

with Queensland, another State suffering under grievances similar to our own. Unfortunately the spirit of the A.I.F. does not permeate the several States of the union. The opposition of the East to the West is not deliberate. It is mere indifference. If the electors by referendum voted for secession, the Eastern States would want to know the reason why, and would thereupon give us better consideration than we have had in the past. If I were asked to interpret the opinion of the Australian people, I should say they were all heartily in favour of a continuation of the union. Our dissatisfaction with the compact is to be ascribed to several causes, such as the apathy of the Eastern States, our small representation in the Federal Parliament, and our distance from the seat of Government. I hope the Bill will be considered on its merits. Those merits lie not in any assertion that Western Australia is desirous of getting out of the union. The object of the Bill is to ascertain whether or not the majority of people of Western Australia are satisfied with the union. The referendum will conclusively demonstrate whether the croakers against the union have a following throughout the State.

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

House adjourned at 6.15 p.m.

Legislative Assembly,

Wednesday, 6th September, 1922.

	PAGE
Questions: Peel Estate tramway	593
Boatsheds, Perth	593
Group settlements, culverts	593
Personal explanation	593
Bill: Licensing Act Amendment, 2s.	594
Miner's Phthisis, 2s.	614

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

QUESTION—PEEL ESTATE, TRAMWAY.

Mr. JOHNSTON asked the Premier: 1, How many miles of railway or tramway have been built in the vicinity of the Peel estate? 2, What is the cost of the railways or tramways? 3, Do ordinary engines and trains run over the railways or tramways? 4, Why was no Parliamentary approval sought for the construction of the railways in question?

The PREMIER replied: 1, The length of temporary tramway in Peel Estate at 31-8-22

was 20½ miles, including spurs and loops; 24 miles have been laid at various times, but spurs are lifted and relaid as required. Tramway is 3ft. 6in. gauge, laid with 45lb. rails. Sleepers 6ft. by 8in. by 4in., ruling grade 1 in 30, minimum curve 6 chains radius, laid on surface without ballast, clearing 25 feet wide; points and crossings of second-hand material. 2, At 31-8-22: Preparation of track, fencing, platelaying, etc., £8,381 17s. 3d.; sleepers £8,935 6s. 9d.; rails and fastenings (18½ miles), £22,205 5s. 9d.; total, £39,522 9s. 9d. (Note.—An additional 2 miles of rails is on loan.) 3, Class "G" locos. only and railway trucks run over the tramway, but no coaches. No passenger traffic is accepted, except at own risk, and no fares are collected. 4, No Parliamentary approval is required for temporary works incidental to developmental operations.

QUESTION—BOATSHEDS, PERTH.

Mr. CORBOY asked the Minister for Works: 1, Were the boatsheds recently destroyed on the Perth foreshore insured? 2, If so, have the Government received such insurance money? 3, Is it the Government's intention to rebuild the boatsheds? 4, If so, when?

The MINISTER FOR WORKS replied: 1, Yes. 2, Yes. 3, Yes. 4, The question of position has recently arisen and is being carefully considered. Decision is expected within the next few days; until that is definitely fixed the character of the structure cannot be determined.

QUESTION—GROUP SETTLEMENTS, CULVERTS.

Mr. JOHNSTON (for Mr. J. H. Smith) asked the Minister for Works: 1, Is he aware that unpowellised karri and red gum are being used for bed logs and stringers in culverts on roads to serve group settlements south of Manjimup? 2, Is he not aware that these timbers are not suitable for ground work and will rot out in a few years? 3, Considering there is an abundance of jarrah in the vicinity, will he give immediate instructions for that timber to be used in future?

The MINISTER FOR WORKS replied: 1, No, but inquiry will be made. 2, It is known that the timbers referred to are not so reliable as jarrah, although on occasion it may be economical to use same. 3, Yes.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION.

Minister for Works and Wyalcatchem-Mt. Marshall Railway.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS (Hon. W. J. George—Murray-Wellington) [4.41]: On the 29th August, in moving the second reading of the Wyalcatchem-Mt. Marshall Railway Extension Bill, I made statements which were

quite bona-fide at the time, but which I regret to find now were based on information which was not quite accurate. I stated that we had the rails and fastenings on the ground for the extension of this line. At that time I understood it was so. I find that, although we were to have received a sufficient number of rails from the Commissioner of Railways, he for the purposes of his lines has had to claim a certain length of rails which will not now be available for this extension. I make this explanation so that members will not be misled.

Hon. T. Walker: How will that affect the Esperance railway?

