

Legislative Assembly,

Wednesday, 4th October, 1922.

	PAGE
Question: Primary Producers' Association and the Government	975
Leave of absence	975
Bills: Perpetual Executors, Trustees and Agency Co. (W.A.), Ltd. (private), referred to Select Committee	975
Licensing Act Amendment, Com.	975

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

QUESTION—PRIMARY PRODUCERS' ASSOCIATION AND THE GOVERNMENT.

Mr. McCALLUM asked the Premier: 1, Is it a fact, as recently stated in the "West Australian" by Mr. Monger, the President of the Primary Producers' Association, "That the Government have undertaken to refer all questions of policy and legislation to his executive before the Bills are introduced to Parliament"? 2, Will the Premier inform the House what arrangements have been made between the Government and the executive of the Primary Producers' Association in regard to the consideration of policy and legislation prior to the Bills being introduced to the House?

The PREMIER replied: 1, No. 2, Answered by No. 1.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

On motion by Mr. Mullany, leave of absence for two weeks granted to Mr. Boyland (Kalgoorlie) on the ground of ill health.

BILL—THE PERPETUAL EXECUTORS, TRUSTEES, AND AGENCY COMPANY (W.A.) LIMITED (PRIVATE).

Introduced by Mr. Mann, and read a first time.

Select Committee appointed.

On motions by Mr. Mann, Bill referred to a select committee consisting of Messrs. Angelo, Lambert, Underwood, Walker, and the mover; with power to call for persons and papers, and to sit on days over which the House stands adjourned; to report on Tuesday, the 10th October.

BILL—LICENSING ACT AMENDMENT. In Committee.

Consideration resumed from the previous day; Mr. Stubbs in the Chair, the Premier in charge of the Bill.

Clause 73—Register of lodgers (partly considered):

Mr. CORBOY: Provision is made in Subclause 5 for anyone on licensed premises after the hours prescribed for the sale of liquor being deemed to be there for some illegal purpose. This will be hard on the people in the back country, despite the addition of Subclause 7 which was agreed to last night. The fact that a man is on the premises after hours will be regarded as prima-facie evidence against him.

The Premier: Not under the clause as amended.

Mr. CORBOY: But it is possible that before the Bill becomes an Act, Subclause 7 will not be in the Bill.

The Premier: We will have an opportunity of dealing with that matter before the Bill is finally passed.

Mr. CORBOY: I would like an assurance from the Premier that Subclause 5 will not be harshly applied.

Mr. Underwood: The Premier cannot give you that assurance. There may be another Premier who may act differently.

The PREMIER: Under the clause as amended it is intended that people can go into hotels. Before the Bill becomes an Act, it will be before us again and members will have an opportunity of safeguarding that position. Subclause 7 cannot be struck out without our permission.

Mr. Corboy: But suppose the Bench decide to deal with a person under Subclause 5, instead of under Subclause 7?

The PREMIER: Several of the clauses will have to be recommitted after the Parliamentary draftsman has gone through the Bill and considered the amendments that have been made. I hope the Bill will be passed to-night. I will then recommit the measure on Tuesday for the reconsideration of some of the clauses. It is difficult in such a Bill to introduce amendments and see that they do not conflict or that they have the effect desired by the Committee. This clause will come under review again.

Mr. MARSHALL: Apart from the point raised by the member for Yilgarn (Mr. Corboy), which is provided for in Subclause 3 under which persons can register as casual lodgers, many workers on the goldfields board at hotels but do not lodge there. These people may be prevented from going to the hotels for meals on Sundays.

The Premier: Not under the clause as amended.

Mr. MARSHALL: I am dubious about that amendment, and I suggest that Subclause 5 be amended by inserting in line 9, the words "boarder or" after "bona fide." That will get over the difficulty.

The CHAIRMAN: I cannot accept the amendment. We have agreed to the addition of Subclause 7 and, therefore, we cannot go back to Subclause 5.

Clause, as amended, put and passed.

Clause 74—agreed to.

Clause 75—Repeal of Section 100:

Mr. MARSHALL: The amendment contemplated by the clause is an effort to abolish the bona fide travellers' section from the Act. While I agree with many of the arguments as to the effect of the section in the metropolis, those arguments do not apply altogether to the back country centres. It will work a hardship there. Unless the Premier is prepared to agree to some amendment exempting the back country areas, I will oppose the clause.

Mr. Underwood: Has not the city man the same rights as the goldfields man?

Mr. MARSHALL: I do not want to discriminate. The Premier said he was adopting the request for the abolition of the bona fide traveller, which had been made to him by a deputation, representing the hotelkeepers in the metropolitan area.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: He did not say that.

The Premier: I said that the abuse of the section had caused us to adopt this course.

Mr. MARSHALL: The effect of the clause will be that when a person leaves Marble Bar on Saturday morning and arrives at Peak Hill, 230 miles distant, on Sunday, he may land there with the temperature at 115 degrees and yet not be able to get any refreshment.

The Minister for Mines: He can get a cup of tea at any hour.

Mr. MARSHALL: The Bill does not deal with tea.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: Yes, it does, after last night's amendment.

Mr. MARSHALL: The mind of the member for North-East Fremantle is obsessed with tea. Adverse conditions are experienced by the people in the back country and this clause will only add to their hardships. If the Premier will not agree to an amendment, I hope the Committee will oppose it.

Mr. J. THOMSON: I move an amendment—

That the following words be added to the clause: "And in lieu of such section the following words be inserted; No person shall be deemed to be a bona fide traveller within the meaning of this Act—(a) if the place where he demands to be or is supplied with liquor is within the licensing district of Perth, Fremantle, Claremont, Subiaco, Leederville, Canning, or Guildford; or (b) if the place where he demands to be or is supplied with liquor is within any other licensing district, then unless such place is more than five miles from the place where he lodged during the preceding night. Such distance to be calculated by the shortest practicable route along or over any public highway or thoroughfare or by or across any arm of the sea, inlet, river, or creek between the place of lodging and supply."

I have the support of hotelkeepers and the employees in the metropolitan area. A lot has been talked about the closing of hotels in that area. Had there been no Sunday drinking, the Nedlands Hotel and the other hotels that the member for Forrest has talked about

so much, would not have been closed. I have seen people in Claremont and Cottesloe at 9 a.m. or 10 a.m. lying in the parks, on the roads and streets, while people have been going to church. In 1925, if this amendment be not carried, I will vote for prohibition.

Mr. Angelo: Will you practice it?

Mr. J. THOMSON: I will. I placed my amendment on the Notice Paper about six weeks ago and seeing that it dealt with Sunday drinking I said to myself, "I won't have a drink on a Sunday."

Mr. Munsie: You said that to yourself, but did you carry it out?

Mr. Angelo: In any case, Sunday is a day of rest.

Mr. J. THOMSON: Hon. members know that prohibition is coming. It may take some years, but it is surely coming. In common with some other hon. members, I take a little every day and I think on Sundays we should not have any drink at all.

The Minister for Mines: You do not say anything about Saturdays.

Mr. J. THOMSON: Next year I intend to say that I will not have any drink on Saturdays. I will go on gradually, starting with Sundays and following with Saturdays, until finally I will cut it out altogether.

Mr. Chesson: What great self-denial!

The Minister for Mines: What will be your condition in the middle of the week?

Mr. Marshall: It is the last straw that breaks the camel's back!

The PREMIER: I agree that the amendment is good for the metropolitan area and I say, therefore, it is equally good for the whole State. Of course, outback we get travellers who are bona fide, and perhaps some consideration should be shown them. However, the abuse of the law has made it imperative that we should wipe out the bona fide travellers' provision altogether. It would represent no great hardship in the back country, for the Minister for Mines, who ought to know, says there is plenty of water in all those places—

Mr. Heron: It is not always good.

The PREMIER: While other members have pointed to the universality of tea and coffee, which, of course, will serve to mitigate the hardship, if any there be. The clause is strictly one of reform. If the member for Claremont is ready to sign a pledge not to drink on Sundays, I do not see why we should not all do the same. I hope the Committee will support the proposal to wipe out the bona fide travellers' provision altogether. I do not know that, as one member has said, I have been asked by Perth hotelkeepers to abolish that provision, but certainly the request has come from hotelkeepers beyond Perth. Some hotelkeepers have to give up their Sundays in order to supply a few bona fide travellers with liquor. Why should not the hotelkeeper have one clear day in the week?

Mr. Underwood: Why does not the parson have one clear day in the week?

The PREMIER: He has six days clear, and I am afraid he exercises but little influence over the hon. member on the seventh. I do not believe, as we have been told, that some hotelkeepers would have to close up but for their Sunday trading. Even if it were true, is it right that any hotel should be kept open merely for its trade on Sundays? The majority of the Committee agree that there should be no Sunday trading in the metropolitan area. How, then, can they argue that Sunday trading should be tolerated in Northam?

Mr. J. Thomson: Suppose you were cutting timber on contract at Newdegate.

The PREMIER: Somewhere it is written, "Six days shalt thou labour." I agree with that. The man who works, and has a glass of beer after his work may be benefited by the draught, but the man who goes to an hotel on Sunday and stays there drinking is doing himself harm. If what the hon. member has said about the Sunday drinking at Nedlands be true, then clearly the men who went there for that purpose were injuring themselves. I am not a supporter of prohibition, but I should like to know how it really operates in America. It would be a good thing to have an inquiry into the question.

The CHAIRMAN: The amendment has nothing to do with prohibition.

The PREMIER: But it has. I am contending that, if the proposed reform be not accepted, prohibition will be brought about, for the public will not stand any more of this Sunday trading. Unless we reform, we shall have prohibition, which, I think, would be a bad thing for the State. The abolition of the bona fide traveller provision throughout the State will result in great good.

Mr. Marshall: Why not have prohibition straight off?

The PREMIER: There is great danger that we shall get it if we do not effect minor reforms. I have heard no valid argument in favour of the bona fide travellers' provision, and I hope the Committee will not agree to any amendment of the clause.

Mr. PICKERING: The Royal Commission which inquired into the question of licensing gave careful consideration to the bona fide travellers' provision, and certainly did not recommend the clause we have here. Much evidence was taken on the point, and at all events that given in country centres was not in favour of abolishing the provision. The Premier seems to think that if we have Sunday trading, necessarily people must get tight.

The Premier: No, no.

Mr. PICKERING: From inquiries made, I believe there is no desire on the part of the police, the hotelkeepers, or the general public, for the abolition of the bona fide traveller provision in country districts. Most farmers are fully occupied during the week, and have not even Saturday afternoon off. They look on the Sunday as a day for visiting.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: Therefore they don't want booze in the pubs.

Mr. PICKERING: They are just as much entitled to have booze in the pubs on the one day they are at liberty as is the hon. member to have it every day in the week.

The Minister for Mines: But he does not drink at all.

Mr. PICKERING: So he tells us, but he lives next to a brewery, and we do not know what happens over the fence. The Premier's arguments will not hold water.

Mr. Underwood: Will they hold beer?

Mr. PICKERING: Because the Premier thinks everybody who goes to a pub on a Sunday must get drunk, why should we cut out the bona fide traveller provision in country districts? My experience in country towns teaches me that there is no excessive drinking on the Sabbath. The clause is an infringement of the right of country people to get a little refreshment on Sunday. It cannot be denied that the conditions in the country are entirely different from those in the metropolitan area. People in the metropolitan area can take home any liquor they require for Sunday, but people in the country have not the same opportunity. Further, they have no wish to take it home; they do not do that sort of thing. It would be quite wrong to accept the advice of the Premier. If the amendment is acceptable to metropolitan members, it will be acceptable to members of the rural districts.

Mr. CHESSON: I move—

That the amendment be amended by striking out of paragraph (b) "such place is more than five miles from the place where he lodged during the preceding night" and inserting the words "he has travelled more than five miles."

It is absurd to provide that if a person travels a distance of five miles from one district to another, he is a bona fide traveller, whereas a man who travels 70 miles and returns to his own town is not entitled to be served with liquor on his return. A few weeks ago there was a prosecution at Cue. Two citizens of good repute travelled 35 miles to Reidy's and back. On the way they picked up a passenger and, when they reached Cue, they went to an hotel and got a drink. The passenger was entitled to get a drink as a bona fide traveller, but the other two men, who had travelled a greater distance, were held to be not bona fide travellers and were fined.

The Premier: They had homes to go to.

Mr. CHESSON: They had travelled 70 miles, and experienced tyre troubles. One of them had got wet and a drink was a necessity.

Mr. Marshall: He wanted to be wet inside as well as outside.

Mr. CHESSON: It is time the present absurd provision was amended. If the law had been administered as the Legislature intended, it would not have been so bad, but the difficulty has arisen through the section having been interpreted literally in order to get convictions.

The Minister for Mines: How would you prove or disprove whether a man had travelled five miles?

Mr. CHESSON: In most instances there would be no difficulty about that in the back country. When people travel, their destination is generally a station or a mining proposition or something of that kind.

The Minister for Mines: But a man could travel by tram from Kalgoorlie to Boulder and back and remain drinking all day.

Mr. Underwood: Why should not he drink, anyhow?

Mr. CHESSON: The law is absurd and my amendment will overcome the present difficulty.

Mr. MANN: Section 94 of the Act reads—

Any holder of a publican's general license, an hotel license, or a wayside-house license, or an Australian wine and beer license who, without reasonable cause, refuses to receive any person as a guest into his house, or to supply any person with food, liquor, refreshment or lodging, or (unless stabling accommodation has been dispensed with) to receive the horse or horses of a traveller and to provide them with sufficient provender and water, whether the owner or person in charge thereof lodges in his house or not, commits an offence against this Act.

If the bona fide traveller provision is deleted, will the publican in the country be entitled to close his house absolutely on Sunday and refuse to receive a guest and provide him with refreshments of any kind?

The Minister for Mines: Do not you remember the amendment carried last night?

Mr. MANN: That has nothing to do with it.

The Minister for Mines: It has.

Mr. MANN: Must the publican refuse to supply liquor, and still comply with Section 94 of the Act by supplying other forms of refreshment. If not, a person might travel 20 miles on a Sunday and be unable to get a meal.

The Minister for Mines: Read your own amendment which was carried last night.

Mr. Johnston: That was permissive, not compulsory.

Mr. MANN: Quite so. Section 94 of the Act makes it obligatory on the licensee to supply. If we follow the Premier's advice, will it still be compulsory to supply a traveller with meals and refreshments other than liquor?

Mr. Marshall: Nothing is mentioned about alcohol.

Mr. MANN: Liquor means alcohol.

Mr. Marshall: I do not think so.

Mr. MANN: I want some information. Does it mean that on Sunday, Section 94 of the Act will not operate?

The Premier: Of course it will operate.

Mr. MANN: If the traveller clause is deleted, a person travelling a long distance on a Sunday might be unable to get a meal.

Mr. Chesson: Every place will be closed up.

The PREMIER: Section 94 of the Act has been amended by Clause 70 of the Bill. It is perfectly clear that refreshments other than intoxicating liquor must be served and that meals must be supplied.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: I oppose the amendment on the amendment, because I find from the evidence given before the Royal Commission that the distance in all the other States is much greater than that proposed by the member for Cue.

