would be very much easier to stop the motion of a ship at sea than to stop betting. There are other persons who do not look upon betting as outrageously indecent, and I am amongst the number.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: I applied that term to the professional bettor.

HON. R. S. HAYNES: Let me tell the hon. gentleman there are always two persons to every bet, and, as a rule, the professional bookmaker does not bet with another bookmaker.

HON. J. W. HACKETT: The rogue and the fool.

HON. R. S. HAYNES: Is betting immoral? If so, make it illegal everywhere. I cannot see that betting on a racecourse is more illegal or more immoral than betting in a drawing-room or in a private house. Because persons do things publicly, that does not make those things illegal. If betting is improper, it is because betting is in its essence improper, whether done publicly or privately. If that is so, let us have a Bill to stop betting everywhere.

HON. F. T. CROWDER: You cannot do that.

HON. R. S. HAYNES: Then reject this Bill. Let us pause for a moment and ask, on what grounds are we to repeal the Act which this House, after mature consideration, and which, after mature consideration in another place, was passed? What ground is now brought forward to ask us to change our views? Mr. Stone has told us that at a recent bicycle meeting, in a certain corner of Perth, certain persons were shouting out the odds, and that the proper person did not win.

HON. F. M. STONE: Not at the South Perth race meeting.

HON. R. S. HAYNES: Has the hon. gentleman been there? If so, I tell him it was not a proper place to go to. Football matches are held at Fremantle, and I suppose there is never any rowdyism at those matches? I suppose there is no bookmaking or rowdyism on the part of the bookmakers at Fremantle, but there is rowdyism on the part of the players—disgraceful proceedings, which are an outrage on decency. Why does not the hon. member (Mr. Stone) introduce a Bill to stop football playing? Football players of the rowdy class not only ruin their morals, but they break their collar-bones—they ought to break their necks.

HON. F. T. CROWDER: If there was no betting, there would be no disgraceful scenes at football matches.

HON. R. S. HAYNES: That is a proposition that the hon. member makes, but I do not know on whose authority. I know there were broken collar-bones long before there was betting. It is proposed to say that, if a person bets on a racecourse that person shall be liable, on conviction, to a penalty of not less than forty shillings, nor more than one hundred pounds, and for a second offence he is to be treated as a rogue and vagabond, and sent to gaol.

HON. F. T. CROWDER: The person would go back to where he came from, in lots of cases.

HON. R. S. HAYNES: The hon. member has turned sincerely moral. "Those whom the gods are about to destroy, they first make mad." The law and the Parliament recognise horse-racing; there is no use shutting our eyes to it: Parliament does recognise horse-racing.

HON. F. T. CROWDER: Legitimate horse-racing.

HON. R. S. HAYNES: I may tell the hon. member I have never seen a legitimate horse-race. Let me say at once that I seldom attend races, but I have never seen a legitimate horse-race run; a legitimate race being one in which every horse in the race has tried to win. Parliament recognises horse-racing, and let us remember that Parliament has for many years voted money for the purpose of promoting horse-racing, that Parliament has given grants of land for the purpose

of horse-racing, that Parliament has constructed railways for the purpose of carrying people to witness horse-racing.

HON. J. W. HACKETT: The Imperial Parliament has adjourned over Derby day.

HON. R. S. HAYNES: Do you think it is right and moral to prepare a place and induce people to go in for horse-racing, and to encourage horse-racing in every way—to ask people to go and see horse-racing, and yet expect them not to bet?

HON. F. T. CROWDER: Certainly.

HON. R. S. HAYNES: Then the hon. member must stay in the bar all the time. Just imagine horse-racing, and expecting people not to bet. Why, Parliament absolutely legalised the totalisator.

HON. F. T. CROWDER: That is not betting.

HON. R. S. HAYNES: Then I do not know what betting is. You put your money down, and sometimes you get it back again, and sometimes you do not. But that does not seem to be the object of the Bill. I hope I am not wearying the House, but I would like to see the House a little consistent when it is pointed out that members are inconsistent.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: I would like to hear the hon. member on the greatness of men; he is now giving us the littleness.

HON. R. S. HAYNES: I have not studied your character yet. Turning to Clause 2, it says, "Every person betting or offering to bet"—not every book-maker, because, although this Bill may be passed, Parliament has promoted horse racing; Parliament has established railways for the purpose of carrying people to witness horse-racing and placing them on the racecourse; and, having done that, Parliament has gone further and made legitimate that which is improper at common law, that is the totalisator, which in other words is a lottery. The running of a lottery is an offence at common law, but it has been made lawful by Parliament. Betting has been made lawful, if you bet in a lottery; but if you bet with another person, you are a rogue and a vagabond; if you do not put your money in the totalisator box, you are a rogue and a vagabond. The Bill is not that bookmakers shall not ply their

calling—that is another matter, for if you say bookmakers shall not ply their calling, then bring in a Bill to that effect. Any person betting or offering to bet by wagering on a racecourse is liable under this Bill.

HON. A. B. KIDSON: Then amend the Bill.

HON. R. S. HAYNES: It does not need amending: wipe it out. Are there not many members here who attend race meetings, and is there any member who would refuse to make a bet at a race meeting with a friend, not being a book-maker?

HON. F. M. STONE: Yes.

HON. R. S. HAYNES: Well, there may be.

HON. D. MCKAY: There are three here.