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: It will not affect the Esperance railway at all.

Hon. P. Collier: It is lucky for you that you made the explanation.

BILL—LICENSING ACT AMENDMENT.

Second Reading.

Debate resumed from the previous day.

Mr. RICHARDSON (Subiaco) [4.43]: The Bill before the House is of such a varied nature that one hardly knows where to begin discussing it. Perhaps the Government would have been wise if they had brought down a new Bill embodying all the proposed amendments. During the last week or two I have struggled to compare the proposed amendments with the original Bill and I have found it impossible in that space of time to complete the comparison. Therefore, I have to confess that up to the present I have not been able to study the Bill as thoroughly as I would have liked. The member for Nelson (Mr. J. H. Smith) in the course of his speech yesterday, made certain statements with which I entirely disagree. He said that the Government in framing the Bill had paid no regard whatever to the recommendations of the Royal Commission. If members read carefully the recommendations of the Commission and the amendments proposed by the Government, they will find that the Bill bristles with the recommendations of the Commission. Therefore, I am inclined to think that the hon. member either has not studied the Commission's recommendations, or else has not studied the amendments proposed by the Government. Last night I was rather surprised to hear the member for Sussex, who was one of the Commission, say that practically none of the evidence taken by the Commission was of any value except that given by experts.

Mr. Underwood: He was right there. There were no experts.

Mr. RICHARDSON: The member for Pilbara (Mr. Underwood) may know more about the matter than I do. However, we should not belittle any evidence given by anyone before the Commission, for the simple reason that the Commission asked for evidence. Other

members of the Commission will, I think, agree with me that, notwithstanding that we set out with certain preconceived ideas, some of the evidence given made us think, and think very seriously. It is only the man who goes on a Commission seeking information and prepared to receive evidence who can change his mind. I am satisfied that if the member for Sussex really meant what he said regarding the value of the evidence, he must have entered upon the investigation, and also come out of it, with a biased mind. As the results of the evidence given, we see the amendments proposed by the Government, every one of which is based wholly or in part on a recommendation made by the Commission. If the Commission have done nothing else, they have given the Government something by which the original Bill has been improved. It is impossible for me to go into all the amendments, but I may touch on the licenses reduction board. I do not mind confessing that when I entered on the investigation I was entirely opposed to the appointment of such a board here. However, the evidence and the figures adduced from Victoria were so overwhelming that I was obliged to consider seriously whether a licenses reduction board was not a better means of reform than any we have hitherto provided here. I have come to the conclusion that Western Australia must have a licenses reduction board.

Mr. Underwood: Such a board will not have a future here.

Mr. RICHARDSON: Perhaps it would be interesting if I gave the House some figures, prepared by the Commission, showing the results of the last local option poll. They disclose the fact that in the three districts which have the greatest number of people to each license, reduction was carried. Here are the figures: Broome, with a population of 1,050 and six licensed houses, the number of persons per license being 175, carried continuance. Collie, with a population of 8,150 and 10 licensed houses, the number of persons per license being 815, carried reduction. Coolgardie, 2,450 population, 14 licenses, 175 persons per license, carried continuance. Cue, 1,150 population, 20 licenses, number of persons per license 57, carried continuance. Guildford, 15,400 population, 13 licenses, 1,261 persons per license, carried reduction. Kalgoorlie, 23,100 population, 91 licenses, number of persons per license 254, carried continuance. Kanowna, 2,150 population 16 licenses, 134 persons per license, carried continuance. Kimberley West, 430 population, four licenses, 105 persons per license carried continuance. Leederville-Subiaco 30,960 population, eight licenses, 3,870 persons per license, carried reduction. Mount Magnet, 1,220 population, 21 licenses, 58 persons per license, carried continuance.

Hon. M. F. Troy: But only by a very small majority.

Mr. RICHARDSON: True, but continuance was carried there. In the very district where hon. members know that reduction

must take place, local option does not give it. In Kalgoorlie the evidence from both sides, the hotel-keepers and the temperance people, was conclusively in favour of a reduction of 50 per cent. in the number of hotel licenses. Yet each side told us that it was practically impossible to carry reduction on a local option poll. I take it hon. members must, therefore, give attention to the question of providing opportunity to bring about reduction.

Mr. Underwood: The number of licenses will reduce itself where there are unnecessary hotels.

Mr. RICHARDSON: I say it is for Parliament to provide the means of reduction, after such evidence.

Mr. Underwood: But you picked your evidence.