The Premier: He only proposes a running track, not a distance.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: Inspector O'Halloran, in his evidence on the bona fide traveller question said—

In New South Wales the distance is 25 miles. In Victoria it is 20 miles. In South Australia the bona fide traveller section has been wiped out altogether. In Queensland, under Section 16 of the amending Act of 1914, a traveller can get liquor if he has travelled 20 miles and intends to lodge at the hotel that night; otherwise he cannot.

I think Inspector O'Halloran's evidence was the best evidence given before the Commission.

Mr. Richardson: It was.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: Inspector O'Halloran added—

I am in favour of wiping out the bona fide traveller section altogether in Western Australia.

The inspector was speaking from his experience of administering the Act.

Mr. Mann: I think he was speaking of the metropolitan area.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: No, he was not, because Mr. Pickering asked—"Even on the goldfields?" and the reply was—

I make no exception whatever. I would wipe out the clause completely. If, however, the Commission should decide to limit it to districts outside the metropolitan area, then I think the radius should be 20 miles. I do not see why it should be any less. New South Wales has 25 miles and they seem to manage all right there. Queensland, which has climatic conditions similar to Western Australia, has wiped it out altogether.

That effectively answers the contention that the traveller section is necessary here on account of our climatic conditions.

Mr. Marshall: Not climatic conditions alone, but general conditions of travelling.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: The conditions here are almost similar to those in Queensland. Queensland is situated in the northern portion of Australia and if the people there can do without the traveller provision, why not the people in Western Australia? I am up against Sunday labour and, if I can

relieve the men employed in the bars on Sunday, I intend to do so.

Mr. Heron: You do not do too much travelling in the back country. You know only East Fremantle.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: I have travelled a good deal. Some members are under the impression that if liquor is barred on Sunday, people will be unable to get any refreshment at all. People, however, will be able to get refreshments other than intoxicating liquor. The abolition of the bona fide traveller will assist the Police Department considerably in their administration of the Act. A great deal of evidence was given by Inspector O'Halloran, whose knowledge of the Act and its administration is such that the Royal Commission complimented him upon his evidence. We should, therefore, take some notice of what he has said. I cannot agree that a person who has travelled five miles should be regarded as a bona fide traveller.

Mr. CORBOY: I am opposed to the amendment moved by the member for Cue. It would make the whole position very unsatisfactory and the bona fide clause ineffective. Later on I intend to move that the five mile radius be increased to ten. In country districts people travel only on Sunday when they have to do so, and a ten mile radius is enough to give them.

Mr. CHESSON: I am prepared to make the radius ten miles so long as the bona fide traveller is defined, irrespective of where he has lodged.

The Premier: If he looped the loop he would be all right.

Mr. CHESSON: It is farcical to have a bona fide traveller defined in the way the Bill sets it forth. If we had officers in the back country who administered the law sympathetically it would not matter very much, but as that is not the case we must have legislation in keeping with the requirements of people in the country districts.

Mr. ANGELO: The consensus of opinion seems to be that the bona fide traveller clause should be wiped out, as it affects the metropolitan area, but should remain so far as the country districts are concerned. Is it worth while depriving a hotel keeper and his staff of their Sunday rest for the sake of a few travellers?

Mr. Underwood: They must be provided with accommodation.

Mr. ANGELO: There are certain stated hours for meals.

Mr. Heron: A man cannot travel at stated hours.

Mr. ANGELO: For the little benefit that is likely to be derived from the retention of the bona fide traveller clause in the country districts, it is not worth while keeping it. When people know they are going to travel they usually prepare their provisions on the previous day. If they cannot do without a drink on Sunday they will take it with them. I intend to vote against the amendment.

Mr. J. H. SMITH: I support the amendment. The man who is living five or eight miles out in the bush can get away only on

the Sunday to get his mail at the nearest township, and when he arrives there is entitled to get some pleasure out of life. Further, when people leave a town early in the morning and travel 30 or 40 miles through the bush, and return to the same town at night, they should be regarded as bona fide travellers also. Apparently the trade in the metropolitan area has made overtures to the Premier in this matter. If he can point to one licensee in my electorate who has mentioned this bona fide traveller clause, I will resign my seat.

The Premier: I do not want you to do that.

Mr. J. H. SMITH: The Premier said the only thing the trade had asked him to abolish was the bona fide traveller clause.

The Minister for Mines: He said no hotel keeper in the metropolitan area had approached him on the subject.

Mr. J. H. SMITH: Let the Premier speak for himself. Some members appear to be playing on the feelings of more sensitive members who think it is wicked to drink on Sunday. There are many bush workers who cannot get any drink at all until they go to the township on Sunday.

The CHAIRMAN: If the amendment of the member for Cue is carried it will not be competent for any other member to go back upon any of the words preceding those struck out. Some members have expressed themselves in favour of paragraph (a) of the amendment of the member for Claremont, but not in favour of paragraph (b). If the amendment on the amendment is negatived, portion only of paragraph (b) will then be before the Committee.

The MINISTER FOR MINES: If the amendment on the amendment is not carried the distance must remain five miles. If the words proposed to be struck out are allowed to remain we cannot afterwards alter the five miles.

The CHAIRMAN: That is so.

Mr. CORBOY: Could not the member for Cue withdraw his amendment, with a view to substituting another amendment to strike out all the words from "then" in the third line of paragraph (b) down to "than" in the fourth line?

The CHAIRMAN: I am endeavouring to avoid confusion amongst members.

Mr. CHESSON: I ask leave to withdraw my amendment for the time being.

Amendment by leave withdrawn.

Mr. CORBOY: The member for Cue would first need to move for the deletion of the words "such place is more than" from the amendment of the member for Claremont.

The Premier: Is it not a question of distance? Anyhow, I object to the amendment altogether.

Mrs. COWAN: I do not intend to support the amendment of the member for Claremont. I agree with the member for Gascoyne, who said that we should show some consideration to the hotelkeepers and their servants. We should also remember the younger people in the country and make it impossible for

them to drive long distances in order to get liquor. If the amendment is carried in any form I hope it will provide that the distance to be travelled will be 20 or 25 miles. The member for Claremont has induced me more than ever to oppose the amendment by reason of his remarks in the direction of establishing prohibition so far as he himself is concerned. It would be against my conscience to support the amendment, because I feel that the bona fide traveller clause should not exist either in regard to the town or the country. We are aware that in many country districts the different committees who worked in the direction of securing votes for reduction or no license, were asked by men on outlying farms to do so, because, it was explained, it was the only way in which they and the younger people could be saved against themselves. Many are induced at the present time to leave their farms to go into the towns on Sundays for the sole purpose of getting drink, and we know how they must feel on the Monday. In the interests of those people we should do all we can to support the Premier in having this provision entirely struck out.

Mr CHESSON: I move an amendment—

That in lines 3 and 4 the words "such place is more than" be struck out.

Mr. Johnston: Does that mean anything?

The Minister for Mines: It all depends on what the hon. member desires to move afterwards.

Hon. P. Collier: He can achieve his purpose in that way.

Mr. CHESSON: My object is to give the member for Yilgarn an opportunity subsequently to strike out "five" and insert "ten."

The MINISTER FOR MINES: The hon. member desires to provide that a bona fide traveller shall be a person who travels five miles, but the "traveller" may do that by going $2\frac{1}{2}$ miles one way and $2\frac{1}{2}$ miles back again.

Mr. McCallum: Or he may do the five miles in a circle.

The MINISTER FOR MINES: Exactly. After the amendment has been disposed of we shall still have an opportunity of deciding the distance.

Amendment put and negatived.

Mr. CORBOY: I move an amendment—

That in line 4 of paragraph (b) "five" be struck out with a view to inserting "ten."

I propose that the distance shall be 10 miles in place of five.

Mr. UNDERWOOD: I do not desire to be side-tracked by fives or sevens, or threes or sixes. It is up to the Premier or some other Minister to show the Committee why the existing section should not remain. There has been no such attempt. The member for Claremont said that he saw some people drunk in his suburb on a Sunday. Whether he saw them or not would depend on the slant of his eye. The hon. member might have been

drunk himself and thought the other fellow was drunk. I have been like that myself.

Hon. P. Collier: And then blamed everybody else.

Mr. UNDERWOOD: Your eye might be slanting towards the left, and at the same time you might think you are seeing straight in front. If a man imagines that he has seen drunks in Claremont on a Sunday, he must have had one or two himself, because I have been there when I have been perfectly sober and I know Claremont to be a nice, clean well-kept suburb and I have not seen any drunks there.

Mr. J. Thomson: On Sunday?

Mr. UNDERWOOD: On Sunday and Monday.

Mr. J. Thomson: You would not see them there on Monday. You must not judge everyone by yourself.

Mr. UNDERWOOD: I am a good standard to judge them by.

The CHAIRMAN: The debate must not develop into an argument between two members.

Mr. UNDERWOOD: When I hear an hon. member say that he has seen drunks at Claremont on Sunday I have to think out things and consider what condition he was in when he saw them. The question now is whether a man should drink on the seventh day. Is it a crime to drink on one particular day and no crime to drink on the other days?

The Premier: This is a question of five miles or ten.

Mr. Lambert: Would you have shops open to sell food on Sundays?

Mr. UNDERWOOD: Restaurants and lemonade shops and tea shops are open on Sunday. It is not necessary to strike out "five" with a view to inserting another word, because no word at all is required. Distance has no bearing in the case of a man travelling in a motor car as against a man walking in bowyangs.

Amendment on the amendment put and passed.

Mr. CORBOY: I move a further amendment—

That the word "ten" be inserted.

Further amendment on the amendment put and passed.

Hon. T. WALKER: Now that the amendment is patched up, I hope it will go the way of all flesh and disappear. One of the best suggestions in the Bill is to wipe out the bona fide section, which has always created lying, litigation, humbug, and hypocrisy. People constantly say they are bona fide travellers when in fact they are not. The land-lord knows they are not, and yet, so to speak, takes their word. Proof of the offence in the police court is difficult. Cases of the kind are no credit either to the public or to the publican; indeed, they are a disgrace to the community. The bona fide traveller section represents a greater danger to the individual taking advantage of it than does any clause of this Bill. When people are secreted on a

Sunday in an hotel, they know they are doing wrong; their minds are excited, and they drink more because they know they cannot remain long. Drink gets hold of people and becomes a craze, a lust. Why should residents of the metropolitan area want to walk 10 miles with a view to getting alcoholic drink on Sunday? Because the evil is getting hold of them, because they are becoming alcoholics. They are on the downward path to absolute drunkards. The bona fide section has been productive of much evil.

Mr. HICKMOTT: I quite agree with the last speaker. The bona fide traveller business is all bunkum. Good men have walked across the Australian continent without getting a drink at all. This amendment should be wiped out altogether.

Mr. PICKERING: The members for Kanoona and Pingelly are selfish. Not wanting a drink themselves, they want to prevent other people from getting one. The talk of Sunday drinking in hotels is absurd. The distance of 10 miles means that the man getting a drink on Sunday must have slept not less than 10 miles away from the hotel in which he gets the drink. Thousands of people in Western Australia live in tents and camps, without any definite home, without clubs or conveniences or motor cars. All the week they are out working, clearing, ploughing, mining. Having been a prospector myself, I know the hard work entailed by prospecting. These men should have some privileges in the same way as city residents have. They like to come in and have a change in their diet by getting meals at an hotel. They want to meet different companions on Sunday, and see something of the pleasant side of life. In this connection I fail to see why the people connected with hotels should not have their holiday on another day of the week than Sunday. The men in the country to whom I have alluded can obtain a break in their lives only on Sunday, and this fact should be considered by the Committee. As for drinking water, I myself could never get very jocular over a glass of water.

Sitting suspended from 6.15 to 7.30 p.m.

Mr. PICKERING: It is necessary that some accommodation should be available in the country centres, especially on Sundays. Many country people living from five to 20 miles away from townships like to go to the centres of population on Sundays in order to meet their friends and probably they may want a drink. I have never stood for prohibition, because I think a certain amount of alcohol is good for one, so long as the quantity is not abused. From inquiries I have made in my own district, I am satisfied that there is not that abuse of the bona fide traveller section in the country towns that has been referred to in this Chamber. On the contrary, my inquiries from police officers and others showed that, so long as it was deleted so far as the metropolitan area was concerned, there would be no objection by

the police in the country districts. At Kalgoolie, when the Licensing Commission took evidence on this question, that evidence was overwhelmingly in favour of the retention of the bona fide traveller section. I believe that position applied to other country centres. I cannot understand the attitude of the Premier who wants to get rid of the bona fide traveller section altogether. He has always represented a country constituency and he must know that what I say regarding the bona fide traveller aspect in country districts is worthy of consideration. If we are to make the country attractive, we should not take away from the people there the little relaxation of having a drink on Sunday. I cannot see that there is any harm in having a drink on Sunday any more than on a week day.

Mr. Lambert: Would you have the hotels open all the time?

Mr. Marshall: There should be certain hours of trading in the country.

Mr. PICKERING: I think a little drink on Sunday in moderation is the same as drink in moderation on week days.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: Moderation is a word that has a very wide meaning.

Mr. PICKERING: The argument that a drink on Sunday would make a man incapable of doing his work on Monday cannot stand, because the same thing would apply to Tuesday or Wednesday. I hope the Committee will not reject the amendment.

Mr. LAMBERT: I do not know that I should express surprise at the opinions of the member for Sussex. So far as I can judge, the evidence taken by the Commission on the question of Sunday drinking was overwhelmingly in favour of closing hotels on the Sabbath. The idea of permitting a man, simply because he can jump into a motor car and drive a certain distance, to guzzle as much as he likes on Sundays, is absurd. It is said that it is required, because a section of the trade may desire it. The good publicans only want a legitimate trade and do not want the bona fide traveller trade.

Member: You are referring to the city trade.

Mr. LAMBERT: No, the country trade as well.

Mr. Heron: You are wrong.

Mr. LAMBERT: Instead of trying to preach a Christian doctrine, some members would like to keep the hotels open seven days a week. Some regard must be had for the Sabbath and that regard cannot be mixed up with opening hotels promiscuously on Sundays.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: If a man bought a pound of tea on Sunday, he would be sent to gaol.

Mr. LAMBERT: The idea of permitting a man to guzzle as much drink as he likes on Sundays merely because he has a motor car, is absurd. I admit that if I were out for a drive with a friend, I would probably stop at an hotel for a while.

Mr. Heron: What if the hotel was not open?

Mr. LAMBERT: I would probably stop just the same—to rest the motor car. The provisions regarding the bona fide traveller are all-essential to the Bill. If we desire to bring about reform, this is the direction in which we can achieve it without doing harm to the trade or inconveniencing the public. Unless we are careful, we will find men running cars for hire on Sundays so as to convey people for a distance of 10 miles, to enable them to get as much drink as they desire. A farmer has no more right to travel 10 miles and guzzle drink than a man in the city.

The Minister for Works: If he can do without it on Sunday, he can do without it for six days in the week.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: It would be a good job if he could.

The Minister for Works: I dare say.

Mr. LAMBERT: If it is essential from a Christian standpoint to close grocers' and butchers' shops on the Sabbath, it is surely more important to close hotels which are not so essential. The member for Sussex stresses the necessity for keeping hotels in Busselton open on Sundays to allow people in that district to enjoy drinking on Sundays. I do not suppose one person in his electorate, apart from those directly interested, has made any representations to him on that score.