HON. R. S. HAYNES: Some people never bet—they are afraid of losing; but I think if those persons had a "good thing on," they would take it. I would not like to tempt anybody. Do you think, as a matter of fact, that it is wrong for any person to make a bet with a friend? We know that ladies go to races, and for them to sit down and look through their glasses and watch the dresses of other ladies is very nice; but they like to have a little excitement, and the law has recognised that and has created the ladies' totalisator. The books that are issued for the races contain the instruments for making a sweep—betting—an offence that is punishable with a fine of 40s. and not more than £100, and for the second offence, committed, say, five or ten years afterwards, a person is branded as a rogue and a vagabond—that is a nice law! This is not a British colony; this is going to be Russia.

HON. F. T. CROWDER: What about South Australia?

HON. R. S. HAYNES: If we are going to follow in the steps of South Australia, why not introduce the Acts they have in that colony?

HON. F. T. CROWDER: No lady in South Australia has been before the Court for betting.

HON. R. S. HAYNES: The hon. member is an authority, but the police may have been remiss in their duty. The Government bring in a Bill for the purpose of opposing betting, and the Bill is brought in on the ground that at a

bicycle sports meeting bookmakers called out the odds, and it is said some of the bicycle racing has been improper, which was in consequence of the betting. Is there a race meeting that we know of at which the running is not open to suspicion ?

HON. W. T. LORON : Very seldom.

HON. F. T. CROWDER : The bookmakers are at the bottom of it as a rule.

HON. R. S. HAYNES : That may or may not be the case. I say this and I challenge contradiction—that with a blind totalisator you can do more swindling than with a bookmaker. If you are going to apply the pruning knife then I ask the Colonial Secretary to withdraw this Bill and see if he cannot introduce some measure to stop bookmaking altogether; I will assist him in such an effort. How many bookmakers are there in the colony? Are there a hundred bookmakers in the colony? I suppose there are 40 or 50, and because there are 40 or 50 persons going down to cycling sports and howling themselves hoarse, calling out the odds and interfering, as it is suggested, with the running, Parliament are going to punish the whole of the inhabitants of the colony and prevent them from betting. Is there any reason in that at all? This Bill which is introduced here will have to go to another place for confirmation, and what will be thought of this House after having passed a measure on two occasions to repeal it now? In the first instance the measure was introduced with another clause added, it went to another place and was passed subject to that one clause being struck out. The measure came back here and this House disagreed with what another place had done, and insisted on what is called the wheel totalisator, being run. Again the Bill was introduced and the House deliberately considered the matter. There was exactly the same homily on the evils of betting and gambling, the same as we have heard this afternoon, but it had no effect on the majority of members.

HON. F. T. CROWDER : Giving them a chance which they have abused.

HON. R. S. HAYNES : The hon. member says "giving them a chance which they have abused." Who are "they?" I introduced this Bill, but I did not do so for the benefit of the bookmakers, far

from it. I introduced it for the benefit of the inhabitants.

A MEMBER : And the bookmakers took advantage of it.

HON. R. S. HAYNES : Are you going to punish 170,000 people because the bookmakers took advantage of it.

HON. D. MCKAY : They are a perfect nuisance.

HON. R. S. HAYNES : I say there are 170,000 people in this colony, and there are fifty or sixty bookmakers, or there may be a hundred, or even two hundred; and because a dozen or twenty bookmakers, or whatever the number may have been, howled themselves hoarse at some cycle sports when Mr. Stone was present, you are going to stultify the action of the House and ask them to change their minds and punish the whole of the people. You are going to punish these people, and make them rogues and vagabonds if they attend races at a place where you have built a railway, and have granted land for horse racing. Mr. Stone thinks an attack should be made on the newspapers. He is sitting too near the leader of the House and is becoming affected by the views of that gentleman. He will make us all moral.

A MEMBER : I want to wipe out the South Perth racecourse.

HON. R. S. HAYNES : Is this House going to meet in solemn conclave to alter the laws of the country in order to wipe out the South Perth racecourse? Is the Bill introduced for the purpose of stopping the bookmakers?

HON. F. T. CROWDER : It is to stop them buying the jockey after they have bought the horse.

HON. R. S. HAYNES : This Bill is introduced by Mr. Stone for the purpose of preventing bookmaking. It is aimed at a certain class which he describes as a bad class. He may be right, but what I am pointing out is that in order to get at 50, 60, or 100 bookmakers, you are punishing the whole colony and stultifying the action of the House, and the action of Parliament almost from the time of the foundation of the colony, because you are making it illegal to go to a racecourse and bet, although you have built railways to the racecourse, and have granted land, and nearly every official goes to the races. And now it is said you are going to shut up tote shops.

HON. H. J. SAUNDERS: Are you in favour of them?

HON. R. S. HAYNES: I do not know that any exist.

HON. H. J. SAUNDERS: There are five tote shops in Hay street.

HON. R. S. HAYNES: I challenge the hon. member's statement, and contradict it. I know that on one occasion one keeper was found in Hay street, but I think it was at the other end. However, it was only one that was discovered, and a police officer was fined; and the business has been stopped, as far as I know. Four, five, or six persons were brought up and fined; but what I want to point out is that you cannot stop betting; and that being so, what is the use of passing a Bill to try to stop it? I will prove my proposition by the words of my hon. friend (Mr. McKay), who says there is an Act which prevents the running of totalisators and tote shops, and yet admits that they all exist. If that be so, what is the use of passing a Betting Suppression Bill?

HON. W. T. LOTON: What is the use of legislation at all, then?

HON. R. S. HAYNES: All I can say is that if the House would be careful and only pass legislation which would have some effect, persons would obey the law. I am honest enough to say that if this Bill passes into law, I shall absolutely disregard it. If I happened to be on the racecourse—which is very seldom the case—I should think I had a right to bet, and should consider it wrong on the part of any legislature to interfere with me. I say again, bring in a Bill to abolish bookmaking, and I will agree to that; but do not stop betting.