Mr. RICHARDSON: Let me draw attention to the evidence given by the chairman of the Licensed Victuallers' Association in Kalgoorlie. He told the Commission that the number of hotels in Kalgoorlie must be reduced by half, but when he was asked whether he would advocate reduction on a local option poll he deliberately replied, "No." What is one to do in such circumstances? Parliament must do something. Though we may favour local option to a certain extent, we must recognise, in view of the evidence from Victoria, that a reduction board is the only means of immediately reducing licenses in Western Australia.

Mr. Underwood: Can you advance any reason for reduction of licenses?

Mr. RICHARDSON: There is evidence all round us.

Mr. Underwood: Give us some reasons for reduction.

Mr. RICHARDSON: I am not here to give reasons. I am here to express my opinion as to the best means of bringing about reduction. My opinion is that a licenses reduction board is the quickest method for arriving at reduction.

Mr. Underwood: It is the quickest method of losing about £40,000 a year.

Mr. RICHARDSON: The hon. member has had an opportunity of speaking on this question, and I hope he will allow me now to express my opinion. Whilst advocating a licenses reduction board, I see some danger in the proposal from this aspect, that immediately the operations of the board come to an end, we shall have to revert to the local option poll. Otherwise there will be no opportunity for the people in particular electorates to say whether or not there shall be further reduction. If Parliament adopts a licenses reduction board, it should be only as a temporary expedient. The board should not be a permanent institution. If the introduction of the board means that the local option poll for reduction is to be dropped, then I must oppose the board, because I hold that the people in every district should have the right to say whether or not there shall be reduction. It is felt by all parties concerned that there is no possible chance of getting the necessary reduction by means of

a local option poll. Now I intend to touch on a few features of the Bill. As regards the bona-fide traveller provision, I am entirely in favour of cutting it out in the case of the metropolitan area; but I am not prepared to advocate its excision in the case of country districts, because I believe there is need for such a provision in the country.

Mr. Marshall: You would not advocate the abolition of the bona-fide traveller provision in my electorate, for instance, would you?

Mr. RICHARDSON: I am not prepared to say, because I do not know the conditions sufficiently well. However, I do know the conditions in the metropolitan area sufficiently well to say that there is no need for a bona-fide traveller clause there at all. Every observant man in the metropolitan area must be perfectly well aware that the men who claim the benefit of the bona-fide traveller provision on Sunday are not even to the extent of five per cent. actually bona-fide travellers. They are not compelled to travel on Sunday.

Mr. Lambert: A lot of them are bona-fide boozers.

Mr. RICHARDSON: I agree with the member for Coolgardie (Mr. Lambert). Those men are using the bona-fide traveller provision purely and simply in order to get away from their homes and go on a drunken spree on Sunday. That is the view I hold of at least 90 per cent. of the men who claim a drink under the bona-fide traveller provision in the metropolitan area on Sundays. The leading hotel-keepers in Perth and Fremantle came to us on the Commission and said that they had no desire that the bona-fide clause should apply in the metropolitan area. It is the desire of hotel-keepers in the metropolitan area to keep their trade clean and above board.

Mr. Mann: Would you ask them to supply meals to travellers on Sunday?

Mr. RICHARDSON: That is a different proposition. We are placing the hotel-keepers in an invidious position, because, notwithstanding the fact that one of them may know that a person is not a genuine traveller, he remains in the position that he cannot refuse to supply the individual because that individual has stated that he is a bona-fide traveller. The hotelkeepers said to the Commission that they wanted their Sundays free, and that they desired to close their bars and to be in the position to refuse to supply liquor at all. They demonstrated to us that they were always under suspicion when men walked in and out of the hotels. Therefore, we should cut out this provision so far as it applies to the metropolitan area and so afford a measure of relief to the better class of hotelkeepers. At any rate, we should fix a radius of 12 miles from the town hall.

Mr. Mann: The Commission suggests that it should be optional in the metropolitan area.

Mr. RICHARDSON: I would be prepared to see it optional, but if it be made optional we shall be giving something to the man who is not altogether honest, that is to say, we shall be leaving a loophole for the dishonest hotelkeeper of which he may take advantage. I am not prepared to say that I would cut out the clause so far as it applies to the country, but I do think it should be cut out in the metropolitan area. In the Commission's report, I think the distance from the Town Hall was made 10 miles. We found that that took in Fremantle and Midland Junction.

Mr. J. Thomson: You might have made it 20 miles.

Mr. O'Loughlen: Why not make it 1,000 miles? It is all right for you with your locker full.