Mr. Pickering: You do not know anything about it.

Mr. LAMBERT: It may be that certain publicans in his electorate have told him that if he does not support the retention of the bona fide traveller section, they will oppose him at the next election. The publicans in my district can oppose me if they like; I am not concerned about that.

The Minister for Works: How many are there now in your electorate?

Mr. Marshall: You want a telescope to find them in Coolgardie.

Mr. LAMBERT: There are more there than in the Minister's district.

The Minister for Works: There are more in my electorate.

Mr. LAMBERT: If they are as economical as the Minister is in "shouting," they will not do much harm. If it is that members must have regard for demands made upon them by publicans in their electorates, let them say so.

The Minister for Mines: I do not think the publicans have asked for this.

Mr. LAMBERT: Once the trade is put on a decent respectable footing, the better class of publican will be glad of the opportunity to get away from their hotels and spend the day with their families.

Mr. Johnston: Would you allow them to shut up their hotels for the whole day?

Mr. LAMBERT: I would rather open the premises for an hour or two on Sundays and then let the publicans get away from their hotels, than retain the bona fide traveller section.

Mr. Johnston: But would you let them close up altogether on Sundays?

Mr. LAMBERT: Certainly not. If a publican is granted a license which compels him to provide beds and meals for the public, that does not say that he shall open his bars on Sundays. The people deserve some consideration, seeing that publicans are given a concession regarding the liquor trade. To say that when one has travelled 10 miles in a motor car he should be entitled to drink as much as he likes, is absurd. Schoolboys would not listen to some of the illogical nonsense talked by supporters of the amendment. It would be much better for hotel-keepers and the public alike if the bona fide traveller provision were abolished. There is no demand from the general public for the provision. The only justification for such a provision would be found at seaside resorts.

Mr. Harrison: You would cater for pleasure, but not for emergency.

Mr. LAMBERT: Presumably the hon. member considers it a case of emergency when he wants a drink.

Mr. Maley: Have you ever had one on a Sunday?

Mr. LAMBERT: Yes, I have had one with the hon. member on a Sunday. Rather than the bona fide provision, would it be better to open hotels for an hour or two on Sunday and then definitely close them for the rest of the day?

Mr. Pickering: You could not get members to agree to that.

Mr. LAMBERT: If they agree to a ten-mile limit, they will agree to anything. In opposing the amendment I am acting in the interests of hotel-keepers.

Mr. Maley: You always have a bottle with you when you travel.

Mr. LAMBERT: If I were travelling with the hon. member I should have a barrel in addition to the bottle. No section of the community is clamouring for the retention of the bona fide traveller provision. To hear some hon. members, particularly the member for Sussex, one would think there were deputations, and bands playing all over the country, in favour of giving everybody the right to go into Busselton on Sunday and put in some solid drinking. I hope the amendment will not be carried.

Mr. DURACK: I have no strong opinions on this question, but I know there is in the back country a feeling that the bona fide traveller provision should be retained for country districts. I should like to see the amendment withdrawn and the following inserted in lieu:—"No person shall be deemed to be a bona fide traveller unless the place where he lodged during the preceding night is at least 20 miles distant." I think that would meet the wishes of the mover of the amendment, and would be acceptable to a majority of the Committee.

The CHAIRMAN: The hon. member cannot move that now. He will vote against the amendment as amended.

Hon. P. COLLIER: And then he will have none.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: We are either in earnest in our efforts for temperance, or else we are merely playing with the subject. I appreciate the annoyance which a traveller on legitimate business might feel on finding it impossible to obtain refreshments on a Sunday. When the member for Coolgardie was speaking I interjected that if it be correct to restrain people from drinking on Sunday, it is a very good argument in support of similar restraint all the week. If it were possible to discriminate between the bona fide traveller and those who travel in order to drink, the difficulty could be easily overcome. Many hotel-keepers would like to have their Sundays free from attendance in the bar. In Claremont a public scandal has been occasioned by the number of people who go down there to obtain liquor on Sundays, while local residents are not able to get it even if they want it. The position is illogical. Motor cars render the ten mile limit altogether inadequate. Last Sunday I motored from Mandurah to Claremont on a running time of less than two hours.

Hon. P. Collier: Did you run dry all the way?

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: I did not. I had on my car sufficient refreshments for my friends with me, and for any others I might chance to meet. However, that is my little peculiarity, whereas the peculiarity of the member for Coolgardie is to let somebody else provide. The discussion on this question has not revealed any remedy for the known difficulties, has not pointed a method of discriminating between the bona fide traveller and the men who are travelling in order to obtain drinks. Until such a remedy be found, I will vote against the amendment. It is not much deprivation for a man to abstain from drink on Sundays. If members can show how we can meet the difficulty, I shall be only too willing to help them. Until that is shown to me, I shall oppose the traveller provision.

Mr. MARSHALL: I am not going to vote for a provision to persecute prospectors merely because the Minister for Works cannot distinguish between genuine travellers and others. The member for Coolgardie has talked a lot of twaddle, but as regards the Murchison the traveller clause is of very little use. However, there are many genuine people who have to travel under adverse conditions and who deserve consideration. Such people travelling hundreds of miles, very often in intense heat, should not be penalised. The genuine prospector should not be penalised merely to block the guzzler in the metropolis. We should not make law breakers of bona fide travellers when, by commonsense methods, we can keep them within the law. We must do justice to the people outback who keep the people of the metropolis in comfort.

Mr. UNDERWOOD: I hope the amendment will be carried, and that then the clause as amended will be struck out.

Mr. Mann: Why?

Mr. UNDERWOOD: Because a thirsty soul who wants a drink should be able to get it. We have heard a good deal about drunkenness from the member for Claremont and the Minister for Works. I have been in towns where the hotels were practically open all day on Sunday, and in those towns there was no drunkenness. Near where I live is a leaning pepper tree, and once or twice in my life all other pepper trees have seemed to lean similarly, and I have looked for a straight one. When I found the straight one, I was in about the same condition as the hon. member when he saw those drunks at Claremont. This tale of drunks at Claremont is utterly opposed to fact.

Mr. J. Thomson: No, it is not.

Mr. UNDERWOOD: I know as many thirsty souls as anyone in this country, and if they desired to get a drink they would travel not to Claremont from Perth, but to Fremantle, and from the Fremantle end they would travel to Perth. This is purely a tale from Claremont—

Hon. T. Walker: Jocular.

Mr. UNDERWOOD: Yes, from a district which elected a member like the present representative as against all the wouser teetotallers we have in Western Australia.

Hon. P. Collier: And now he is posing as an advocate of temperance.

Mr. UNDERWOOD: As a temperance reformer. I would like some member to tell us logically and reasonably if it is right to drink on Monday, why it is not right to drink on Sunday?

Mr. J. Thomson: For health purposes.

Mr. UNDERWOOD: Will the hon. member tell us on the ground of health why one particular day in the week should be excluded to improve our health?

The Minister for Works: To give your liver a rest.

Hon. P. Collier: Then you should have five Sundays in the week.

Mr. Lambert: Some members should have six Sundays in the week.

Mr. UNDERWOOD: All are not constituted alike. Some men have practically no liver, and some could not take a drop of beer on Thursday or any other day, but that is no reason why I should be prevented from getting a drink on Sunday.

Mr. Harrison: The idea is to give you a rest.

Mr. UNDERWOOD: How does the hon. member know I want a rest on Sunday?

Mr. Clydesdale: It would not be hard to prove that you want a drink.

The Minister for Mines: It would not take much to prove that you want a rest on Wednesday—that is to-day.

Mr. UNDERWOOD: The Minister will want a rest on Thursday when my oil motion comes on.

The CHAIRMAN: The hon. member cannot discuss oil.

Mr. UNDERWOOD: I am merely discussing fusel oil. Before we impose any restriction on a citizen who is doing nothing against the interests of his fellows, conclusive and logical evidence should be advanced in support of the course proposed.

Mr. J. Thomson: It is showing a bad example to the young.

Mr. UNDERWOOD: The hon. member could not even prove that it was a bad example. Members assume certain things merely because certain people have said them.

The Minister for Mines: Why close hotels at 9 p.m.?

Mr. UNDERWOOD: Because someone has said they should be closed.

The Minister for Mines: Would you keep them open the whole 24 hours?

Mr. UNDERWOOD: No one is dying through their being open.

The Minister for Mines: Then why not keep a greengrocer's shop open the whole 24 hours?

Mr. UNDERWOOD: That could be done.

Mr. Mann: A greengrocer is closed under the Factories Act.

Mr. UNDERWOOD: As a boy I worked for a draper till 9 o'clock each night and 11.30 o'clock on Saturday and I am here to tell the tale. I have lived right through these terrible times when one could get a drink on Sunday, and I am still here. It is proposed that the traveller provision apply to districts outside the metropolitan area. That is right, because those people living in the metropolitan area and desiring to drink on Sunday can purchase it on Saturday night and take it home. Whether the reformers will gain anything by forcing such people to take drink into their homes is something for the reformers to think over. In the back country different conditions prevail, and that is the only reason why the amendment is warranted.

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

Ayes	21
Noes	19

Majority for 2

AYES.

Mr. Gheson	Mr. Money
Mr. Clydesdale	Mr. Munzie
Mr. Collier	Mr. Pickering
Mr. Corboy	Mr. Piesse
Mr. Heron	Mr. Richardson
Mr. Johnston	Mr. Sampson
Mr. Latham	Mr. J. H. Smith
Mr. Lutey	Mr. J. Thomson
Mr. C. C. Maley	Mr. Underwood
Mr. Mann	Mr. Mullany
Mr. Marshall	

(Teller.)

NOES.

Mr. Angelo	Mr. Lambert
Mr. Angwin	Mr. H. K. Maley
Mr. Brown	Mr. McCallum
Mrs. Cowan	Sir James Mitchell
Mr. Davies	Mr. Scaddan
Mr. Durack	Mr. Simons
Mr. George	Mr. J. M. Smith
Mr. Gibson	Mr. Walker
Mr. Harrison	Mr. A. Thomson
Mr. Hickmott	(Teller.)

Amendment, as amended, thus passed.

Mr. McCALLUM: I move—

That the amendment be further amended by adding a proviso as follows: "Provided that this section shall operate over the districts named in Subsection (a) only in respect of hotels situated within a radius of 20 miles of the Perth Town Hall and to hotels situated within such radius which may not be within the districts named in such subsection."

The amendment as amended just now says that within the districts named there is to be no Sunday trading, but that outside those districts the bona fide traveller clause will operate. One could therefore travel from Perth to Gosnells, a distance of 10 miles, and obtain a drink, but if one travelled from Perth to Rockingham, or to Kalamunda, twice the distance, one could not get a drink. So long as one is travelling north, one can get a drink, but when one travels south one cannot do so.

Mr. J. Thompson: Who is going to travel 20 miles to get a drink?

Mr. McCALLUM: The proviso I have moved will make the position more fair than it is now. It cannot be left as it is. If my amendment is agreed to, Sunday closing will operate within a radius of 20 miles of the Town Hall.

Mr. Lambert: The amendment is a good one.

The MINISTER FOR MINES: It certainly makes the position more fair, but it is somewhat peculiar that a person owning a motor car and living within the 20 mile radius can go outside it and get a drink, while a person who lives just outside the radius cannot come within it and get a drink. The whole thing is absurd but we have done it now, and all we can do is to make the position as fair as possible.

Amendment on amendment put and passed.

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

Clauses 76 to 78—agreed to.

Clause 79—Registration of bar attendants:

Mr. McCALLUM: I hope this clause will be struck out. It provides for the registration of bar attendants, who will lose their registration upon conviction for offences under the Act, and will be debarred from work in the industry for two years. That is most unfair. Obligations are cast upon the employees who are not in control of the

business. If they carry out their instructions, which may be contrary to the law, they will be deprived of their employment. If they fail to carry out their instructions their employer will dispense with their services. Every barman on the Eastern Goldfields has to go to work on Sunday. If he refuses to do so, his employer "has him set," but if he does go to work on Sunday he will be de-registered.

The Minister for Works: What work does he do on Sunday?

Mr. McCALLUM: He works in the bar, selling liquor.

Hon. P. Collier: How innocent you are!

Mr. McCALLUM: Obligations are cast upon the employee which are not cast upon the employer.

Mr. Latham: This clause will also control the licensee.

Mr. McCALLUM: If the employer tells the barman to break the law but obey his instructions, what is the position of the barman?

Mr. Latham: The employer would have more sense than to do that.

Mr. McCALLUM: This kind of thing goes on even in the Fremantle district. Under Clause 71, Subclause 4, bar tenders are equally responsible with the licensee for ascertaining whether bona fide travellers are in fact bona fide. Under Clause 84 the bar tender is equally liable with the licensee for serving men under the influence of liquor. Under Clause 85 the bar tender is equally responsible with the licensee for allowing persons under the influence of liquor to remain on the premises. Under Clause 90 he is equally liable with the licensee for serving persons under the age of 21 years, and under Clause 72 he is equally liable for serving liquor outside the stipulated hours. The present law suggests that, in addition, the employee should be registered, and if convicted go out of the industry for two years. It is altogether over the odds. There is no fairness in the clause unless the Bill also provides that the bar tender shall have equal authority with the licensee in the management of the hotel.

The Premier: We cannot do that.

Mr. McCALLUM: No.

The Premier: The period of disqualification is one year.

Mr. McCALLUM: No evidence was given from either side before the Royal Commission in favour of such a provision as this. The obligation which it throws upon the employee is altogether unfair. If the licensee goes away leaving the hotel in charge of an employee, and the employee breaks the law, the licensee can sack the employee. However, the employee cannot sack the boss.

Clause put and negatived.

Clause 80—Penalty if liquor is drunk on premises contrary to license:

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: I quite agree with the first portion of Subsection 1

of proposed Section 106a, making it an offence—

If any purchaser of any liquor from a person who is only licensed to sell the same not to be drunk on the premises, drink such liquor on the premises where the same is sold.

But I cannot agree to the fairness of providing that there shall be an offence if such liquor is drunk—

in any street, road, or place adjoining or near such premises.

This would mean that the holder of a gallon license would have to shepherd the man who bought a gallon of beer from him.

The Minister for Mines: No. The proposed subsection also says—

if it appears that such drinking was with his privity or consent.

Clause put and passed.

Clause 81—Supplying liquor under a false description:

Mr. McCALLUM: I move an amendment—

That after "description," line 3, there be inserted "or who has upon the licensed premises any liquor under a fictitious heading, trade name, brand, or description."

The amendment will bring this clause into line with that which applies to adulteration of liquor. Without this amendment it would be necessary to catch the man actually selling.

Mr. MANN: I move an amendment on the amendment—

That "for the purpose of sale" be added to the amendment.

The Minister for Mines: Then there could never be a conviction.

Mr. MANN: Suppose a publican ordered certain liquor, and on receipt of the liquor found that it was not what he had ordered, what should he do then?

The Minister for Mines: Put it out of the door. Your amendment would defeat the whole object of the clause.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: I fail to see what the member for Perth has in mind. In the case which he suggests there would be nothing in the nature of "fictitious heading, trade name, brand, or description." There is no sense in the amendment.

Mr. MANN: The spirit of the clause lies in its application to the sale of liquor.

The Minister for Mines: But not that of your amendment.