HON. F. T. CROWDER: What is the difference between betting and bookmaking; will you explain that?

HON. R. S. HAYNES: As the hon. member has said bookmaking is such a serious evil in the colony, one would have thought he knew all about it.

HON. F. T. CROWDER: So I do.

HON. R. S. HAYNES: Bookmakers are the persons growled at. They are the persons who shout out the odds, which, it is said, is an outrage on decency. Let those who wish to stop the shouting of the odds introduce a Bill which will prevent it; and that will be very simple. Even those who have charge of the race-

courses can prevent the shouting of the odds. I think I was at the racecourse in Perth last year, and I believe it was the first time for ten or twelve years; so members may see what I know about horse races. If I remember aright, I saw the word "Silence," and I heard no shouting of odds. It may have been that in the din I did not hear it, but I do not know whether such is the case or not. Members who attend there regularly will know whether I am right or not on that point. You can easily stop the shouting of odds, and it can be done on the Recreation Ground.

HON. F. M. STONE: They tried to stop it.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: The section will be for the benefit of the people attending these racecourses.

HON. R. S. HAYNES: If people misbehave themselves, let those people be punished; but do not punish those who behave properly.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: Will not this clause punish those who behave improperly?

HON. R. S. HAYNES: It will do it, but it is very much like cutting a man's head off to cure the toothache. If you prevent betting, be consistent, and pass an Act to reinvest in the Government the land given to the trustees of the Perth racecourse, tear up the railway, stop the building of the railway at Bunbury to the racecourse, and reinvest the land given to the trustees for racecourse purposes.

HON. F. T. CROWDER: No, no.

HON. R. S. HAYNES: The hon. member would not be such a Vandal as to do that. Mr. Stone quotes in support of his argument the Western Australian Turf Club, and says certain members of the club have said they wish the section to be again inserted. The club may do so, but, speaking subject to correction, I say the club have passed rules by which they charge ten, twenty, or a hundred pounds, or some large sum, for conceding to bookmakers the right to ply their calling. There have been only one or two meetings, two or three days' racing, since this Act was passed, and I never heard of any complaint about bookmaking or excessive betting or disorderly conduct upon the Perth racecourse at any of those

meetings. I challenge contradiction in that respect. What has caused the Turf Club to change their position? It was at the instance of the Turf Club that the Bill last year was introduced.

HON. F. T. CROWDER: The robbery of the public has caused them to do it.

HON. R. S. HAYNES: Let me say that the Bill now introduced was introduced in another place by a member at a time when he was piqued at some person not having paid his bets. Am I right? It was passed very hastily, and that was one of the grounds on which I sought to have it kept off the statute book. The Turf Club knew very well what things happened, and how betting was carried on, before the late Bill was introduced, and they knew very well what the effect would be if they repealed it. The Turf Club have, as I say, had three or four days' racing on Perth racecourse, at which nothing peculiar has transpired, so far as I know; no complaint about improper running, and no disgraceful scenes, nor any persons ruined; and yet, in face of that, the Turf Club come and say "We will repeal this." The figure never works unless somebody pulls the string, and there is always a reason for something; and I think I can divine the reason that prompts the Turf Club to ask for the repeal of the late Bill. If bookmakers go out there they compete with the totalisator. People do not bet so much with the totalisator as with the bookmakers, and the Club lose 10 per cent.

A MEMBER: So the bookmaker says.

ANOTHER MEMBER: That is quite true.

HON. R. S. HAYNES: I have shown you there is no legitimate reason why the Turf Club should ask for the late Bill to be repealed.

HON. F. T. CROWDER: Except the robbery of the public.

HON. R. S. HAYNES: Except the 10 per cent.

HON. J. W. HACKETT: You must lose in the long run.

HON. R. S. HAYNES: If you keep on you must lose. The real cause of the desire of the Turf Club to have the alteration now proposed is that they are afraid of competition. Are you going to allow one class of people to bet with impunity, and to prosecute another class?

A question was raised with reference to the totalisator, and I warn members that, if this Bill be passed, the Totalisator Act will be put to the test. I am not going to say whether the view which is expressed, and expressed by very good lawyers, is correct, that every person who deposits a stake with a totalisator is betting. This Act was passed since the Totalisator Act, and it practically repeals it, and if members who are interested in totalisators think they are doing themselves a benefit, they had better beware, for they may be cutting a switch to beat their own backs. I shall at all events request the hon. member not to press the motion to a division to-night, and I ask the House to pause and consider whether it would be wise to pass such legislation as this, and perhaps be told afterwards in another place that we do not know our own minds? I can quite understand that if the Bill it is sought to repeal had been passed in another place, and sent to us, and we had passed it without fully considering it, it would be right for this House to say on our own initiative, "We will introduce a Bill to repeal it, and send the Bill down for consideration." But what must be thought of the way in which we in this House do our business and consider our measures, if we ask the other House to repeal a measure one session, and the next session ask them to reconsider it, without giving any reason whatever except that the Turf Club think there is too much competition? Really, it seems to me to be little short of childish. I hope members will see their way to consent to an adjournment of this debate, so that more members can be present to express their opinions on the Bill. Although the House may not be in favour of passing such a measure as this, it would be in favour of a movement to suppress the vice of betting.