Mr. RICHARDSON: Something has been said with regard to the strength of liquor, and until this Commission began its sittings I was always under the impression that by reducing the strength of alcoholic liquors we would bring about a state of sobriety. After having listened to the evidence of both sides, including that of experts, I have arrived at the conclusion that we shall not reach that state of sobriety which I anticipated by reducing the strength of liquor. If we are going to have liquor, I contend it should be served as pure as possible. It was ably demonstrated by the experts in giving evidence that by reducing the strength to a certain extent the liquors were rendered of no use, but apart from that, it was proved that by lowering the strength we would not reduce drinking, but, on the other hand, would bring about a system of consuming whisky, brandy and other spirits neat, instead of as at the present time diluting them with water or soda. There is one important matter included in the Bill, and it is, that beer shall not be sold of an alcoholic strength of over a certain percentage. It was proved to the Commission that beer of good quality could be made of reduced strength, and if we find at some future time that beer of a lighter quality can be successfully brewed, Parliament should then consider the advisableness of reducing the strength. After all, the average man does not go into an hotel to get drunk; he goes there to take refreshment which he requires. Therefore if we can supply to that individual something which is of a lighter quality, it is due to this Parliament to legislate in that direction. I listened with some degree of pleasure to the member for Nelson's speech last night, and I listened interestedly to what I might term his dramatic statements regarding the raising of the age at which liquor shall be supplied to males. The Bill provides that the age shall be increased from 18 to 21. The hon. member referred to patriots who called upon youths of 18 years to enlist, but how he was able to reconcile the statement of youths of this age going into camp with his suggestion that if they wanted to get

drunk they could do so, I really do not know. I look at this question from a sensible point of view. Every man in this House is of fairly mature age, and he knows that a boy's mind, his system and his frame are not properly developed at the age of 18. But between 18 and 21 a youth develops not only his faculties but also his physique to a greater extent than at any other period of his life. He develops from boyhood to manhood. His outlook on life is entirely different, and if you cut away from him those things which are likely to affect him in after life, a good service will be rendered. It is at the period of his life when he reaches 21, that a youth has sounder judgment as to what is right or wrong. Therefore, I regard the amendment which increases the age at which liquor shall be served to a person as one of the best in the Bill, and I hope every member will give it his support. It is on arriving at the age of 18 that a lad begins to drink shandy. I guarantee that every member in this House remembers that when he was at that age he was induced by his pals to go into hotels and drink first lemonade, then shandy, and then having acquired the taste for beer, to take beer neat and then perhaps develop a taste for whisky and other alcohols. I know what has happened to many, perhaps in this House, and I am not going to say that it has not happened to myself. But it is at that age that youths develop the drinking habit, as a result of which they are inclined to become jovial, so to speak, and don't care a hang about anything. Therefore I trust that this amendment will be agreed to. There has been some comment regarding the closing of billiard saloons in the metropolitan area at nine o'clock, or at the hour at which the hotels close. The reason for the Commission's recommendations in this regard I consider are very good. It has been pointed out in the police evidence given before the Commission that it is almost impossible to get a case for selling after hours where a billiard room is kept open in an hotel. The member for Nelson dealt fully with the question of billiard saloons in country towns. The recommendation of the Commission deals exclusively with those premises within a radius of 12 miles of the post office in Perth. It was because the police found it so difficult to secure a conviction against those drinking after hours in hotels where there were also billiard rooms that this recommendation was made. The existing position of affairs, whereby bars must close at nine o'clock and billiard rooms may remain open until 11 o'clock, creates an anomaly and prevents the police from going to an hotel and saying to a man that he is there for an illegal purpose. The individual can immediately reply that he is there merely for the purpose of a game of billiards. It is a question of the police not being able to exercise proper supervision where billiard saloons are allowed to remain open whilst the bars are closed. I believe that

the hotelkeepers are in favour of allowing this amendment to go through, because in the metropolitan area, at any rate, a billiard room in an hotel is looked upon as a sort of nuisance.

Mr. Underwood: Of course, you should never be allowed to play billiards.

Mr. J. Thomson: Nine o'clock is late enough.

Mr. RICHARDSON: What is the use of the Government or anybody trying to make the trade clean, if we are going to be opposed in those directions in which it is shown that distinct breaches of the Act have been committed, and where the police have had no supervision? It is all very well for the member for Pilbara to say that it is wrong to play billiards. The hon. member does other things which, perhaps, are worse than that.

Mr. Underwood: There are other members who do worse things.