Mr. MANN: Every case should be considered on its merits. I hope the Committee will in fairness permit those words to be added.

Amendment on the amendment put and negatived.

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

Clauses 82 to 85—agreed to.

Clause 86—Supplying liquor to police officers on duty:

Mr. UNDERWOOD: Such a provision as this should not be contained in an Act of Parliament. It is not merely crude, but rubbishy. Have we not our police regulations to prevent a policeman from drinking while on duty? Why throw on the publican one of the responsibilities of our Police Department? Moreover, the clause says that the publican may not supply a policeman if he becomes drunk. We have already provided that a publican must not serve anybody who is drunk; so why specify the policeman here? I hope the Committee will strike out the clause.

Clause put and negatived.

Clause 87—agreed to.

Clause 88—Only one bar-room except by permission of court:

Mr. RICHARDSON: What is the reason for stipulating that without the permission of the court no licensee shall have more than one bar-room?

Mr. Mann: That was recommended by the Commission.

Mr. JOHNSTON: The clause provides for something that is opposed to a policy laid down by some licensing courts at the present time. It provides that no licensee shall sell or supply liquor in more than one bar-room or have more than one bar-room, unless he has obtained the permission of the court.

The Minister for Works: That is a democratic measure.

The Minister for Mines: It means that a licensee cannot establish a second bar unless he secures the permission of the Licensing Court.

Mr. JOHNSTON: Where the court has approved of plans it is all right. The clause refers to a room divided into compartments by wooden partitions being regarded as one room. To make provision for such partitions is quite wrong, seeing that licensing benches have insisted on having no doors between bars and keeping them entirely separated.

Mr. MARSHALL: The clause seems to suggest that if licensees have been conducting their business for years past with partitions consisting of brick or concrete, they will have to pull them down unless they get the permission of the court to have more than one bar-room.

The Premier: That is quite wrong.

The Minister for Mines: The clause is to prevent the establishment of secret places for drinking without the knowledge of the court.

Mr. MARSHALL: There is no mention in the clause about secret places for drinking.

Mr. Mann: They are known to exist.

The PREMIER: The licensee can have as many bars as he likes provided he gets the permission of the court. It means that licensees will not be allowed to have bars distributed about their premises in such a way that they may become secret drinking places.

Mr. McCallum: In Victoria licensees have to pay an additional fee for every bar.

The PREMIER: We have not gone as far as that, but we say that the court must approve of any additional bars established on licensed premises. There can be no objection to the clause and it will not work any harm to the public.

Mr. COWAN: I move an amendment—

That the second paragraph of the proposed new Section 115 (a) be struck out.

I propose to move for the insertion, in lieu of the paragraph mentioned, of the following new paragraph:—"Provided that it shall not be competent for the court to grant permission to the licensee to have or use in any bar-room or saloon of premises for which an hotel license is held, any partition of wood or other material, so as to wholly or partially prevent or limit the uninterrupted view of the whole of the place where the bar is situated, or so as to wholly or partially divide such place into two or more compartments." We have removed one of the most objectionable features from the wineshop and now we are to make provision for it in connection with hotels. It seems to me that we should not provide for such conditions in hotels as led to the Gun Alley tragedy in Melbourne. We should be free from such possibilities. The paragraph of Subclause 1 to which I refer is a serious matter, and I hope the Committee will agree to strike it out with a view to inserting the paragraph I have read.

The PREMIER: Nothing will be gained by striking out the paragraph because the court will have to give permission for the division of a room into compartments.

Mrs. Cowan: You take this provision away from wine shops and permit it in hotels.

The PREMIER: That is a totally different thing in relation to hotels. The licensees have to apply to the court for permission.

Mrs. Cowan: Courts are not infallible.

The PREMIER: The courts will have to be satisfied before they will give permission. In the case of wine shops, we said that the bar room must be open for obvious reasons. In the case of hotels, the same reasons do not exist.

Amendment put and negatived.

Clause put and passed.

Clauses 89 to 91—agreed to.

Clause 92—Penalty for obtaining liquor by false statement as to age:

Mrs. COWAN: I move an amendment—

That in line 3 after "years," the following words be inserted, "whether a servant of the licensee living on the premises or not."

In an earlier clause provision is made that no person apparently under the age of 21 years of age is to be served with liquor. It is not right to allow boys and girls of 16 years to be employed in hotels as servants and allow

them to act as messengers to deliver drink to others.

The Minister for Works: Any person employed must be over the age of 21 years.

Hon. M. F. Troy: Yes, it says, "Any person."

Mrs. COWAN: The amendment will safeguard the position. We should not have boys and girls of 16 years of age allowed to take drink to customers.

The PREMIER: If the member for West Perth seeks to prevent people under 16 years of age being supplied with intoxicating liquor, or supplying liquor to others, it is unnecessary. I do not think that the amendment is required at all.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: We have passed Clause 90 which says that anyone who "permits any person apparently under the age of 21 years" to be supplied with liquor commits an offence. It does not matter whether they are living on the premises or not. The clause refers to "any person," but if the amendment is agreed to the provision will apply to only a servant of the licensee. The hon. member would do well to withdraw the amendment.

Amendment put and negatived.

Clause put and passed.

[Mr. Munsie took the Chair.]

Clause 93—Penalty on sending a child for liquor:

Mr. RICHARDSON: There seems to be an anomaly in this. We have already agreed that nobody under the age of 21 shall be supplied with liquor, notwithstanding which the clause gives the right to send for liquor a child over the age of 16. I move an amendment—

That in line 2 "16" be struck out and "21" inserted in lieu.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: I am not so much against the striking out of 16, as against the insertion of 21. Under the amendment a lad of 18 who is driving a cart for a storekeeper holding a gallon license will not be able to call at a spirit merchant's for a case of whisky, and so it will be impracticable for him to keep his job.

Mr. MARSHALL: Clause 92 provides that the licensee of an hotel shall not supply liquor to anyone under 21 years of age. I agree with the member for North-East Fremantle that the amendment would prejudicially affect a large number of youths now employed by commercial firms in the city. I will vote for the clause.

Mr. RICHARDSON: I am not desirous of pressing the amendment, since it has been pointed out that it will affect certain employees. Still I am afraid the clause is creating an anomaly. However, I will withdraw the amendment.

Amendment by leave withdrawn.

Clause put and passed.

Clauses 93a to 95—agreed to.

Clause 96—Employment of Asiatics:

Mr. MANN: The clause provides that Asiatics employed on licensed premises on the 15th August, 1922, shall be registered, and that only registered Asiatics shall be so employed. The cause may inflict a hardship upon Asiatics now in employment, for it may have happened that on the date mentioned certain Asiatic employees were ill, and so temporarily out of work. Are they to be debarred from future employment?

The Minister for Works: No, it is only necessary to register such a person.

Mr. MANN: I move an amendment—

That after "on" in line 2 the words "or before" be inserted.

Amendment put and negatived.

Mr. MacCallum SMITH: I move an amendment.

That the following proviso be added:—"Provided this section shall not apply to persons of the Jewish race."

Hon. P. Collier: This is not a money-lenders' Bill!

Mr. MacCallum SMITH: There are in Western Australia numbers of Asiatics who are of the Jewish race. They will be under a hardship if we pass the clause without this proviso.

Mr. SIMONS: I hope the amendment will be agreed to. In East Perth there are over 200 Jewish electors, and without this provision some of them will suffer hardships.

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

Clause 97—agreed to.

Clause 98—Posting of betting placards:

Mr. UNDERWOOD: Is the clause necessary?

Mr. Mann: Absolutely.

Mr. UNDERWOOD: The hon. member professes to know all about public houses, drinking, and betting. I do not mind confessing that I know more about each of those things than he does.

The Premier: This is a different matter.

Mr. UNDERWOOD: It is not. I know most of the publicans in Western Australia, yet I know only one who bets. We do not go to hotels to get bets.

The Minister for Mines: Where would you go?

Mr. UNDERWOOD: I will not tell you. This is a foolish clause, because it is unnecessary. Publicans, as a rule, do not bet.

Hon. T. Walker: Have not some publicans been prosecuted for using their places for betting?

Mr. UNDERWOOD: Chemists, tobacconists, and Sunday schools, might be prosecuted if anything in the way of gambling was carried on there.

The Premier: This was recommended by the Commission.

Mr. UNDERWOOD: I should like some member of the Commission to tell us why the clause was included.

Mr. MANN: This matter was brought prominently under the notice of the Commission. Apart from the evidence tendered, I know there are several publicans in Perth who encourage bookmakers to frequent their bars on Saturday afternoons. Men starting for home with their wages drop in and stay there the whole afternoon. The bookmakers attends to their wants, the results are posted in the bar, and what these men do not spend in drink they spend in betting.

Mr. McCallum Smith: What about their winnings?

Mr. MANN: They go in the same way. Numerous hotels follow this practice. There have been police court prosecutions within the last few months for betting in hotels. It is only fair to the publicans who run their hotels on good lines that we should pass the clause.

Hon. M. F. TROY: This Bill is evidently a metropolitan measure. The amendment is unnecessary. A publican has as much right to post notices regarding betting results as a storekeeper, newsagent, or tobacconist. In the back country most of the hotels post results. During the war, war news was posted. If the posting of betting results is prohibited, we should stop the posting of other news. This is rank hypocrisy. Betting can be witnessed in St. George's-terrace any day. The police know of it; the Minister knows of it; every one knows of it. Dozens of times I have read the notices posted at country hotels and have not been induced to drink.

Capt. CARTER: I agree with the hon. member for Perth.

Mr. Underwood: A wonder he did not clean it up before.

Capt. CARTER: I am glad the framers of the Bill decided to impose on the State the duty of preventing this sort of thing. It is not one man's job. Recently a prominent hotel served a useful purpose by posting the news that filtered through during the newspaper strike, but the previous speaker has not shown that that was a parallel case with betting. Race meetings are held on Wednesday and Saturday, and men go to the hotels to bet on the various races and, being forced to remain in or about the precincts of the hotel to watch their interests, indulge in drinking which is generally excessive as the expenditure on betting is excessive. The clause is an excellent one and I hope the Committee will pass it.

Mr. SIMONS: I hope the clause will be retained. The practice of placarding horse-racing results is one of the most vicious phases of sport. The class of people thus brought together consists largely of a very undesirable element.

Mr. Underwood: That is nonsense.

Mr. SIMONS: I know what I am talking about. These hotels become the magnet point for a very undesirable element and many first-class hotels have been reduced to second and third class because they have been made a rendezvous for people who should not be afforded these facilities to congregate. So objectionable are these gatherings that the

same side of the street is not passable for womenfolk. There are two attractive features of horse racing, the thrill of seeing horses do their best, when they are allowed to—

Mr. Clydesdale: I am glad you mentioned that.

Mr. SIMONS: And the glamour, colour, lawns and spectacle on the course, added to which is the excitement of betting. Here we are robbed of all the nicer points of the racing game, and nothing but the more objectionable is left, representing a most damnable perversion of the sporting instinct. I hope the Committee will retain the clause and thus do something to clean up this eyesore of the city.

Mr. LAMBERT: It is desirable that the clause should stand. During recent years the congregation of so-called sports at hotels of Perth and Fremantle has become particularly noticeable. I do not think the better class of hotelkeeper requires or desires this sort of thing and I doubt whether it serves any useful public purpose. If people want to bet, they should go to the racecourses.

The Minister for Mines: To what race-course would you go to bet on the Melbourne Cup?

Mr. LAMBERT: To Flemington, and I would not allow people to bet except on the race-courses. Outside of one hotel in Kalgoorlie on Saturday, there were about a dozen of these so-called bookmakers—side-walk spielsers—betting with about 150 men. They are absolute spielsers. At one time I made a bet with one of them and he took me down for £12, so that my observations are backed with considerable feeling.

The Minister for Mines: He must have got up very early that morning.

Hon. P. Collier: The south side of St. George's-terrace from William-street to Barrack-street has been given over to them now.

Mr. LAMBERT: I do not know that we should single out hotels but we can make a start with them. This betting is more noticeable here than on the fields. The other day I saw a young fop of about 18 with a notebook and pencil in the main street of Fremantle taking a bet from a kiddie of about 12, while a policeman was standing nearby. I told the policeman it was a pity he was content to saunter along instead of doing his duty. The sooner this scandal is cleaned up, the better. It is most objectionable.

Mr. MARSHALL: Betting is already provided for under special legislation.

Mr. Mann: This is a matter of posting, which is not illegal.

Mr. MARSHALL: I fail to see why we should victimise lessees of hotels in this way. The whole Bill amounts to persecution of one particular section of our commercial community. It is altogether too drastic as applied to the goldfields.

Mr. LUTEY: I move an amendment—

That in line 3 the words "or about" be struck out.

If this is carried, these notices can then be affixed to the verandah posts of hotels. Those

people who congregate outside hotels to discuss horse-races are by no means all undesirable.

Mr. PICKERING: If a licensee is prevented from posting such a notice on his premises he can easily arrange with the man next door to do this. It is hardly possible to achieve the object desired by the hon. member by the means suggested.

Mr. UNDERWOOD: The words "or about" are superfluous, and silly in the extreme. This kind of thing is already prohibited under the Police Act.

The Minister for Mines: This does not deal with betting but with posting.

Mr. UNDERWOOD: Possibly we have not had a police force capable of administering that Act. It is said that the publicans bring the bookmakers to their hotels in order to get custom. Publicans do not bet. The only thing that takes a man into an hotel is the stuff that is sold there. The member for Perth talks of cleaning up the trade. He should show wherein the trade is dirty. It is not a dirty trade, but a good, clean one.

The CHAIRMAN: This is nothing to do with the cleaning up of the trade.

Hon. P. Collier: This is not the only Bill before us.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: The clause should stand, in the interests of civic government and the development of the city. The existing methods are not in the best interests of the city. I believe most hotel-keepers are opposed to the present principle, and that very few of them post these results.

Mrs. COWAN: I hope the clause will not be interfered with. There is no reason why we should add to the temptations of the young people of the community by affording them an opportunity of reading racing results outside or inside hotels. It seems as if the members who have been talking about this clause are not quite so saintly in the matter of betting as some of them would have us believe.

Mr. MARSHALL: Would I be in order in moving a further amendment to strike out the words "on or"?

The CHAIRMAN: The hon. member cannot move that amendment while the present amendment is before the Chair.

Mr. LAMBERT: Some interpretation of this clause should be obtained. The words proposed to be struck out do seem to be superfluous; but whether posting racing results on a verandah post, for instance, would be posting them on the premises is doubtful.

The Premier: "About the premises," would mean, for instance, posting them on a board stuck up outside the premises.

Mr. LAMBERT: "On or about" seems too elastic. I would like the member for Kanowna or some other legal authority to give the Committee an opinion as to whether the wording is effective.

Hon. T. Walker: You know as well as anybody what the clause means.

Amendment put and negatived.

Mr. MARSHALL: I now desire to move an amendment that the words "on or" be struck out.

The CHAIRMAN: The hon. member cannot do that now.

Mr. MARSHALL: I understood you, Sir, to say previously that I could not do it then.

The CHAIRMAN: I am sorry the hon. member misunderstood me. What I told him was that he could not move his amendment unless the other amendment was withdrawn. We cannot go back now.

Clause put, and a division taken with the following result:—

Ayes	28
Noes	10

Majority for 18

AYES.