HON. A. B. KIDSON (West): I think, in view of the attitude which I took on a former occasion, when a section of the Act was repealed last session, and when I seconded the motion for the second reading of the Bill, it is my duty now to explain my altered attitude. I intend to support the second reading of this Bill and as strongly as I possibly can, because I feel that in taking the action I did on a former occasion I made a mistake, and I think the House made a very serious

mistake in passing the repeal of that section of the Police Act. Personally, for some considerable time I have been connected, in some shape or form, with sports, both before and since the repeal of that section; therefore I can speak from experience, and I do not speak from the experience of the one occasion which was mentioned by Mr. Stone, but I speak from the experience of numerous occasions.

HON. R. S. HAYNES: At Fremantle?

HON. A. B. KIDSON: At Fremantle and elsewhere, and I say the scenes witnessed on those occasions, not only at Fremantle, but elsewhere, were a perfect scandal and disgrace to any community. I will explain what I mean. You hear a bookmaker shouting the odds at the top of his voice; you see a free fight here, and you see a free fight there, and you see a free fight further on until the place is nothing more nor less, I do not hesitate to say, than a pandemonium. This goes on to such an extent that it is most unpleasant, and almost impossible, to take ladies to the sports—in fact, I say personally, I never would dream of taking a lady to witness sports in such circumstances as those, and I speak from my experience and from what I have seen on numerous occasions since the repeal of the Act, and previous to it. I can safely say that when the Act was in force a man could take ladies to witness sports and there was nothing of the scandalous nature and the noisy shouting of odds, or the free fights; but since Section 2 of the Police Act has been repealed—and I can assure hon. members that what I am stating is a fact—all these things have occurred. Shortly after the repeal of the section, I went to a sports meeting, and I was struck with the difference as compared with what a sports meeting was like before the Act was altered. I am not going to say that this Bill is perfect as it stands, because I think it requires some amendment, and I feel sure that Mr. Stone, when the Bill gets into Committee, will agree to amendment in certain directions. At the same time I think it is absolutely essential that something should be done at once in order to do away with the great scandal that now exists. With regard to betting, personally I am not averse to anyone betting if he wants to, but let that person bet pri-

vately and not make himself a nuisance to others.

HON. R. S. HAYNES: Put that in the Bill, then.

HON. A. B. KIDSON: We will put that in the Bill; but let the Bill pass the second reading, and then we can consider what form the amendment shall take. If it is necessary to have an amendment to the effect suggested, I am sure Mr. Stone will agree to it.

HON. R. S. HAYNES: All my objections to the Bill will fail then.

HON. A. B. KIDSON: I thought the hon. member was objecting to the Bill *in toto*, and did not want the House to pass it.

HON. R. S. HAYNES: As at present drawn.

HON. A. B. KIDSON: Then I understand the hon. member will vote for the second reading of the Bill, and will endeavour to amend it in Committee?

HON. R. S. HAYNES: I asked for an adjournment for the purpose of considering amendments.

HON. A. B. KIDSON: I do not think Mr. Stone is going to take that bait.

HON. R. S. HAYNES: He is afraid of a full House.

HON. A. B. KIDSON: No; he is not. I hope Mr. Stone will press the Bill to a division to-night, because the postponing of the second reading to another day will not alter the right of amendment which hon. members possess; and if the second reading is passed, the committee stage can be postponed. I hope hon. members will pass the second reading, and so let the House agree to a measure which will tend to take away that great scandal which at present exists.

HON. R. S. HAYNES: We shall become a laughing stock.

HON. A. B. KIDSON: The hon. member says that this House will become a laughing stock. I say this House became a laughing-stock by repealing the Act; therefore, I feel all the more keenly the necessity of my speaking to-day, in order to take up a diametrically opposite stand to that which I took upon a former occasion. I am afraid betting cannot be stopped, and I am not going to stand up in this House and speak in opposition to what I think is useless, but it is absolutely necessary to get this Bill or some measure, having a similar object in view,

passed, to stop the great scandal that now exists.

HON. R. S. HAYNES : Get the debate adjourned for a week, and you will change your mind again.

HON. A. B. KIDSON : I am not like the hon. member. I do not think I need detain the House further. I could not see anything in the arguments of the Hon. R. S. Haynes, who spoke of Parliament having sanctioned horse-racing.

HON. R. S. HAYNES : My arguments were addressed to intelligence.

HON. A. B. KIDSON : It was not intelligence that actuated them.

HON. R. S. HAYNES : I know you did not understand them.

HON. A. B. KIDSON : The hon. member spoke of Parliament encouraging horse-racing ; I cannot see what that has to do with betting. The hon. member seemed to come to the conclusion that because Parliament encouraged horse-racing that we must encourage betting.

HON. R. S. HAYNES : It is like giving a man a knife and fork and a plate and putting nothing upon it.

HON. A. B. KIDSON : The hon. member's argument is a very bad one. If a person cannot go to a sports meeting without betting he had better stay away, and we had better do away with sports altogether.

HON. D. K. CONGDON (West) : I intend to oppose the second reading of this Bill. It would be very inconsistent indeed, having passed a measure last session repealing an enactment which provided a penalty for betting, to now re-enact that law. It was said that the Act which it was sought to repeal last session had been passed by mistake, and an attempt was made to remedy the error. I shall certainly vote against the second reading. I do not see that because Mr. Stone has been to one portion of Perth and witnessed disgraceful scenes that that is any reason why we should pass this Bill.

HON. D. MCKAY : You must have seen disgraceful scenes, too.

HON. D. K. CONGDON : I do not see why we should punish the whole of the people of this colony because one section disgraces itself. If betting is allowed, I should like to see it carried on in a more decent manner than is the case at the present time ; still, I do not see why we should punish all the people of the

colony because a certain section disgrace themselves.