Mr. RICHARDSON: I know there are. If the provisions of the Bill do not suit the member for Pilbara, I cannot help it. He has had a chance to express his views and I wish to express mine. Most hon. members approach the question of revenue to be derived from the liquor traffic from the point of view either of prohibitionists or of the hotelkeepers. Putting aside my ideas on the drink question, I wish to consider the revenue problem from an equitable standpoint. Yesterday an hon. member said that although not a prohibitionist, he hoped the trade would be taxed out of existence. In my view, while we legalise the liquor trade, we must be fair and just to it. I am not prepared to tax it out of existence. I believe a percentage on the purchases of liquor is the most equitable way of imposing a license fee. Personally, I do not think the liquor trade can pay 12 per cent. To impose so heavy a fee would be to kill some of the smaller hotelkeepers. Like the member for Perth (Mr. Mann), I believe a fair tax would be seven per cent. We would not be justified in imposing more than that.

Mr. Underwood: Put seven per cent. on tea.

Mr. RICHARDSON: That is beside the question. I do not know whether the hon. member drinks tea. It would be unfair to tax the hotelkeeper more than seven per cent. in addition to the two per cent. which he will have to pay for compensation. The Commission found that, generally speaking, hotelkeepers were not making huge fortunes. If we are to get revenue, let us be fair.

Mr. Underwood: That is right, try it on tea.

Mr. RICHARDSON: To please the hon. member, I am prepared to do even that.

Mr. SPEAKER: This is not the time to tax tea.

Mr. RICHARDSON: I will support the Government up to seven per cent., but no further. I am not in favour of any compensation fund to be taken from the revenue, although I agree to such a fund if provided by the hotelkeepers themselves. I oppose compensation from

State revenue, on the score that the licensees have already been given a time compensation of 10 years. Consideration of revenue brings us to the question of the licenses reduction board, because a portion of that two per cent. is to be devoted to the payment of fees to the board and to the licensing court. I agree with the member for Perth that we must be certain that there shall be only one board and one court, both composed of the same people. One licensing court and one reduction board consisting of the one personnel can easily transact the whole of the licensing business. In outback centres it may be desirable to grant to the local magistrate power to look after certain questions, but generally speaking it will be quite practicable for one body of three men to conduct the whole of the licensing business, including the reduction issue. I hope that in Committee the Premier will put it beyond all doubt that only the one set of men will be appointed.

Hon. T. Walker: He has already promised that.

Mr. RICHARDSON: Still I think we require to have it made very definite. The Commission came to the conclusion that, running side by side with the licenses reduction board, a State-wide poll on compulsory voting with an 85 per cent. vote would be sufficient. I was the only dissident. I believe we should take a local option poll, wet or dry, on the electoral boundaries. The Government, when laying down those electoral boundaries, took into consideration community of interests. That community of interests should be applied to all questions of licensing. Failing to secure local option on the electoral boundaries, the next most democratic measure is a State-wide poll taken unconditionally on a simple majority with compulsory voting. I fail to see why any conditions should be made, as for instance an 85 per cent. poll. If people will stay away from the poll, why should others who have been working hard to ensure a heavy poll be penalised? The principle is not democratic. The Government propose that the poll, to be effective, shall give a three-fifths majority. When I shall be convinced that the vote of he who favours the three-fifths majority is only two-fifths of a unit, while mine is worth three-fifths, I shall be prepared to consider the extraordinary proposition. In my view, every vote cast should be as good as the next.

Mr. Davies: That is not the point.

Mr. RICHARDSON: If a precedent of this sort be created, it must be applied to all cases. Those advocating a three-fifths majority for a local option poll would not consider it for any other kind of referendum. I shall be told there are vested interests to consider. But 10 years ago the vested interests agreed to a poll. Majority rule should be good enough for Australians. It is remarkable that the Premier has brought down a provision for a three-fifths majority, when we find on going through

the evidence before the Commission that those most directly interested were not clamouring for it. Mr. Jacoby, the general manager of the Swan Brewery, said he had no objection to a State-wide poll on a simple majority with compulsory voting, but otherwise unconditional. Mr. Jacoby may be taken as an authority on the desires of the hotelkeepers; yet he had no objection to offer. Other hotelkeepers said the same thing: they could not advocate the three-fifths majority. There was no evidence before the Commission on which the Premier could have determined to put up the three-fifths majority.

Mr. O'Loughlen: Hear, hear!

Mr. RICHARDSON: I hope that, when in Committee, the three-fifths majority will be cut out and a simple majority on compulsory voting inserted in its place.

Mr. O'Loughlen: If it is not, we will retain local option.