Mr. Angelo	Mr. Mann
Mr. Angwin	Mr. McCallum
Mr. Carter	Sir James Mitchell
Mr. Clydesdale	Mr. Money
Mr. Collier	Mr. Piesse
Mrs. Cowan	Mr. Richardson
Mr. Davies	Mr. Sampson
Mr. Durack	Mr. Scaddan
Mr. George	Mr. Simons
Mr. Gibson	Mr. J. M. Smith
Mr. Johnston	Mr. J. Thomson
Mr. Lambert	Mr. Walker
Mr. Latham	Mr. Wilson
Mr. H. K. Maley	Mr. Mullany

(Teller.)

NOES.

Mr. Chesson	Mr. Marshall
Mr. Corboy	Mr. Pickering
Mr. Heron	Mr. Troy
Mr. Lutey	Mr. Underwood
Mr. C. C. Maley	Mr. J. H. Smith

(Teller.)

Clause thus passed.

Clause 99 to 109—agreed to.

[Mr. Stubbs resumed the Chair.]

Clause 110—Amendment of Section 146.

Mr. LATHAM: I move an amendment—

That in proposed paragraph 1, after "club," line 2, there be inserted "except boys who are being trained as waiters or are serving as messengers."

Unless this amendment is carried, hardship may be occasioned to boys who are being trained as waiters in clubs.

The Minister for Works: They can be trained in restaurants.

Mr. LATHAM: The work in restaurants is quite different from that in clubs.

Mr. ANGELO: This amendment is requested by the Registered Clubs' Association, Incorporated, of Western Australia, which includes most of the important clubs of the metropolis and the country districts. I do not think Ministers have had any complaints

whatever as to this Bill from the clubs, who are desirous of falling in with the wishes of the Government. Not many boys are affected, as only a few clubs employ them. The boys do not in any way come in contact with the serving of liquor.

Members: Oh, don't they?

Mr. ANGELO: From my knowledge of the clubs asking for this amendment, I can assure the Committee that that is so. I am prepared to agree to any proviso, such as that the lads should not be allowed to serve in bars or handle liquor.

Mr. Mann: They are permitted to be employed in the administrative work of the club, according to the Bill as it stands.

Mr. ANGELO: But what does administrative work really mean? Will it include lads who are being trained as waiters? Where the lads are acting as waiters, they are not serving liquor.

Mr. McCallum: They are used for that purpose.

Mr. ANGELO: Not in the clubs I have anything to do with.

Mr. McCallum: If boys are waiting at table they must bring in liquor if required.

Mr. ANGELO: No, that is not so. According to Clause 91, which has been agreed to, we do not object to lads delivering liquor.

Mr. Lambert: There is a difference between "delivering" and "serving" liquor.

Mr. ANGELO: We do not ask that these lads should have anything to do with the serving of liquor in the dining room. They really become apprentices until they are full-fledged waiters.

Mr. MONEY: I hope it is not the intention of the Committee to give the right to any minor to serve liquor. A club should be like one's own private house.

Capt. Carter: How often is it?

Mr. Mann: There are clubs—and clubs!

Mr. McCallum: It is better to keep the boys away from the clubs.

Mr. Lambert: Does the member for Bunbury use lads to serve or deliver liquor in his own private house?

Mr. MONEY: Most hon. members have liquor in their homes.

Mr. McCallum: You would keep it away from your own boys.

Mr. MONEY: I do not always look upon the black side of things.

Mr. McCallum: You would not let one of your boys go into a club to handle liquor.

Mr. MONEY: Why should not boys be allowed to wait at table at 18 years of age?

Mr. McCallum: They can under the Bill, but you want to have them before they are 16. You want to take them from the cradle!

Mr. MONEY: What should be done with the boys between the ages of 16 and 18? They are really trainees, and if they are to be waiters, it must be remembered that the experience gained in a restaurant or a tea-room is not that which suits them for work as waiters in a club. I support the amend-

ment, because a residential club should be the same as one's private house.

Mr. Clydesdale: There is no comparison.

Mr. LAMBERT: The idea that a club is on all fours with a private house is simply moonshine! It is a very tolerant legislature that has not insisted upon tightening up the conduct of clubs.

Mr. Latham: Of residential clubs as well?

Mr. LAMBERT: Yes.

Mr. Latham: I suggest you should join one. You do not belong to a good residential club at all.

Mr. LAMBERT: I belonged to a good residential club when the hon. member was grubbing stumps in the backblocks.

Mr. Latham: And it was a good occupation.

Hon. P. Collier: It was one you should never have left.

Mr. LAMBERT: There is a tendency to give too much license to clubs. A club is not a very desirable training ground for boys.

Mr. J. Thomson: What experience have you had of clubs?

Mr. LAMBERT: Not all the experience is centred in the Western Australian Club. I do not think the member for Claremont should strenuously advocate boys serving drinks. It is desirable that we should keep clubs within bounds. Men can drink and gamble all night long in clubs and it is a scandal.

Mr. Pickering: It would be, if it were true.

Mr. LAMBERT: It is true.

Mr. Pickering: It is not.

Mr. LAMBERT: I belong to some clubs.

Mr. Angelo: You should belong to a respectable club.

Mr. LAMBERT: I could belong to the club which the member for Gascoyne joined not long since.

Mr. Angelo: I have been a member for only 10 years!

Mr. LAMBERT: The idea of trying to mislead the Committee by saying that a club is on all fours with a private house! It is usually the man who wants to dodge his private house and his domestic responsibilities who goes to a club.

Hon. P. Collier: It is the place where crusty old bachelors go.

Mr. LAMBERT: Yes, or those married men who are more fitted to be bachelors.

Mr. MONEY: I am not aware that the section of the Act has been abused.

Hon. P. Collier: But this is a cleaning up Bill.

Mr. MONEY: There is nothing to clean up.

Mr. McCallum: You want us to bring along a row of wrecked youths before you will agree to any cleaning up.

Mr. MONEY: I have heard no evidence that the section has not been properly carried out.

Mr. SIMONS: Throughout the Bill it is laid down that 21 shall be the established age for association with hotels, and I see no reason why we should make an exemption in respect of clubs. The provision is for the protection of young citizens. Why should we drive a boy into the bar?

Mr. Latham: We are not trying to do that.

Mr. SIMONS: If he is told to go into the bar and bring six whiskies, he will have to do it. It is not a desirable atmosphere for kids of 18 years of age.

Mr. Latham: You require to stop them from traveling on railway lines.

Mr. SIMONS: When the hon. member has as much experience of clubs as I have had, he will know why this amendment has been introduced.

Amendment put and negatived.

Clause put and passed.

Clause 111—agreed to.

Clause 112—Amendment of Section 149:

Mr. ANGELO: I move an amendment—
That the following proviso be inserted to follow Subsection (1) of new Section 149: "Provided that it shall be lawful for a member on giving six hours' notice to the secretary in writing, and subject to the approval of the committee in writing, to invite guests, whose names shall be stated in the notice, and not exceeding three in number, to the use of the club premises between the hours of six in the evening and twelve midnight."

This is already in the existing Act.

Hon. P. Collier: But we are cleaning up.

Mr. ANGELO: I understand the Premier, in reply to a deputation, agreed to this. There is no evidence to show that the existing provision has been abused.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: Read the evidence of the Royal Commission.

Mr. Mann: One club with 5,000 members had not the address of any of the 5,000.

Mr. ANGELO: I should like to know the name of that club.

Mr. Mann: Well, read the evidence taken by the Royal Commission and you will learn it.

Mr. ANGELO: I am here on behalf of the association of clubs, all of which are doing their best to carry out their functions in a proper manner. They wish to see this amendment inserted in the Bill. Without the amendment it will be impossible for club members to have their friends in for dinner.

Hon. T. Walker: Or for a tiddly.

Mr. McCallum: Under the Bill they can have their friends in for dinner.

Mr. ANGELO: Not without the amendment. In any case, one cannot ask a friend in to dinner and show him out immediately afterwards.

Mr. McCallum: I can imagine how painful the parting would be at midnight.

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

Ayes	14
Noes	26

Majority against .. 12

AYES.

Mr. Angelo	Mr. Money
Mr. Durack	Mr. Pickering
Mr. Harrison	Mr. Plesse
Mr. Johnston	Mr. J. H. Smith
Mr. Latham	Mr. J. Thomson
Mr. C. C. Maley	Mr. Underwood
Mr. H. K. Maley	Mr. Gibson

(Teller.)

NOES.

Mr. Angwin	Mr. Marshall
Mr. Carter	Mr. McCallum
Mr. Chesson	Sir James Mitchell
Mr. Clydesdale	Mr. Munsie
Mr. Collier	Mr. Richardson
Mr. Corboy	Mr. Sampson
Mrs. Cowan	Mr. Scaddan
Mr. Davies	Mr. Simons
Mr. George	Mr. J. M. Smith
Mr. Heron	Mr. Troy
Mr. Lambert	Mr. Walker
Mr. Lutey	Mr. Wilson
Mr. Mann	Mr. Mullany

(Teller.)

Amendment thus negatived.

Clause put and passed.

Clause 113—Sale of liquor:

Hon. M. F. TROY: Why should a club be allowed to remain open until 11 p.m. when hotels have to close at 9 p.m.? I move an amendment—

That in line 4 "eleven" be struck out and "nine" inserted in lieu.

Mr. PICKERING: I trust the Committee will not agree to the amendment. A club is entirely different from an hotel, in that it is a home for its members. Most clubs are well conducted. Hon. members are going too far when they say that clubs are the same as hotels. An applicant for membership has to satisfy the committee that he is a fit and proper person to become a member. Endeavours are made to keep clubs respectable and they are made homes by men away from home.

Mr. McCallum: They are the same as hotels.

Mr. PICKERING: All the innuendoes about drunkenness in clubs are without foundation.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: Because the police cannot go in to see.

Mr. PICKERING: Under this measure they will be able to do so. The Commission asked the representatives of the clubs whether they had any objection to inspection by an authorised police officer, and they replied they had not.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: Authorised by whom?

Mr. PICKERING: By the Police Department. The clubs had no objection because there was nothing to object to. Members

should take a reasonable view of the question. People who make clubs their homes should be able to enjoy reasonable privileges.

Mr. J. THOMSON: Thirty years ago I came from the goldfields and was made a member of the W.A. Club. I have had the honour of being president of that club and, for the last 15 years, I have gone there every Friday night for a game of bridge.

Mr. Clydesdale: Every Monday morning.

Mr. J. THOMSON: No. Am I doing any harm to the Leader of the Opposition or anyone else?

Hon. P. Collier: I am not objecting.

Mr. J. THOMSON: There is nothing in all this talk about gambling in clubs. We do not allow it. We might have a game of 1s. a hundred or 6d. a hundred or play for a drink.

Hon. P. Collier: What do you call gambling?

Mr. J. THOMSON: I do not call that gambling.

Mr. Corboy: That is a Scotch definition.

Mr. J. THOMSON: If the amendment is passed, members will be doing something which will make my life miserable. I want to go to my club on Friday night and meet my friends and have a drink after 9 o'clock. To put clubs on the same footing as hotels would shorten my life. Am I doing any harm to anyone by having a drink after 9 o'clock?

Hon. P. Collier: The ordinary man might ask that with regard to the hotels.

Mr. J. THOMSON: If I had not been a member of that club, I do not think I would have been member for Claremont to-day.

Hon. P. Collier: Then we shall vote it out.

Mr. J. THOMSON: We make no profit; we are a sort of young men's Christian association. We have a cricket club and a bowling club—

Hon. P. Collier: And prayers every Sunday?

Mr. J. THOMSON: There is no gambling or drinking in respectable clubs.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: We have been told that the club is a home. How many homes are allowed to sell liquor?

Mr. J. Thomson: Come to my home and I will give you a drink.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: The club has power to sell after 9 o'clock. All licensed premises should be on an equality. If it is not right to drink in an hotel after 9 p.m., it is not right to drink in a club.

Mr. J. Thomson: Or in a private house.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: I have evidence to show that it has been almost impossible for the police to ascertain what was going on in a club.

Mr. J. Thomson: It all depends on what you call a club.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: This measure does not provide for admitting the police to clubs. An inspector can go in.

The Premier: Or instruct anyone else.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: The licensing court can authorise a police officer.

Mr. McCallum: The Commissioner of Police, too?

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: No, the licensing court. It is possible that a certain police officer, authorised to inspect clubs, might immediately after such authorisation be moved to another part of the State.

Mr. Latham: Surely such authority could be given to more than one officer.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: In the course of his evidence before the Royal Commission Inspector O'Halloran said that if the police by any chance gained admission to a club and found liquor being supplied to an intoxicated person, the secretary would be liable. The position at present was that it was impossible for the police to know what was going on in clubs. They had no right of entry except under warrant, and so well guarded were they with legislative armour that even if they desired to enter they had to get a warrant from either the chairman or a member of the Licensing Committee, not one of whom might be available at the time. The inspector went on to say he knew of one club in Perth at which singing and cornet playing had been going on till one o'clock in the morning, to the disturbance of the lodgers in the hotel adjoining. We thus find that clubs are worse than hotels. If that sort of thing had happened in a private home the police would have called in to know what was going on. It would be a good thing for the State if clubs had never been allowed to come into existence. I have known men who have gone to their graves through being members of clubs.

Mr. J. Thomson: Poor weak-minded men!

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: If it is right that hotel bars should be closed to the general public at nine o'clock it is also right that the bars of clubs should be similarly closed.

Mr. J. Thomson: A club is a private house.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: It is a public house.

The Minister for Mines: What about our own bar? We can keep open as long as we like.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: That would not affect me either way. I have never belonged to a club.

Mr. J. Thomson: You would have been a much better man if you had been a member of a club.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: I have retained my health without joining a club. I would sooner see a son of mine go into an hotel than into a club. In an hotel he would be carefully watched, but in a club he would be under no supervision. He would be behind closed doors, as at a secret gathering. Clubs and hotels should be placed on the same footing. A club is a place which entices a man from his home, in many cases. That is so in the Old Country and the Eastern States as well as here. Clubs are worse than hotels.

Mr. DURACK: The hon. member forgets that an hotel is open to any member of the public, whereas entrance to a club is governed by nomination and ballot, and so only

a fit and proper person can be admitted to a club. Unlike the hon. member, I would not rather see my son go into an hotel than into a club. To the latter one goes for many other purposes than that of getting a drink—for a meal, or to read a newspaper.

Mr. LATHAM: The fact of 10 bedrooms being stipulated shows that residential clubs are contemplated here. The amendment should not be carried, for under it a man will not be able to get a drink in a residential club after nine p.m., whereas he can do so in an hotel. Many men who never drink at all are members of clubs.

Mr. McCALLUM: The provision as to 10 bedrooms applies only in respect of lodgers being furnished with liquor, and has nothing whatever to do with clubs. Does the member for Kimberley contend that all sorts of bad characters use hotels?

Mr. Durack: The hotelkeepers must admit them.

Mr. McCALLUM: Nothing of the sort. If they admit bad characters, they are liable to be prosecuted for it. The argument that nomination and balloting make a club a better resort than an hotel is absurd. An hotel can be made a man's home just as well as a club can. Apparently the argument is that because a club member pays a guinea or two by way of annual subscription he is to have all sorts of special privileges.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: I do not like the clause at all. It is a very peculiar one. Under it a lodger at a club could drink for 24 hours a day.