HON. A. P. MATHESON (North-East) : I also intend to oppose the second reading of the Bill. No arguments have been introduced by those who have spoken to lead me to alter the views which I held when the Bill for amending the Police Act was before us last year. Two arguments have been given in favour of the measure, and one is the argument of persons opposed to betting altogether. This Bill does not meet the views of persons opposed to betting altogether. As Mr. Haynes points out, to put money on a totalisator is undoubtedly betting, and whatever members may think, from a moral point of view, the totalisator does a great deal of harm to women and children. Women and children put money on the totalisator—I have seen them—but they would not go to a bookmaker. It appears to me also that this Bill, even if it is passed, will never be enforced properly. That was the objection which was raised to the law we amended last session. Nobody could have been more concise on the subject than the members who spoke, including Mr. Stone, and he voted for amending the Act, because the carrying out of the law was a perfect farce. I agree with him.

HON. F. M. STONE : Does it stop book-making ?

HON. A. P. MATHESON : Bookmaking will go on in exactly the same way if we pass the Bill. What I see happening under a number of Acts is this : if an inspector or policeman has a pique against an individual, he takes advantage of an Act of Parliament to punish that individual, while the general public, who break the law just as much, are allowed to go free. It is a fact that certain Acts are enforced against one person and not against another. There are Acts which have recently been passed which lend themselves to that course of treatment, and this Bill will do the same. The real objection which has been taken to the present position of affairs is that bookmakers are able to shout their odds and make their attendance at race meetings or bicycle meetings disagreeable. I may say I have certainly been to race meetings in Perth recently, and I did not observe any of the objections which have been raised against the bookmakers.

There was no objection to the bookmakers on the course, and I would not have raised any objection to them. I believe there were some disgraceful proceedings at a certain bicycle sports meeting. I have never been to any such sports, but I understand that disgraceful proceedings do take place; but surely it is in the hands of the committee, who have charge of the Association ground, to stop the shouting of odds.

HON. F. M. STONE: They have tried to.

HON. R. S. HAYNES: They could do it.

HON. A. P. MATHESON: It seems to me that if the ground is vested in a committee, and if the committee are unable to make certain regulations—

HON. R. S. HAYNES: They can make by-laws.

HON. A. P. MATHESON: One of the by-laws or terms of admission could be that odds should not be shouted.

HON. F. M. STONE: The opinion of eminent counsel has been taken on the point, and the opinion was against the committee.

HON. A. P. MATHESON: Then in that case I will go a step further, and say that if the hon. gentleman proposed to bring in an entirely different Bill, which would enable the owners of these grounds to prevent persons from shouting the odds, I should be prepared to support it; but I am not prepared to support the Bill as it stands, to procure immunity for bicycle sports, and other sports which have not been mentioned, from bookmakers: because it is certain the public do not wish bookmakers to be shut out where horse racing is carried on. Mr. Kidson alluded to a fight going on at some sports that he attended: but I would ask whether those fighting were bookmakers or others?

A MEMBER: It was the result of betting.

HON. A. P. MATHESON: If the bookmakers were misconducting themselves, there might be some strength in the argument; but it is extremely unlikely that the bookmakers would do anything of the kind. As a rule, fighting takes place among the ordinary loafers who attend a racecourse. I do not intend to take up the time of the House by making a long speech. I have given the reasons why I intend to oppose the Bill, and I can only say to the hon. gentleman that if he will bring in some other form of Bill such as

I suggest, giving the committee power to stop persons from shouting the odds—which, after all, is what is complained of—I shall, as I have said, be perfectly prepared to support him.

HON. C. E. DEMPSTER (East): I shall not support the Bill before the House, because, in the first place, I think it extremely unreasonable to undo this session what we did last. I would not have supported the introduction of the Bill last year had I not seen how very badly the matter was working at that time. Numbers of men were allowed to bet with impunity, but every now and then the police would make a raid upon people, and those people would be pulled up. I thought it far better to make it legitimate to bet than to have a lot of secret betting; and I still think so. It appears to me that it is perfectly impossible to do away with betting altogether, and, as I say, it is better to have betting done legitimately than to have it carried on in the manner it would be if betting were not allowed by law. I therefore think it would be well to leave betting legitimate for some time to come, at all events. If betting could be done away with entirely, it would be desirable to exterminate it in the interests of the community, for I am sure that a great deal of evil would thus be prevented. Even in horse-racing, I am sure that if there were no bookmakers the racing would be much better and more honest than at the present time; but I again assert that if we cannot do away with betting we had better have it legitimate.

Question—that the Bill be read a second time—put, and a division having been called for by the Hon. R. S. Haynes, it was taken with the following result:—

Ayes	11
Noes	4
Majority for	7

AYES—11.
 The Hon. F. T. Crowder
 The Hon. J. W. Hackett
 The Hon. W. T. Loton
 The Hon. D. McKay
 The Hon. C. A. Piessé
 The Hon. G. Baudell
 The Hon. J. E. Richardson
 The Hon. H. J. Saunders
 The Hon. W. Spencer
 The Hon. F. M. Stone
 The Hon. A. B. Kidson

NOES—4.
 The Hon. D. K. Coughdon
 The Hon. C. E. Dempster
 The Hon. A. P. Matheson
 The Hon. R. S. Haynes
(Teller).

Question thus passed.
 Bill read a second time.

WINES, BEER, AND SPIRIT SALE
AMENDMENT BILL.

SECOND READING.