Mr. RICHARDSON: In Western Australia we have a travelling public. Numbers of our people are continually passing to and from the other States. On election day at least 7½ per cent. of those on the roll are out of the State. From five per cent. to 7½ per cent. of those on the roll are dead and buried. Then there are all the duplications to be accounted for. Altogether at least 15 per cent. of those on the roll are not here to vote on polling day. Thus it is necessary to get a full 100 per cent. of those entitled to vote to make up the 85 per cent. vote required, and so any possibility of success on compulsory voting with an 85 per cent. vote is wholly cut away.

Mr. Davies: Still, the three-fifths majority is defensible.

Mr. RICHARDSON: It is not democratic. I have always stood for simple majority rule, and I am not going to depart from it now. I believe in it, and I think every other man in his heart believes in it.

Mr. Durack: In this case you want permanency and stability.

Mr. RICHARDSON: We are always hearing the cry of vested interests, of permanence and stability. What does wealth matter? Are not lives better than wealth? We should consider humanity more than we do, and wealth less. It is said that the local option poll may create anomalies. No matter what we do, we create anomalies. Every Act that is passed affects the position one way or the other. If one person loses, probably 100 will gain. Parliament was constituted to give the greatest good to the greatest number. Members may say that an anomaly will be created by one district going dry and another remaining wet. In New Zealand certain districts went dry and others remained wet, and the same thing applies to the United States of America. The anomalies were not so great there that they created any ill feeling or any inconvenience. If any anomaly is created in this State it will not be of such a character as to hurt anyone. If people of a certain electorate say they wish to go dry, we should give them the right to do so.

Something has been said about the carrying away of liquor on Sundays. The idea of the Commission in dealing with this question was to make the penalty so severe that no man would wish to carry away liquor in bulk on Sundays from any hotel or club. There is a tremendous amount of this sort of thing going on, and it has created dissatisfaction in many districts. I hope the amendment in this regard will be passed. There is something in the new Bill which would give the right to the licenses reduction board to perhaps grant new licenses or reinstate old ones, provided a premium were paid, in certain districts where reduction had taken place by reason of a local option poll. I do not think the intention, when taking the local option poll, was to reinstate licenses if reduction were carried. If that were so, the local option poll would be futile. I am rather surprised that this small amendment was placed in the present Bill. Hon. members should look up the matter for themselves, because it would be entirely wrong for anything of the sort to happen. With regard to the carrying of liquor by males or females in a hotel under the age of 16, I wish to explain the reasons for the Commission's recommendations. At times waitresses are called upon to bring a bottle of lager or wine or something of that sort to a customer. Had we recommended the age of 21, it would have meant that all waitresses in hotels must be over the age of 21.

Mrs. Cowan: And a very good thing, if applied to both boys and girls.

Mr. RICHARDSON: I do not know that it would be. Waitresses are as good as anyone else in hotels. It would debar girls and perhaps boys from getting work in hotels if this age limit were imposed. They would not be permitted to go from the dining room and bring a bottle of lager from the bar and place it on the table unless they were of the age of 21. That was the reason why the Commission made its recommendation on this subject. It was not desired to deprive the girls of 18 to 20 of employment in hotels. I look upon the Bill more as a Committee Bill, but have touched upon a few matters concerning which the Government have disagreed with the recommendations of the Commission. When in Committee I intend to move some amendments. I hope if we cannot secure local option on the electoral boundaries, that we shall secure a State-wide poll. If we can get a State-wide poll on a simple majority and a compulsory vote without any qualifications, we shall be going a good way towards the desires of those who want a democratic measure and one that will perhaps meet with success.

Mr. McCALLUM (South Fremantle) [5.37]: I regret I have not had time to more fully compare the Bill with the recommendations of the Commission. That was my misfortune. The task ahead of anyone in comparing a 54-page Bill with the report of the Commission and the parent Act is a consider-