Mr. Money: So he can at a State hotel.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: No.

Mr. Mann: It is just the same as at an hotel.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: Someone must have been dreaming when this provision went into the Bill. It seems to me that at a club with the statutory number of bedrooms a lodger would be able to drink right through the 24 hours.

Capt. CARTER: We should look on the club question only in relation to the sale of liquor as on all fours with all other licenses for the sale of that commodity. I am a member of what is perhaps the best, or at least the equal of the best club in Western Australia. We should not legislate for that type of club. There is, I am told, a club where the subscription is a guinea a year and the members get a refund of 10s. in beer chits. We should legislate for that class of club. There are so called sports clubs—I do not refer to the Sports Club—in which a number of sporting people gather together for drinking purposes.

Mr. Clydesdale: They are in the minority.

Capt. CARTER: Still they offer unfair competition to good clubs and to hotels. The Premier lives in a palatial hotel in Perth, and within 200 yards there are three clubs holding licenses. After 9 p.m., people go from the hotels where the bars have been closed and spend their money in the clubs in that vicinity until the early hours of the morning.

Hon. P. Collier: And then start on the chits.

Capt. CARTER: It is unfair to an hotel for which heavy rental has to be paid and which carries a large capital expenditure.

The Premier: The licensee of the hotel has different opportunities.

Capt. CARTER: That is true, but those opportunities are far outbalanced by the capital involved in running a hotel, and the additional selling capacity enjoyed by the clubs owing to the extension of the hours of trading. We must not look upon this matter as purely a question of the sale of liquor. I resent the attitude of some members, who regard their clubs as patterns and assert that we should not legislate for clubs at all. We must legislate for the type of club that is a menace to the community and a danger for rich and poor alike. Many men can ill afford to belong to a club, but they go there to get liquor when they cannot get it anywhere else. This type of license is the most serious form we have to deal with. Therefore we should legislate for all classes of clubs. I support the amendment.

Hon. M. F. TROY: I have no objection to clubs, but why should we treat them differently from hotels. The Bill deals with the sale of liquor and clubs should not be allowed later hours than hotels for the sale of liquor.

The Minister for Mines: What about our own club here? Would you include it?

Hon. M. F. TROY: Yes, certainly.

The Minister for Mines: Then see you are consistent.

Hon. M. F. TROY: Although we have legislation closing hotels at 9 o'clock, I am often puzzled to know where the people we see under the influence of liquor when we are catching our last trams and trains, get it from.

The Minister for Mines: That cannot be sunstroke.

Hon. M. F. TROY: The Bill provides that people cannot get liquor after 9 o'clock, and what is fair for one person is fair for another.

Mr. PICKERING: I hope members will not continue to take this jaundiced view of clubs. Clubs are not primarily for the sale of liquor. Some consideration should be shown for clubs, many of which are residential and country clubs. I am anxious that their privileges should not be taken away. To all intents a residential club is a home for its members. While on the goldfields, as well as elsewhere, we saw something of these clubs, and from what I could gather, clubs like the Hannans Club at Kalgoorlie are very well conducted.

Mr. Lambert: Do you say the Hannans club is well run?

Mr. PICKERING: From what I could see it was all right. Whilst there I did not see any excessive drinking. It would be a very serious thing if, through ignorance, the amendment were carried.

Mr. LAMBERT: Why should the payment of £2 2s. subscription fee give a club mem-

ber the right to go on drinking after the hotels are closed? Possibly, some discrimination should be shown in favour of genuine residential clubs, but a non-residential club is merely a drinking shop. I will vote for the amendment.

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

Ayes	15
Noes	22
Majority against				7

AYES.

Mr. Angwin
Mr. Carter
Mr. Corboy
Mrs. Cowan
Mr. Davies
Mr. Heron
Mr. Lambert
Mr. McCallum

Mr. Richardson
Mr. Simons
Mr. J. M. Smith
Mr. Troy
Mr. Walker
Mr. Wilson
Mr. Munste

(Teller.)

NOES.

Mr. Angelo
Mr. Chesson
Mr. Clydesdale
Mr. Collier
Mr. Durack
Mr. George
Mr. Gibson
Mr. Johnston
Mr. Latham
Mr. Lutey
Mr. H. K. Maley

Mr. Mann
Mr. Marshall
Sir James Mitchell
Mr. Money
Mr. Pickering
Mr. Piesse
Mr. Sampson
Mr. Scaddan
Mr. J. H. Smith
Mr. Underwood
Mr. Mullany

(Teller.)

Amendment thus negatived.

Mr. CORBOY: It is my intention to move that all words after "morning" in line 4 be struck out. Under the clause, the sale of liquor in a club is prohibited after 11 o'clock except to bona fide lodgers; so long as there are 10 bedrooms in the club, all the club members can claim to be bona fide lodgers.

The Minister for Mines: Nothing of the sort. The provision means that there cannot be a bona fide lodger unless the club has 10 bedrooms.

Mr. CORBOY: But any member of the club, drinking after hours, could claim to be a lodger.

The Minister for Mines: No, he is prevented by Clause 119, under which there must be kept a record of bona fide lodgers.

The Premier: The clause is a perfectly good one.

Mr. LAMBERT: I do not know whether it is a good one. People might go there and take a bedroom merely for the night. I move—

That all the words after "morning" in line 6 be struck out.

The PREMIER: The member for Coolgardie does not realise the effect his amendment would have. If a man lives at an

hotel he can get liquor at any time during the night. If a lodger returned to his club at one or two o'clock in the morning he might require refreshments, but the amendment would preclude his being served.

Amendment put and negatived.

Clause put and passed.

Clause 114—agreed to.

Clause 115—Amendment of Section 162:

Mr. ANGELO: I move an amendment—

That in line 5 the word "ten" be struck out and "five" inserted in lieu.

This amendment is almost consequential on the decision of the Committee regarding the percentage to be paid on liquor.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: Under the existing law clubs are dealt with differently from hotels. They have to pay a percentage and, being patronised by a superior class of individuals, no doubt they can afford to pay more than hotels which common people patronise. I am surprised at the hon. member moving for this reduction to bring clubs down to the level of hotels. If a man wishes to be aristocratic he should pay for it.

Mr. Money: This applies to all clubs.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: All club members are supposed to be superior individuals. Have not they to be nominated for membership and then approved by the club committee? Being above the common herd who visit hotels, they should be prepared to pay a little more.

Mr. Angelo: Would the Fremantle Workers' Club agree with you?

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: By striking out these words the hon. member will lose his respectability.

Mr. Lambert: That is a Methodist way of appealing to the hon. member.

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

Ayes	30
Noes	7
Majority for				23

AYES.

Mr. Angelo
Mr. Carter
Mr. Chesson
Mr. Clydesdale
Mr. Collier
Mr. Davies
Mr. Durack
Mr. George
Mr. Gibson
Mr. Heron
Mr. Johnston
Mr. Latham
Mr. Lutey
Mr. H. K. Maley
Mr. Mann

Mr. Marshall
Sir James Mitchell
Mr. Money
Mr. Mullany
Mr. Pickering
Mr. Piesse
Mr. Richardson
Mr. Sampson
Mr. Scaddan
Mr. J. H. Smith
Mr. J. M. Smith
Mr. Troy
Mr. Underwood
Mr. Wilson
Mr. Munste

(Teller.)

NOES.

Mr. Angwin	Mr. McCallum
Mr. Corboy	Mr. Walker
Mrs. Cowan	Mr. Simons
Mr. Lambert	(Teller.)

Amendment thus passed.

Mr. ANGELO: I move an amendment—

That the word "five" be inserted.

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

Clauses 116, 117—agreed to.

Clause 118—Premises to be subject to inspection:

Mr. CORBOY: I move an amendment—

That in Subclause 1 the words "authorised in writing by a member of the Licensing Court" be struck out.

I want it to be possible for the police to enter a club just as they can enter upon hotel premises.

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

Ayes	16
Noes	21

Majority against	..	5
------------------	----	---

AYES.

Mr. Angwin	Mr. McCallum
Mr. Chesson	Mr. Richardson
Mr. Clydesdale	Mr. Simons
Mr. Corboy	Mr. Troy
Mr. Davies	Mr. Walker
Mr. Heron	Mr. Wilson
Mr. Lambert	Mr. Munroe
Mr. Lutey	(Teller.)
Mr. Marshall	

NOES.

Mr. Angelo	Sir James Mitchell
Mr. Carter	Mr. Money
Mr. Collier	Mr. Pickering
Mrs. Cowan	Mr. Plesse
Mr. Durack	Mr. Sampson
Mr. George	Mr. Scaddan
Mr. Gibson	Mr. J. H. Smith
Mr. Johnston	Mr. J. M. Smith
Mr. Latham	Mr. Underwood
Mr. H. K. Maley	Mr. Mullany
Mr. Mann	(Teller.)

Amendment thus negatived.

Mr. SIMONS: I move an amendment—

That in Subclause 2 after "inspector or" the words "such authorised" be struck out.

If it is necessary for the police to appeal to the Licensing Bench for written authority to enter upon club premises the Bill will be inoperative. I want to avoid the necessity for this being done. At present it is impossible for the police to ascertain whether a club is well conducted or not.

Point of Order.

The Minister for Works: I rise to a point of order. Seeing that proposed Subsection 1 has been passed, is it permissible now to move an amendment to strike out words which would nullify that subsection?

The Chairman: I think it would be reversing a decision already arrived at by the Committee.

Mr. Simons: This is relating specifically to a secretary of a club, who is in the same position as the licensee of an hotel.

The Chairman: The point which the Chair has to decide is whether the striking out of the words will cause this subsection to conflict with the vote just taken. It appears to me that that will be the case, unless hon. members think otherwise.

Mr. Simons: This subsection defines the duties and powers of the secretary of a club. The previous subsection does not govern the secretary's actions. There are two different things; otherwise there would not be two different subsections governing them.

Hon. P. Collier: The carrying of the amendment would make no difference.

The Chairman: I am afraid the amendment is inadmissible. However, I do not desire to Burke discussion.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: There is a big difference between inspecting the bar and searching the premises. A policeman might go into the bar without going through the premises. The authority given, however, is to search the whole of the premises, including the bedrooms of boarders.

The Chairman: I will accept the amendment.

Committee resumed.

Mr. SIMONS: We do not wish to pass legislation which will make the Chamber look stupid. If Sunday trading is going on in an hotel, a policeman can go in straight away and take action; but if a brawl is taking place in a club, a policeman cannot go in to stop it without first obtaining an authorisation from a member of the licensing court. The club is created a sort of sanctuary, putting people above the law. Hotels are not allowed to serve liquor on Sunday. Now, almost at the entrance to St. George's Cathedral there is a club from which Sunday after Sunday I have seen men staggering forth, just about lunch time, and bumping against women coming home from church. The result is that respectable hotelkeepers are made the subjects of charges of which they are wholly innocent. I have known music, rowing and roystering to go on in clubs until 3 o'clock of a Sunday morning. I know of a club situated a few doors from a very respectable hotel, the lodgers in which hotel sometimes cannot sleep for the noise of the club. On one occasion the hotelkeeper rang up the police on this account, and the police told him they had no authority to enter. The hotelkeeper then appealed to the people in the club, and was told to get away or he would be thrown out of the window.

The noise went on until daylight. We are putting a creative force in one part of the Bill, and are emasculating that force a little lower down.

THE MINISTER FOR MINES: The hon. member is under a misconception. If his amendment were carried, it would not affect the position in the slightest degree. Certainly members of the police force, inspectors of licensed premises, and inspectors of liquor can enter such premises at any time; and any member of the police force authorised in writing by a member of the licensing court can do so as well. Those are the conditions under which clubs are now open for inspection. Then there is a penalty upon the secretary who refuses to admit an inspector, or an authorised member of the police force, or obstructs him, or causes or permits him to be obstructed, or delays him in the discharge of his duty.

Mr. McCallum: That means the secretary can stop an inspector of licensed premises from going in.

THE MINISTER FOR WORKS: Not every member of the police force is authorised to carry out the duties specified by every Act of Parliament. They are detailed for certain work.

Mr. Simons. Cannot every member of the police force go into hotels?

THE MINISTER FOR MINES: Under the Bill the Commissioner of Police will apply to the licensing authority for a general authority for certain officers who will be detailed for this work, and those persons so authorised will be always empowered to carry out duties under the Act. Men will be authorised in sufficient numbers to cope with the work.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: Why are different provisions set out for clubs and for hotels?

THE MINISTER FOR MINES: The inspection of clubs and the system to be adopted have been entirely altered. We are practically handing over the control to the Commissioner under authority from the licensing bench. He will detail men not only to be empowered with the necessary authority at all times, but also others to conduct raids on clubs without the knowledge of those institutions.

Hon. P. Collier: Just as is done to-day in the case of Sunday trading.

THE MINISTER FOR MINES: That is so.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: The Commissioner of Police has no power regarding clubs.

THE MINISTER FOR MINES: He will get all the authority he requires from the licensing authorities.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: A police officer has to be authorised by the court and the magistrates are limited under Clause 7 as to whom they shall delegate the powers and the police are not mentioned there.

The Minister for Mines: Do you think the court would hand over that power to any constable?

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: The Commissioner will furnish the names of officers for whom he requires authority. At the same time something may happen in a club and the police will not be able to interfere.

The Minister for Mines. If there is an offence against the Act, there are no premises so sacred that a constable cannot enter.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: You are making the clubs sacred.

The Minister for Mines: We are not.

Mr. Clydesdale: The member for North-East Fremantle should join a club and learn something for himself.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: Thank God I have not been a club member all these years and that I can do without clubs now. The Bill affords protection to the general public regarding hotels, but not against clubs. All should be placed on the same footing of equality. A police officer might enter a club without searching the premises, for he could not do so without the authority of the Licensing Court. Even if the club were on fire the police would not dare to go in.

The Minister for Mines: That is wrong.

12 o'clock midnight.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: Any policeman who took the chance might be suspended for entering the sacred precincts. I hope the amendment will be carried.

THE MINISTER FOR MINES: The Bill does not make of any place a sanctuary where crime can be committed and the police kept out. This is merely a right to inspect the place to see whether the conditions of the license are being complied with. Under the British Constitution the most sacred retreat is a man's private house; yet the police will go there if occasion arises, just as they will go into a club.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: I am not going to let the hon. member put into my mouth the word "crime." Betting can be carried on in the club.

Mr. Money: That is a crime.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: Yes, but it is not so regarded.

The Minister for Mines: The inspectors can go along and see about it.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: We have it in evidence that Inspector O'Halloran had no power to go in.

Mr. McCallum: Even though there was a riot.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: No matter what was going on, he could not enter.

The Minister for Mines: You are wrong.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: The place should be open to a police officer, whose duty it is to see that the bar is not being used after hours. But no matter what is being done in a club, nobody can enter, unless indeed he be a picked man.