HON. F. M. STONE, in moving the second reading, said : This is a Bill to amend the Wines, Beer and Spirit Sale Act Amendment Act, 1880. Clause 2 was passed last session by this House, and struck out in another place. It is a clause which, it seems to me, ought to be on our statute book for the protection of the honest publican. The clause is that if a defendant upon being prosecuted proves to a magistrate that he had reasonable grounds to believe a person was a traveller at the time he supplied him, and that he took all reasonable precaution to ascertain the man was a traveller, he should not be convicted; but it gives the magistrate power to order a prosecution against any person improperly representing himself to be a traveller. I think the House will agree it is only reasonable that a person who goes into a public house and, improperly representing himself as a traveller, obtains a drink through that representation, should be punished for doing so, because he is often the means of trapping the publican into supplying him with liquor, and is perhaps more to blame than the publican himself. If a publican has a *bonâ fide* belief that a person is a traveller, and he uses all reasonable precautions to find out whether that is so, he gets off scot-free. I have taken that clause from the English Act, and, having read the authorities on it, it seems to me to work very well in England, where it has been in force a considerable time.

HON. J. W. HACKETT: What is reasonable precaution?

HON. F. M. STONE: Evidence has been brought forward that publicans have had a notice up in the bar, in large letters, warning any person that if he improperly represents himself to be a traveller, he will be fined £5. That is to start with. They have also had persons at the doors to ask people whether visitors are travellers, and where they have come from; not the simple question, "Are you a *bonâ fide* traveller?" but some particulars. Those precautions have been held to be reasonable. I do not know that any member of the House will oppose Clause 3, which deals with certain women who are employed in hotels: I refer to barmaids.

I propose in this clause that no barmaid shall be employed in a bar on a Sunday, and I do not think any gentlemen would get up in the House and say they were in favour of barmaids being so employed; because to start with, we know the law is that only a *bonâ fide* traveller shall be supplied with liquor, and to my mind there is no necessity to have a barmaid in a bar on a Sunday. As regards many hotels, very few travellers would go into them. There may be hotels close to a railway station where perhaps there may be more traffic than elsewhere; but in those cases there is nothing to prevent the keepers from having a barman, if the custom is so large that it is necessary to keep open a bar. I have not been in any hotel in Perth on a Sunday, but I have been in Fremantle; and it is well-known that the bars both in Perth and Fremantle are run the same as on ordinary weekdays. You will go into hotels and find the barmaids behind the bars.

HON. R. S. HAYNES: Where?

HON. F. M. STONE: In Fremantle. It is also the case in Perth, for I have very good information that it is so.

HON. A. P. MATHESON: What about the Act?

HON. F. M. STONE: I cannot see how any member can oppose this Bill, because the Act says that no liquor shall be supplied to any person except a *bonâ fide* traveller, and I assert that there is no necessity for bars to be kept open as they are, with barmaids in them.

HON. F. T. CROWDER: And yet you support women's suffrage.

HON. R. S. HAYNES: This is women suffering.

HON. F. M. STONE: I have heard of a woman working in a bar from ten in the morning until ten at night, and what necessity is there for that? Why should a woman have to go into a bar on a Sunday, and be there the same as on an ordinary day? I think that if we take away the barmaids from this Sunday trade, in many cases there will not be the attraction to the bar which exists at present; and I do not suppose the House will countenance in any way the employment of women in a bar on a Sunday, but will be of opinion that they should have their Sunday free, the same as we have. It may be argued that barmen will be put in; but there is not the same objection to

that as to barmaids being employed for the purpose of supplying the travelling public. The clause goes further, and says no woman shall be employed in a bar after eleven o'clock at night; and my reason for bringing in that clause is that I consider it only humane that such a clause should be on our statute book. I may tell members that from inquiries I have made, I find that in many of the hotels in Perth—indeed, I may say nearly all—the women go on from, I think, ten o'clock in the morning, and are there up to twelve o'clock at night, and even one o'clock the next morning: being engaged thirteen hours. They are often in the bar until one o'clock in the morning. The bars are supposed to be shut at eleven o'clock, but permission is given to keep open the billiard-room bar to supply only those persons who are playing billiards.

HON. R. S. HAYNES: No, no.

HON. F. M. STONE: I tell you that such is the case, because I happened to be defending a person who was prosecuted for supplying other people, and that person was fined. Permission is only granted by the magistrate to keep open the bar for the purpose of supplying the billiard-room bar.

HON. R. S. HAYNES: That may be so in Perth, but generally it is permission to keep open until twelve in all other places.

HON. F. M. STONE: The billiard-room bar is the only one kept open, and the liquor has to be supplied. Of course one is well aware that when persons are at the bar they may have had liquor supplied at twelve o'clock, and may stop about yarning at the door. In many cases these women are unable to get away from the bar for half-an-hour or, perhaps, an hour.

HON. D. MCKAY: They are the attraction.

HON. F. M. STONE: They are the attraction. We passed here an Early Closing Act last session, under which employees are only allowed to be employed in shops during certain hours, so as to limit their hours of work. But here we now find that these women—and I defy contradiction—are employed for twelve hours; from ten to ten, and in some cases from nine a.m. to twelve at night. What time have these barmaids to sleep? The

long hours simply mean ruination to them, and I do not think the House will hesitate to pass a Bill for the purpose of curtailing the long hours of these barmaids. We have adopted this principle on many occasions.

HON. R. S. HAYNES: Interfering with the rights of the public?

HON. F. M. STONE: My hon. friend voted for the Bill.

HON. R. S. HAYNES: I am speaking of the Betting Act.

HON. F. T. CROWDER: We ought not to pass such a Bill as this.