able one. Members should have been given longer than a week in order to get a grip of the suggestions of the Government, and be in a position to discuss the Bill more intelligently than it is possible for them to do now. This Bill is more of a reform Bill than that which was introduced last session. That was almost entirely a taxation Bill. The Commission outlined the steps which should be taken in the way of reform, and many of these have been adopted by the Government, and I think will do much good. In the course of the inquiries made by the Commission in various parts of the States, sections of so-called temperance reformers were met with who were opposed to the trade being made respectable. They wanted it to become as disreputable as possible in order to create public opposition, and they argued that it would thus be possible more quickly to bring about its abolition. The temperance movement is not the only movement where this view is adopted. These are the temperance red-raggers. We have a few in our own movement and they are in almost every form of organisation. We tried to take a different view, and wanted to place the trade on a respectable footing so as to make it an industry no one would be ashamed of. The Government have adopted a State-wide poll as against the local option, and this view is endorsed by the Commission. I have been a supporter of local option for many years, but it must be admitted that in actual practice it has not proved satisfactory. Generally the temperance organisations favour the State-wide poll as against the local option vote. When the great bulk of temperance organisations support the State-wide poll and the trade agrees, we have both extremes saying they are prepared to adopt the suggestion. It should not, therefore, be difficult for Parliament also to agree. Whilst in the Eastern States I inquired exhaustively into the operations of the local option vote there. It was not at all satisfactory in any of the States where it had been applied. There are districts which were obviously over-licensed, and in which there were altogether too many hotels. These districts persistently voted continuance. In New South Wales, in Wolloomooloo especially, there were many dirty hovels called hotels at almost every street corner. The surroundings were disgraceful, and yet these districts persistently voted by huge majorities for continuance, and there was no possible chance of local option effecting any reform or for any reduction of licenses being brought about. The same thing applied in Victoria, not only in the suburbs but in the heart of the city. A few years ago Little Collins-street and Little Bourke-street were thick with dirty disreputable hotels, which were the haunts of thieves and the worst characters of the community. A person hardly dared walk along those streets in daylight, for it practically meant taking one's life in one's hands. These districts voted continuance, and local option had no chance of clearing out these objectionable houses.

Since the establishment of the Licenses reduction Board all these hotels have been cleared out, and the trade has been cleaned up. These streets are now improved and respectable, and there is a decent class of hotel in the city, all the most objectionable places having been closed up. I wish to show the difference between the operations of local option in Victoria and the effect of the Licenses Reduction Board. There were 122 polls taken in Victoria for increase, and these resulted in a net increase of hotels of 145. There were 46 polls taken for decrease, prior to 1906, and these resulted in 217 hotels being closed. In the period up to 1906 there had been a decrease of 72 hotels under local option. These decreases had cost £908 per hotel, which had to be paid by the State. Since the board was established, and up to the end of December last, 1,437 hotels were closed at a cost of £514 per hotel, and this cost was borne by the compensation fund. There is thus a big difference between the effective work of the reduction board and the operations of the local option poll. If we are to have the trade cleaned up here and placed upon a respectable footing, we shall have to wait a long while for reform if we are going to do it by local option. To come nearer home, if the Leeder-ville and Subiaco licensing district were given hotels in proportion to its population, as laid down in Victoria, it would be entitled to another 27 hotels, and yet the district voted reduction. On the goldfields it is admitted by the trade that 50 per cent. of the hotels could be closed, and yet the people voted continuance and in other cases voted an increase. There is not much outlook in that direction for reform so far as reduction is concerned. It has been said in the course of the debate that the people of a particular district are those most concerned, and that if they vote for decrease or continuance, their decision should prevail. I differ from that argument, especially in connection with the country districts. It is not only the people resident in those districts who are concerned as to the accommodation provided in hotels in their particular districts. The people who travel through an area and may require accommodation should also receive consideration. Are we to argue that only the people residing in the city of Perth are concerned about the accommodation provided in the metropolitan hotels? What about the rest of the community? What about those who come to the city from other parts in order to transact business or to visit Perth? Are they not to be considered? Is not proper accommodation required for such people?

Mr. Chesson: The same thing applies in the country districts.

Mr. McCALLUM: That is so. While we were travelling round the country, the members of the Commission met a party of eight men who were passing through a district where there was no hotel. Because of that fact, they could not get accommodation and they had to go on after midnight for a fur-

ther 14 miles, in order to get accommodation at the nearest hotel. Surely such people are entitled to consideration as much, if not more so, as the people who are resident in that particular district. I notice that the Bill provides no minimum as to the number to which the hotels can be reduced. The Bill sets out that so long as money remains in the fund, the board can go on reducing the number of hotels. The Bill practically says that that must be done. What does that mean? While the payment of 2 per cent. into the compensation fund is not sufficient straight away, as time goes on and that fund mounts up, the instructions to the board are in effect that they must close the hotels while the money lasts. It may mean that in course of time the Bill will bring about prohibition by means of the contributions from the trade itself. That, surely, is a most unfair proposition. It is unfair to ask those engaged in the trade to pay into a fund for the purpose of wiping themselves out with their own money!

Mrs. Cowan: The provision is only for six years.