Mr. SIMONS: The police certainly have not had the right to go into a club. I know

of a building in which an industry was being carried on beneath a club where Bedlam was held every night. Five times did I appeal to the police, but they said they could not enter the club. The only way the police could get over the trouble was to detail two plain clothes men to stay in the shadows about the club entrance in the hope of catching club members leaving the premises and committing a nuisance. For the Minister to say that a club is not a sanctuary, is to state something which is quite inaccurate. The condition I refer to was being maintained as recently as last Sunday. I have seen women around the entrance to that club at 2 o'clock in the morning trying to get their husbands out of it. I am sorry to see in the Bill a clause allowing such clubs to carry on their abominable abuses.

Mr. LAMBERT: Our police force is fairly discreet. They have never abused their right to enter hotels. Surely it is not contended that they would overstep their duty in respect of clubs! It might as well be said that they should not inspect licensed premises.

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

Ayes	11
Noes	22

Majority against .. 11

AYES.

Mr. Angwin	Mr. Marshall
Mr. Clydesdale	Mr. McCallum
Mr. Corboy	Mr. Simons
Mr. Heron	Mr. Wilson
Mr. Lambert	Mr. Munsie
Mr. Luty	(Teller.)

NOES.

Mr. Carter	Mr. Money
Mr. Chosson	Mr. Pickering
Mr. Collier	Mr. Plesse
Mrs. Cowan	Mr. Sampson
Mr. Davies	Mr. Scaddan
Mr. Durack	Mr. J. H. Smith
Mr. Gibson	Mr. J. M. Smith
Mr. Johnston	Mr. Stubbs
Mr. Latham	Mr. Underwood
Mr. H. K. Maley	Mr. Mullany
Mr. Mann	(Teller.)
Sir James Mitchell	

Amendment thus negatived.

Clause put and passed.

Clause 119—agreed to.

Clause 120—Amendment of Section 170:

The MINISTER FOR MINES: I move an amendment—

That in line 3 the word "fifteen" be struck out and "twelve" inserted in lieu.

This is merely a misprint.

Amendment put and passed.

Clause 121—agreed to.

Clause 122—Proof strength of beer:

Mr. McCALLUM: The proposed new section provides that no "person" shall sell or supply beer or stout containing more than a certain percentage of proof spirit. Only licensees are permitted to supply, however, and if anyone else supplied, he could be charged with the illicit sale of liquor. The word "person" should be struck out and "licensee" substituted.

Mr. Mann: Would the term "licensee" cover a brewer?

Mr. McCALLUM: Yes, because he holds a license. As the clause stands, I think it would be necessary to prove a sale before it would be possible to get a conviction. I move an amendment—

That in line 1 of the proposed new section "person" be struck out and "licensee" inserted in lieu.

Mr. MANN: If a person were illicitly selling liquor, he would be committing an offence, but he would be committing a second offence if the beer or stout sold contained more than the stipulated proof spirit. It should be possible to get at such a person for the second offence as well as the first.

The Minister for Mines: "Person" would include a licensee, but "licensee" would not include any person.

Mr. MANN: That is so. The hon. member should leave in the word "person."

Mr. McCallum: I will withdraw the amendment.

Amendment by leave withdrawn.

Mr. McCALLUM: I move an amendment—

That after the words "sell or supply to any other person" there be inserted "or have on his licensed premises apparently for sale."

Mr. Mann: Unless the hon. member leaves out the word "licensed," he will not cover the illicit seller.

Mr. McCallum: I am willing to strike out that word and would amend my amendment accordingly.

The CHAIRMAN: The amendment is amended accordingly.

Amendment put and passed.

Mr. McCALLUM: I move a further amendment—

That after the word "sell" in Subclause 2 the words "or have on his premises apparently for sale" be inserted.

Mr. MANN: A person may purchase whisky not of the required maturity but may keep it in his store until it has reached the age of three years in the wood. On the other hand, he may purchase whisky believing it to be matured, but ascertain subsequently that it was not mature. In order to overcome the difficulty I would suggest that the hon. member should embody in his amendment the words "exposed for sale."

Mr. LAMBERT: It would be a dangerous thing to adopt the suggestion of the mem-

ber for Perth. If the purchaser of whisky wanted to keep it for the purpose of maturing it, he would store it in some cellar where it would not be apparently for sale.

The MINISTER FOR MINES: If a person indents whisky and discovers it does not comply with the Act as to maturity, he will not take it out of bond. If he discovered its immaturity after taking it out of bond he would naturally report the matter to the inspector of liquors and would arrange for its storage until such time as it had complied with the Act.

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

Clause 123—Penalty for not keeping placard posted:

Mr. LAMBERT: I do not know that the posting of placards recording convictions is necessary at all.

Mr. MacCallum Smith: It savours of the Middle Ages.

Mr. LAMBERT: I suggest that hon. members vote against the provision.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: I do not know that this is not a very good provision. It will only affect a person who sells liquor of improper quality. A similar law formerly obtained in other parts of the world, and not only as regards alcoholic liquors, but also as regards foods and drinks generally.

Mr. Mann: It represents a double punishment.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: No; it represents a protection to the public. The object is to advertise the danger. True, the punishment is severe; but sometimes severity is necessary in the interests of the public. I have heard repeatedly that there is more danger from bad liquor than from liquor of ordinary quality. In the back country, I have been told, the liquor is generally "damned bad."

Mr. Heron: You are wrong.

Mr. Clydesdale: It has improved very considerably.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: Some reason and justification must have been advanced for inserting the provision; otherwise there is an admission that the Bill has not been properly drafted.

Mr. MacCallum Smith: It is a wrong principle.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: If when I was in charge of the Health Department I could have placarded sellers of bad milk, I would have done it.

Mr. Clydesdale: If the provision were made applicable generally, it would be all right.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: I am dealing with this matter on the general principle. A grocer, a baker, or any other trader of that class who lays himself out to take the public down in the quality of his goods cannot be placarded too much.

Mr. Latham: Surely one punishment is sufficient.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: The time for placarding is limited to two weeks.

Mr. Clydesdale: A trader who is placarded might just as well go out of business.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: The sooner such a trader goes out of business, the better for the public.

Mrs. Cowan: The placarding will not be done unless it is directed by the court.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: This will be used only against those who set themselves out deliberately to take advantage of people.

Mr. Clydesdale: Then the licenses should be taken from such individuals.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: It is for use against those who will not carry on their businesses properly and it is unfortunate that such a provision should be inserted for the first time in a Licensing Bill. If a commencement had been made in some other measure it might have proved more acceptable to members generally.

The Minister for Works: But this provision should be knocked out.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: I am arguing that it should be retained. The present spectacle beats anything I have ever seen. Here we have Ministers ridiculing the provisions of the Bill they introduced. Why did the Government insert such a clause if they can only see fit to ridicule it now? Was it that it was merely taken from the Victorian Act?

The Minister for Mines: Another instance of scissors and paste.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: The clause must have been included for some reason. It will not affect the honest publican. We have too many traders apart from hotelkeepers to whom a similar provision could be applied. I want to placard the premises of a person who has adopted unfair methods which will be injurious to honest publicans while the public themselves will be robbed.

Mr. MacCallum Smith: The Bill provides for the punishment of such persons.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: And this is part of the punishment. Unfortunately, the morality of the commercial community is such that we will have to take steps to protect the general public.

The Minister for Mines: I do not know where you would begin and no one knows where you could end.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: We only provide punishment for those who act dishonestly.

Mr. Mann: But a publican may be a victim of circumstances.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: It is surprising to notice how many members are out to protect the man who is acting dishonestly.

Mr. MacCallum Smith: Are you in favour of branding all law breakers?

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: The hotelkeeper who persists in taking the public down—this provision does not apply to the first offence—should be placarded for the protection of honest traders.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: Although imbued by the best of motives, the member for North-East Fremantle has misread the clause. He does not know anything about the liquor business; he is prejudiced and has been misled. Suppose this placard is put on the

wall, the licensee's customers will not blame him, but will say that he sells good liquor. The placard will be an excellent advertisement for the licensee.

Mr. LAMBERT: The clause opens up a very dangerous precedent.

The Premier: Well, let it go out.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: Why was it put in?

The Premier: I did not mean it to be put in.

Mr. LAMBERT: That assurance, given half an hour ago, would have saved half an hour's discussion.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: I want to know why the clause was put here.

Mr. McCallum: Why are the Government opposing their own proposals?

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: I cannot believe that the clause was inserted without good reason. It is in successful operation in other countries, including Victoria. It has now been copied here but, curiously enough, the Government are withdrawing their support from it.

The PREMIER: I do not see why the offending licensee should be doubly penalised. As a matter of fact the clause was in the original draft of the Bill, but I did not intend that it should be retained. Why should the member for North-East Fremantle object to its being dropped?

Clause put and negatived.

Clauses 124 to 131—agreed to.

Postponed Clause 18—Amendment of Section 45:

Mr. MANN: Not only brewers' and wine and spirit licenses, but billiard table, eating house and lodging house licenses come under the Act, and it appears to me that no further boarding house or eating house licenses can be granted. I would like to know whether that is intended.

The Premier: It is not intended.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: The proposed new Section 45, Subsection 2, provides—

Where a petition is presented to the Governor asking that the licensing court may have authority to grant a new license within any district, and such petition is signed by a majority in number of the adult residents living in an area therein defined, etc. The area should be defined in the Bill.

The Premier: It cannot be defined.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: I think it can be. A petition might be signed by a large number of electors in a defined area on one side of the area where it is proposed the new licensed premises should be erected. If the residents within a mile radius of the site of the proposed new premises were required to sign the petition, that would meet the needs of the metropolitan area. The petition would then bear the signatures of the people principally affected. If the area were made too large, those living at a distance would not care whether the license was granted or not. By restricting the area to reasonable limits the people would take greater interest.

The Premier: One mile is too great for the metropolitan area.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: I am willing to make it half a mile. I move an amendment—

That in line 5 of the proposed new Subsection 2, "therein defined" be struck out and the words "being a radius of 40 chains from the site where it is proposed that such licensed premises shall be erected within a metropolitan district, as provided in Subsection 2 of Section 109" be inserted in lieu.

The PREMIER: I have no objection to the radius of half a mile, which means a mile across. A radius of one mile would have been too great for Perth.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: The licensing court has in the past unfairly defined the areas. People who have lived within the closely populated part of a district have been debarred from expressing an opinion as to whether a license should be granted for premises quite close to them, because of the boundaries that have been fixed. I would point out, of course, that my amendment will apply only to the metropolitan area, that of the member for Williams-Narrogin applying to the country districts.

Mr. DAVIES: Let us assume that an application is received from an area in a district which carried a reduction at the last local option poll. That area will be smaller than the local option district. Would it be competent for the court, merely because of the receipt of a petition from the people within the restricted area, to grant a license in a district which has voted for reduction?

Mr. Latham: But both sides can appeal.

Hon. P. Collier: What the member for Guildford suggests could happen, but there is nothing wrong with it. It would only show that the court had not rightly interpreted the situation.

Mr. DAVIES: Should Parliament declare against such a vote?

[Mr. Stubbs resumed the Chair.]

The PREMIER: Under this Bill there cannot be more licenses in a district than there were at the end of 1922. If a petition were presented, it would only be a request to the court to consider the granting of a license. Anyone can appear before a licensing court to oppose a license.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: In some areas the people residing within a 40-chain radius would be a very small number, but the signatures to be obtained would have to be those of adults; and, in addition, the Governor may refer the petition to the licenses reduction board. Thus ample protection is provided.

Mr. LATHAM: Section 61 of the principal Act gets over the difficulty raised by the member for Guildford.

Amendment put and passed.

Mr. JOHNSTON: I move an amendment—

That the following be added to stand as Subsection 3 of proposed Section 45:—
 "Except as provided in Subsection 2 the area to be defined in the petition shall be subject to the approval of the licenses reduction board, or the licensing court, as the case may be, and notice of the presentation of the petition shall be published by the petitioners forthwith in the 'Government Gazette' and a newspaper circulating in the district."

It has always been the policy of this State to insist on full publicity being given to applications for new licenses. The existing Act requires that there shall be a notice posted on the land and another on the court house, and that the application shall also be advertised in the Press. The real fight for the granting of a new license will not take place before the Licensing Court, but before the Licenses Reduction Board on the receipt of this petition. It is in the interests of all concerned that adequate publicity shall be given to the petition, otherwise it may be circulated quietly without the majority of people knowing anything about it.

Mr. Mann: What does "forthwith" mean? You may not be able to get it published in the local Press within a week or a fortnight.

Mr. JOHNSTON: I will substitute "within seven days" for "forthwith" in the amendment and I will move it with that alteration.

Proposed new subclause put and passed.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: I move an amendment—

That the following two new subclauses be added:—

7. Where a petition is presented to the Governor asking that the Licensing Court or Licenses Reduction Board may have authority to restrict a license for a licensed premises, on the ground that the business of such licensed premises is conducted so as to be a serious inconvenience to persons requiring accommodation, or so as to be a nuisance to the neighbourhood, or that the existence of the license in an unrestricted form brings to the neighbourhood of the licensed premises an undesirable class of persons, or that the conduct of persons visiting the licensed premises is of a disorderly nature, and such petition is signed by a majority in number of the adult residents living in an area described in such petition, the Governor may refer such petition for inquiry by the Licenses Reduction Board during the operation of Part V. of this Act, and thereafter by the Licensing Court.

8. If on such inquiry, and after hearing evidence, the Board or Court, as the case may be, is of the opinion that restrictions should be placed on the license of such licensed premises, then the Board or Court, as the case may be, may order that on certain specified days or during certain specified hours of any day or days, liquor may

not be sold and/or that liquor may not be supplied on such licensed premises and/or that on certain specified days or during certain specified hours of any day or days no persons shall be allowed on such licensed premises other than bona fide lodgers, the licensee, members of his family, or any servant of the licensee living on the premises. And the Board may from time to time make, amend or cancel any such order under this section in its absolute discretion. No person shall wilfully offend against any order of the Board or Court under this section. Penalty £100.

There is nothing mandatory about the amendment; it is purely permissive.

The Premier: That "may" means "shall."

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: The amendment will assist in assuring that licensed premises are conducted in a proper manner. There are one or two licensed premises in the metropolitan area that should be wiped out altogether, and on Sundays and public holidays they become a complete nuisance to the people in the area affected. It should be possible for a person to assist the police in seeing that such an hotel ceased to be a nuisance. On an application under the proposed subclauses, restriction could be placed upon that type of hotel during certain hours, or the premises could be closed up altogether.

The PREMIER: We had better consider this amendment when we are presenting another licensing Bill, for it affects the whole measure. It ought to go to the Parliamentary Draftsman as a basis for a separate Bill. I hope the Committee will not agree to it.

Amendment put and negatived.

Clause, as previously amended, agreed to.

New clause:

Mr. JOHNSTON: I move—

That the following new clause be inserted to stand as Clause 16a:—"Amendment of Section 41.—16a. Section 41 of the principal Act is hereby amended by omitting the following words, namely: 'Provided that no liquor shall by virtue of an occasional license be sold or consumed at any public bar on the licensed premises.'"

An occasional license is granted to enable the premises to be kept open from 9 o'clock onwards when, for instance, an agricultural show or race meeting is being held in a country town. At such a time there is a large crowd in the town, and many women and children are to be found waiting in parlours and sitting rooms of licensed premises. Under the occasional license the bars cannot be kept open after 9 o'clock, and so liquor is served in other rooms, with the result that uninformed people think the licensee is trading illegally. If the licensed house is to be kept open under an occasional license, the liquor sold after the ordinary hour of closing ought to be sold at the public bar.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: I support the new clause. It is a common sense proposal. In the circumstances recounted by the hon. member, the liquor should be sold at the bar instead of in the parlours and sitting rooms.