HON. F. M. STONE: I thought my friend was a Sunday observer. I think Mr. Crowder believes in Sunday observance, and this Bill is to enable barmaids to have Sunday to themselves. I regret that Mr. Crowder should be against this Bill. We know in these days that hotels are pretty "hard up," but it would be better for hotels to continue to be "hard up" than to obtain money by Sunday trading, when women have to work on Sundays to help to earn that money.

HON. F. T. CROWDER: We do not want the House to be made ridiculous by this sort of legislation.

HON. R. S. HAYNES: That has been done already.

HON. F. M. STONE: Will this House be made ridiculous because it is going to pass a law to cause the Sabbath to be observed. I regret that Mr. Crowder should have made the remark. It should not be said that the House is attempting to make itself ridiculous when it is endeavouring to pass legislation in regard to Sunday observance. An endeavour will be made, under one clause, to do away with a good deal of the Sunday trading which is now carried on. There is no necessity for Sunday trading at all. There is no necessity for keeping bars open as on a week-day. If a hotelkeeper wishes to supply a traveller or a boarder, he can have a barman, and the bar need not be open, but the customer can be supplied through a little window.

HON. F. T. CROWDER: The law allows bars to be kept open until midnight now.

HON. F. M. STONE: I am speaking of Sunday observance. I wish a clause passed to prevent any women being employed in a bar on Sunday. On a week-day a hotelkeeper can supply liquor

up till 12 o'clock in the billiard-room to billiard players.

HON. R. S. HAYNES: I do not think there is power to restrict it.

HON. F. M. STONE: Several people have been convicted, but there has been no appeal. If hotelkeepers want to keep their bars open till 12 o'clock at night, let them have a barman, and not keep a woman in the bar until midnight.

HON. F. T. CROWDER: The barmaids do not begin in the bar until one o'clock in the afternoon.

HON. F. M. STONE: They go into the bar at 10 o'clock in the morning.

HON. R. S. HAYNES: We will appoint a select committee to inquire.

HON. F. M. STONE: There are only two hotels where the hours mentioned by Mr. Crowder are in force, and most of the barmaids have to commence at 10 o'clock in the morning. I hope the House will pass the clause. The Sunday trade, as carried on now, should be put a stop to. The bars are open on Sunday as if it were an ordinary week-day, and women are made to serve in the bars when they should have their Sundays free. I commend the Bill to the House.

HON. F. T. CROWDER: I have no objection to Clause 2, but so far as Clause 3 is concerned, I shall oppose it, for it seems to me that legislation like this is simply making the Legislative Council of this colony ridiculous. Clause 3 points out that "It shall not be lawful for any person holding a publican's general license, a wine and beer license, or a way-side-house license to have, retain, or employ there a barmaid, or suffer to be retained or employed in any bar in the house or place in which such license shall be exercised, any female on a Sunday." I maintain that, according to the meaning of the word "retain," a hotelkeeper would not be allowed to permit his wife to be on his licensed premises on Sunday.

HON. D. MCKAY: Oh, no.

HON. F. T. CROWDER: I think the clause means that. As to the latter part of the clause, that no barmaid shall be employed after 11 o'clock at night on a week-day, under a fine or penalty of not less than £10 or more than £50, that amounts to this—

HON. R. S. HAYNES: It is an interference with the rights of the public.

HON. F. T. CROWDER: The Bill which the hon. member refers to is very different from this one.

HON. R. S. HAYNES: The shoe did not pinch then, but it does now.

HON. F. T. CROWDER: I say a publican who employs barmaids—really I have had nothing to do with hotels for a year or two, and I know very little about them.

HON. R. S. HAYNES: And he has given up betting, too!

HON. F. T. CROWDER: The barmaids go into the bar at one o'clock in the afternoon, and we are asked to say that these barmaids shall not work until 12 o'clock at night. I wish hon. members to remember that when the Legislative Council of this colony, a body who are supposed to legislate in a sensible manner, pass such a Bill as this, the outside public may say this House is making itself ridiculous. I am not going to oppose the second reading of the Bill, because I consider Clause 2 is really necessary; for at the present time the onus of proof is thrown on the licensed victualler, whereas Clause 2 alters that state of things.

HON. R. S. HAYNES (Central): I shall support the Bill, and I had better state my reasons for so doing. I desire to be consistent. This house has recognised the principle of interfering with the rights of the public, and having assented to that proposition, I feel myself constrained to disagree with Mr. Crowder; but I desire to carry Mr. Stone to the brink of a precipice in the hope that he will fall over, and then this legislation will cease. I propose to move an amendment in committee to extend the proposal that not only shall there be no Sunday trading, but that there shall be no trading on Christmas Day or Good Friday. We have interfered with the rights of the people by saying that employees shall not work after certain hours, therefore we should not ask barmaids to work after 11 o'clock at night; after working until 11 o'clock at night barmaids should be allowed to go home.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

EVIDENCE BILL.

SECOND READING.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY (Hon. G. Randell), in moving the second reading of this Bill, said: This is a copy of a law which is already in operation in two at least of the Australian colonies, if not three. It is doubtful whether the law is in operation in New South Wales, but it is in operation in Queensland and Victoria. It is merely a formal Bill, having for its object the dealing with judicial acts and official signatures, making easy of proof matters that are of a non-contentious character. Before this Bill was passed in the other colonies it was submitted to the Governments of all the colonies, and of course it was submitted to the Government of this colony: therefore, the Government are well acquainted with the principles embodied in the Bill. I am satisfied the Bill will accomplish the purpose for which it was intended and I think on reading over this Bill that it is likely to be of special use in the administration of justice. I think it is a step in the right direction. Whatever we may think of federation in general, this Bill is a step in the direction of the true federation of the colonies.