Mr MANN: The effect of the new clause will be to stop all occasional licenses. In the case of an agricultural show in a country town, the occasional license is granted with a view to the provision of food and refreshments for visitors, not for local residents. Frequently hotels in the city are granted occasional licenses for the purpose of dinners being held on the premises. Is the front bar of such an hotel to be kept open as the result of the occasional license? That is what the new clause will mean. I hope it will not be agreed to.

New clause put and negatived.

New clause:

Mr. McCALLUM: I move—

That the following be inserted to stand as Clause 123a:—"A section is inserted in Part IX. of the principal Act as follows:—176a. A branch of the Police Department shall be established to deal with the inspection of licensed premises. Such branch shall, subject to the control of the Commissioner of Police, be in charge of an experienced senior officer, whose time shall be devoted exclusively to such duties and the inspection of liquor and reporting upon the management and condition of licensed premises to the Commissioner of Police and the licensing courts. Such officer, and any member of the police force attached for the time being to such branch of the department shall, *ex officio*, be an inspector of licensed premises."

This was overlooked, because the Commission did not actually set it out in their recommendations. It covers an expression of opinion in the report. After 10 years' experience of the court in the city, I can say that the principal difficulty experienced is that it has been nobody's business to look after this job. Frequently we have asked whether certain things have been done or for some particulars regarding the application before us, and there has been no one to give us the information. If there is any law which requires the whole attention of an officer it is the licensing law. To expect every member of the police force to be acquainted with all the complicated provisions and technicalities of the Act is an impossibility. Any Government could reasonably approve of the new clause.

Mr. Latham: Is not Inspector O'Halloran in charge?

Mr. McCALLUM: He has numerous duties to attend to.

Mr. Latham: He seems to be an expert.

Mr. McCALLUM: Yes, which is a compliment to him. This has not been his special duty. No particular officer has been told off for this duty. I ask that a senior

officer be placed in charge of the administration of the Act. He would issue authority to members of the police in each district to inspect premises and report, and so the trade throughout the State would be controlled. If the Government endeavour to carry on as they have done in the past, the administration of this measure will be an utter impossibility. On one occasion an application was made in Perth for a particular license and, when the court asked whether there was any objection to the license, no objection was raised. The bench then asked whether the premises had been inspected and were suitable and had sufficient accommodation, but no one could give that information. We were told that the police were so busy with their ordinary duties that they had no time to devote to reporting on licensing matters.

The Premier: How could you use police all over the State for this work?

Mr. McCALLUM: There would be a senior officer in Perth subject to the directions of the Commissioner of Police, and his reports would go to the Commissioner and to the board. In each licensing district an officer, probably the inspector of police, would be appointed to report to the senior officer in Perth. When reports come in he would check them. To-day there is no record in any Government department supplying any information as to the operations of the licensing law, the conduct of the licensee, how the business is controlled, and how the law is operating in any portion of the State.

Hon. P. Collier: One licensing district is administered strictly, while in another there is no supervision.

Mr. McCALLUM: There is no settled policy or uniformity of administration in connection with the conduct of the liquor trade. I propose there should be one authority set up in the city, who shall report both to the Commissioner of Police and the licenses reduction board. Each licensing division will have its own officer to report to the chief and these reports would be sent on to head office and thence to the governing authority. Without such an arrangement it would be impossible to secure efficient administration of the licensing law.

The PREMIER: The proposal is likely to lead to duplication in the department.

Mr. McCALLUM: One man only at the head office is required.

The PREMIER: If men are required to devote time to this work they will not be able to attend to their other duties.

Mr. McCALLUM: The police would receive their instructions from the Commissioner.

The PREMIER: If it were only a question of one man devoting his whole time to the work it would not be so bad, but to my mind the proposal goes much further.

Mr. LATHAM: The proposal will lead to the establishment of a new department, to which I am opposed. The Commissioner already avails himself of the services of his expert officers. If it were necessary to place

the whole time of one man upon this work no doubt he would arrange it. Probably the police already have the necessary powers to carry out what the hon. member desires. I hesitate to agree to anything that will lead to the building up of a new department.

Mr. PICKERING: I favour the suggestion. One principal officer could carry out the work that is required, and secure the assistance necessary from members of the police force.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: I also hope that the new clause will be carried. Having one man in charge of this work would be a distinct advantage. At present the work is everybody's business, and therefore no one's business.

The Premier: But things are going well.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: Then why this Bill? I move an amendment on the amendment—

That after "licensed premises" in the second paragraph of proposed Section 176a there be inserted "or any other premises in which intoxicating liquor is for sale."

Clubs, for instance, should be inspected.

Mr. McCallum: Under this Bill clubs are licensed premises and the secretary is the licensee.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: From various clauses of the Bill, that does not seem to me to be so. If we are going to appoint a special officer for this purpose, he should have full control of the sale of intoxicating liquor.

Mr. MANN: I desire to add words to provide for the inspection of liquors under this new clause. To-day the inspection is done by the State Hotels Department. That does not seem to be quite fair and reasonable. The inspector of liquors should be under the board, or else under this proposed branch of the Police Department.

The CHAIRMAN: The hon. member can move that amendment after the present amendment has been disposed of.

Mr. PICKERING: Does the member for North-East Fremantle propose additional inspection?

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: No; but inspection of all clubs, dining cars, and so forth, wherever liquor is sold.

Amendment put, and declared carried on the voices.

Mr. Pickering called for a division.

Bells rung.

Point of Order.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: I rise to a point of order. There was only one No; and, there being only one No, there is no right to call for a division.

Mr. Pickering: There were two Noes.

The Chairman: The member for North-East Fremantle has asked the question whether the Chairman is right in having the bells rung and dividing the Committee when only one No was called in answer to the ques-

tion put from the Chair. A division cannot be called for unless more than one vote has been given for the Ayes or the Noes, as the case may be. I heard only one No given, but I did not wish to question Mr. Pickering's call for a division. My attention having been called to the matter now, I cannot allow a division.

Mr. Durack: I called "No" at the time when the member for Sussex said "No."

Mr. Simons: I distinctly heard your silence!

The Chairman: I heard one "No" and several "Ayes." If the Committee consider I was wrong, they can say so. I am positive there were more affirmatives than negatives.

The Minister for Mines: We agree with you.

Amendment thus passed.

Committee resumed.

Mr. MANN: I move a further amendment—

That after "premises" in the second paragraph of the proposed new subclause the words "and inspection of liquors" be inserted.

The CHAIRMAN: I cannot accept that amendment at this stage.

The MINISTER FOR MINES: The member for Perth can secure what he desires by moving later that a new subclause should be added.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: I move an amendment—

That after "licensed premises" in the second paragraph the following words be added: "or any other premises in which intoxicating liquor is for sale."

That will deal with dining cars and every other place where liquor is sold.

Mr. PICKERING: On a previous occasion on an amendment like this, the Chairman gave a ruling to which I took exception. In this instance, as the Chairman did not hear our voices in the negative, the only way open for us is to oppose the whole clause.

Amendment put and passed.

Mr. PICKERING: Divide!

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: Is it essential that a new department should be established?

Hon. P. Collier: There is a department already!

Mr. Lambert: What is the matter with the Minister? Why is he making a rambling speech?

Mr. Pickering: On a point of order. I called for a division.

The CHAIRMAN: I did not hear it.

Bells rung and the House divided.

The CHAIRMAN: Obviously there is such a large majority that I declare the division off.

Point of Order.

Mr. Latham: On a point of order, I think that division should be recorded.

The Chairman: Do you?

Mr. Latham: Certainly. There were three votes on one side and their names should be recorded.

The Chairman: If you think that, you had better come and take the Chair.

Mr. Latham: In any case, I have risen to a point of order.

Mr. Simons: A point of mental disorder!

Hon. P. Collier: Under what Standing Order?

Mr. Latham: I protest against that ruling, and I claim that under Standing Order 201 the division ought to be duly recorded.

The Chairman: No tellers were appointed. It is the common practice in all Parliaments that where the Speaker or Chairman, by looking at the numbers on either side, is satisfied there is no possibility of any mistake being made, he calls the division off.

Dissent from Chairman's Ruling.

Mr. Pickering: I move—

That the Chairman's ruling be disagreed with.

I do so on the ground that the ruling is not in conformity with Standing Order 201.

The Chairman: Very well, I will report to the House.

[The Deputy Speaker resumed the Chair.]

The Chairman: I have to report, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that I gave a ruling in Committee—

Mr. Johnston: On a point of order. To whom are your remarks being addressed?

The Chairman: To the Deputy Speaker. I am Deputy Speaker as well as Chairman of Committees.

Mr. Johnston: The great Pooh Bah!

The Deputy Speaker: That is an offensive expression, and I demand an apology. Stand up and apologise!

Mr. Johnston: I apologise.

The Deputy Speaker: You are not going to make a fool of me!

Mr. Johnston: That would be unnecessary.

The Deputy Speaker: I will ask you to apologise again.

Mr. Johnston: I apologise.

The Chairman: A division was called for in Committee, Mr. Deputy Speaker, when 30 members went to the right and three to the left. I considered the division was not necessary. Tellers were not appointed, and I said, "The Ayes have it." Mr. Pickering then handed up to me the following in writing: "I dissent from the Chairman's ruling on the ground that it is not in conformity with Standing Order 201."

The Deputy Speaker: The practice in many Parliaments is that when a division is obvious to the Speaker or the Chairman it is not necessary to appoint tellers. I consider the Chairman's ruling was correct.

Dissent from Deputy Speaker's ruling.

Mr. Pickering: I move—

That the Deputy Speaker's ruling be dissented from.

I do that on the ground that the ruling is not in conformity with Standing Order 201. It is obvious that when members call for a division, they do so with the object that their votes shall be recorded. There is only one other Standing Order which deals with this, namely Standing Order 200.

The Minister for Mines: You cannot go back.

Mr. Pickering: I will go back! Standing Order No. 200 reads—

In case there should be only one member on a side on a division, the Speaker, without completing the division, shall forthwith declare the resolution arrived at.

The Minister for Works: A matter of discretion.

Mr. Pickering: There is nothing in the Standing Orders to justify the Chairman of Committees in acting as he has done, and I think the House should uphold the dignity of the division and see that it is properly recorded in such a case.

Mr. Underwood: What is your assertion?

Mr. Pickering: I think I am speaking for the members who accompanied me when I say we desire that our votes should be recorded.

Mr. Money: I think the House is erring in this matter. I regret the incident, because it might be quoted on future occasions as a precedent.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: Three to 30 cannot establish a precedent.

Mr. Money: I know of no authority permitting us to set aside our Standing Orders. In the absence of any such authority, Standing Order No. 200 entirely deals with the question. Inasmuch as there were three members voting on one side, and not one as stated in the Standing Order, the succeeding Standing Order should have been followed and the division recorded. Members are justified in asking that their votes be recorded. Let us forget what has happened.

Mr. Simons: We never can forget that.

Mr. Money: We do not want this to be quoted as a precedent. If a division can rightly be called off because there are three on one side, it could be rightly called off if there were 13 on one side. There is no difference in the principle. The question should be decided on its merits.

Mr. Latham: I regret the occurrence; I had no intention of turning the proceedings into something savouring of the ridiculous. I divided with the idea of having my vote registered in the records of the House. Some members think that, because only three voted on one side, they should be made the subject of ridicule, but I maintain that I have a perfect right to retain my individuality.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: Speak to the motion.

Mr. Latham: I am pointing out the reason; I divided in order to have my vote recorded.

Hon. M. F. Troy. On a point of order, the

hon member is not speaking to the motion. He is giving reasons and explanations and is distinctly out of order. If you allow him to do that, we shall all want to give reasons and explanations and where will it end?

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

Ayes	9
Noes	28

Majority against 17

AYES.

Mr. Davies	Mr. Money
Mr. Durack	Mr. Pickering
Mr. Johnston	Mr. Plesse
Mr. Lambert	Mr. Munzie
Mr. Latham	(Teller.)

NOES.

Mr. Angelo	Mr. McCallum
Mr. Angwin	Sir James Mitchell
Mr. Carter	Mr. Mullany
Mr. Clydesdale	Mr. Richardson
Mr. Collier	Mr. Sampson
Mr. Corboy	Mr. Scaddan
Mrs. Cowan	Mr. Simons
Mr. George	Mr. J. H. Smith
Mr. Gibson	Mr. J. M. Smith
Mr. Heron	Mr. Troy
Mr. Lutey	Mr. Underwood
Mr. H. K. Maley	Mr. Wilson
Mr. Marshall	Mr. Mann
	(Teller.)

Question thus negatived.

[Committee resumed.]

Mr. MANN: I move an amendment—

That the following be added to the proposed new clause: "Inspectors of liquors appointed under the Health Act shall be officers of the branch of the Police Department established under this section."

Mr. UNDERWOOD: I trust the amendment will not be carried. We have done very well in the past under the Health Act without dealing with the inspectors in the way proposed.

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

Ayes	21
Noes	13

Majority for 8

AYES.

Mr. Angelo	Mr. McCallum
Mr. Carter	Sir James Mitchell
Mrs. Cowan	Mr. Plesse
Mr. Davies	Mr. Richardson
Mr. Durack	Mr. Sampson
Mr. George	Mr. Scaddan
Mr. Gibson	Mr. Simons
Mr. Lambert	Mr. J. M. Smith
Mr. Lutey	Mr. Wilson
Mr. H. K. Maley	Mr. Mullany
Mr. Mann	(Teller.)

NOES.

Mr. Angwin	Mr. Money
Mr. Clydesdale	Mr. Pickering
Mr. Collier	Mr. J. H. Smith
Mr. Corboy	Mr. Troy
Mr. Heron	Mr. Underwood
Mr. Johnston	Mr. Munzie
Mr. Latham	(Teller.)

Amendment thus passed; proposed new clause, as amended, agreed to.

Title—agreed to.

Bill reported with amendments.

House adjourned at 3.0 a.m. (Thursday).

Legislative Assembly,

Thursday, 5th October, 1922.

	Page
Questions: Forests Commission Report	1004
Electoral, South-East Province	1004
Return: Industries Assistance; Loans	1008
Bill: Perth Markets, 2B.	1009
Motions: Soldier Settlement, Select Committee, publication of proceedings	1005
Narrogin-Dwarka Railway, to inquire by Select Committee	1026

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

QUESTION—FORESTS COMMISSION, REPORT.

Mrs. COWAN asked the Premier: 1, Has the Forests Commission which was appointed in December of last year completed its labours? 2, If so, has he received the report? 3, If not, has he any idea whether it will be presented before the close of the present session? 4, Will he request that it be presented at an early date, so that members may have an opportunity of analysing it before the Forests Department estimates are considered?

The MINISTER FOR WORKS (for the Premier) replied: 1, I am advised that the report is nearing completion. 2, Answered by No. 1. 3 and 4, The Commissioners expect to present their report shortly.

Hon. P. Collier: You are optimistic.

QUESTION—ELECTORAL, SOUTH-EAST PROVINCE.

Mr. JOHNSTON asked the Minister for Works: What was the cost to the Government of the last contested election for the South-East Province?