HON. R. S. HAYNES: That sounds like a paradox coming from you.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: Does it? Because I am opposed to the financial and industrial federation of the colonies. I believe the hon. member (Mr. R. S. Haynes) will give his hearty support to the Bill because it enables the administration of justice to be more easily carried out. At the present time it is very difficult to prove certain things and the Court can insist on those proofs being given. The admission of any proof of any act embodied in the Bill which is admissible in one colony will be admissible in this colony and *vice versa*. The whole of the colonies and New Zealand and Fiji are included in the Bill whenever those countries pass such a Bill as this. I do not think I need refer to the different clauses of the Bill: the marginal notes contain almost all that it is necessary to mention. The marginal note to Clause 7 says:

Documents admissible in Australasian colonies without proof to be equally admissible in Western Australia.

Then Clause 8 says:

Documents of Australasian colony which in Western Australia admissible mere production properly certified copy.

Any certificate, official or public document or any document of or proceeding of any corporation or company or any certified copy of any document or by-law or entry in any register or other book or any other proceeding shall be receivable in evidence provided they respectively purport to be sealed or impressed with the stamp of the particular colony without any proof of the seal or stamp or of the signature. In introducing the Bill in another place the Attorney General only made a very short speech, therefore it is only necessary for me to say a few words in regard to the Bill. I believe the measure will be acceptable to members, especially to hon. and learned members. I move the second reading of the Bill.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

On the question of resolving the House into Committee on the Bill,

HON. R. S. HAYNES said: If the committee stage were not proceeded with at once he would support the Bill, for the principle of the Bill was all right; but it was very dangerous to pass Bills through and find that owing to the absence of careful examination there was some error. It seemed to him there was a mistake in this Bill, and he thought it should make one careful. By Clause 10 it was provided that all Courts and persons acting judicially within Western Australia should take judicial notice of the signature of every person who was for the time being, and of every person who had at any time been, a police or stipendary magistrate or justice of the peace in any of the Australasian colonies. He did not know why a Court should take judicial notice of the signature of a justice of the peace. He could understand it if the name were signed by him in his judicial capacity.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: The Bill said "acting judicially."

HON. R. S. HAYNES: The Bill was intended to apply to a signature made by a magistrate in his judicial capacity, but it was open to another construction. If the hon. member would fix a later date for the committee stage he would be only too happy to go through the Bill. He

thought matters of this sort should be submitted to the learned Judges.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: If it would suit the convenience of the hon. member, he would let the committee stage be taken next week or the week after.

HON. R. S. HAYNES: There was no necessity to defer it too long.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: Then let it be taken next week.

Ordered, that the Committee stage be an order of the day for 2nd August.

ADJOURNMENT.

The House adjourned at 6.20 o'clock until the next day.

Legislative Assembly.

Wednesday, 26th July, 1899.

Appropriation Message re Supply Bill. Petition: Franchise to Women. Question: Flash Lights at Rottnest, Misleading. Question: Pilot Service, Increase. Question: Rocket Life-saving Apparatus, Rottnest. Question: Signal Code, Rottnest. Question: Night and Tide Signals, Fremantle Harbour. Motion: Commonwealth Bill, Adult Male Franchise (withdrawn). Motion: Harbour and Pilot Services, Fremantle; to Reorganise (Amendment passed). Contagious Diseases (Bees) Bill, first reading. Millard Railway, to Inquire: Council's Resolution considered (adjourned). Adjournment.

The **DEPUTY SPEAKER** took the Chair at 4.30 o'clock, p.m.

PRAYERS.

APPROPRIATION MESSAGE RE SUPPLY BILL.

Message from the Governor, presented by the **PREMIER** and read, recommended appropriation from revenue and loan funds for the purposes of a Supply Bill, £850,000.

Ordered, that the Message be considered in Committee of Supply at the next sitting of the House.

PETITION—WOMEN'S FRANCHISE.

MR. WALTER JAMES presented a petition praying for the early introduction of legislation for extending the Parliamentary franchise to women.

Petition received and read.

QUESTION—FLASH LIGHTS AT ROTTNEST, MISLEADING.

MR. HIGHAM asked the Premier, Whether, in consideration of the many adverse reports made by master mariners and others, he had decided to prevent in future the practice of burning flash lights at the Rottnest Lighthouse, such lights being thought liable to mislead masters of vessels entering the port of Fremantle.

THE PREMIER (Right Hon. Sir J. Forrest) replied:—The Chief Harbour Master has reported that he does not consider the flash light or "flare up" at Rottnest Lighthouse should mislead a careful seaman. Nevertheless the Government has given instructions to discontinue it for the future.

QUESTION—PILOT SERVICE, INCREASE.

MR. HIGHAM asked the Premier, Whether it was true that, although three pilots are provided for Rottnest, one had been absent for some eighteen months. If so, what provision was being made for the ever increasing shipping entering Fremantle.

THE PREMIER (Right Hon. Sir J. Forrest) replied:—In consequence of the increase in the river harbour traffic, one of the Rottnest pilots has been doing duty at Fremantle. The pilot service has not been impaired thereby, but as the traffic is increasing, another pilot will soon have to be provided.

QUESTION—ROCKET LIFE-SAVING APPARATUS, ROTTNEST.

MR. HIGHAM asked the Premier, Whether it was the intention of the Government to provide a rocket life-saving apparatus to be stationed at Rottnest.

THE PREMIER (Right Hon. Sir J. Forrest) replied:—The Government intend at once ordering a complete rocket apparatus, and the pilot crew will be periodically exercised to use it; also, a second party will be taught in case of the pilot boat being absent from the island.