Mr. McCALLUM: Quite so, but in all probability it will be re-enacted. The same position will be created here as has been the experience in Victoria. At the end of the period, it will be renewed from time to time. In Victoria there is a balance of upwards of a quarter of a million pounds in hand and the trade is pushing for a reduction in the tax. In Victoria the Act provides a minimum below which the Licenses Reduction Board cannot go. If there is to be any justice and fairness in the spending of the money contributed by these people, the Bill should provide for a minimum number below which the board in given districts cannot go. That appears to me to be a vital omission which should be remedied by the Government. I notice the recommendation of the Commission that for all new licenses tenders should be called, has not been adopted by the Government. The Premier has said that a premium will be received in respect of licenses granted. The Bill provides for that; but that is the existing law to-day. The Premier says that in future the premium must be a substantial one. In the past it has amounted to little more than 5s. in some cases. In the opinion of the Commission, the State, by virtue of the fact that it was granting a monopoly in certain districts, had the right to receive compensation. That compensation should go to the State instead of going to certain individuals. If the Government called for tenders and sold the lease to the highest bidder, the State would receive some benefit. The Government, however, refuse to collect revenue in that direction and propose to make a present of this monopoly to the individual. In the mallee districts of Victoria, the board fixed a fair rental by deciding what a building without a license would be worth and what it would be worth with the license. The difference between the values of the building with and without the license, respectively, is

fixed by the board as the amount to be paid into the coffers of the State. That is the latest operation of this measure in the mallee districts in Victoria, and surely the same thing should be done here.

The Minister for Works: In such a case, the Government would get the benefit of the ingoing instead of the owner of the premises.

Mr. McCALLUM: Exactly; the Government would get the full benefit of the value of the license granted for the premises. The present Government are "stony broke" and I do not know why they have turned down the proposal of the Commission.

The Minister for Works: You need not reproach us with our poverty.

Mr. McCALLUM: I propose to give the Government a little more of that later on. It is time the Government were hit up about it.

Mrs. Cowan: There is provision for the Government to get a premium.

Mr. McCALLUM: That is the existing law, but the Government have only received a guinea, or two guineas, or three guineas, as the case may be.

Mrs. Cowan: There is a saving clause here.

Mr. McCALLUM: On page 10 of the report of the Royal Commission, hon. members will find a record of the premiums paid. It sets out the premiums at various amounts and £25 is the highest premium received. Those amounts show what has been received in the past. Perhaps hon. members are aware of cases where an hotel has been put up and a license has been granted to an individual. Without doing a tap, the owner of that license finds the next day that it is worth thousands of pounds.

Mr. Chesson: That happened in Meekatharra.

Mr. McCALLUM: Why cannot that augmented amount go into the coffers of the State? It is the State, and not the individual that confers the monopoly under that license. Strange to say, the trade supported that proposition. Their witnesses said it was a fair thing that the State should reap the benefit. There was no opposition to that proposal. I am at a loss to understand why the Government have not adopted it. I also regret that the Government have not seen fit to strike out the licenses for railway cars altogether. The Commission recommended that that should be done. The Government have gone so far as to say that these licenses will in future be controlled by the licensing bench. We asked that the license should be struck out altogether and I hope that will be done when we consider the Bill in Committee. It has been stated that the control of those railway cars has improved since they were let to private contractors, in comparison with the experience when they were under the control of the Commissioner of Railways. We had the evidence of a lessee of one of the cars and he told us that he did not push the sale of

liquor. He catered for the requirements of his passengers at the dining table and he said that that was when he liked to see them taking liquor. Apart from that time, he did not push the sale of liquor at all. We boarded the train at Kalgoorlie and the coaches had hardly left the station platform, before a waiter came along and announced that the bar was open if passengers desired a drink. We reached Northam on Sunday morning. Before 7 o'clock, when passengers were still in their bunks, a waiter came along and announced from door to door, right down the train: "The bar is open, gentlemen." This demonstrated that, on the contrary, these people were actually catering for this business and pushing the drink trade. It is difficult to see why we should have drink on the trains, as well as at the refreshment rooms. It is most objectionable for passengers travelling by train if a man is under the influence of liquor. Passengers cannot get away from such a man, as they are horded together in a small space, which prevents one from getting rid of such individuals. It appears to me that the conduct of the Great Western railway is quite satisfactory, and if that state of affairs can operate on a long journey such as that from Kalgoorlie to Port Augusta, there is no reason why it should not operate on our State railways.

Mrs. Cowan: Hear, hear!

Mr. McCALLUM: I regret the Government have included the provision for the registration of bar attendants. That provision was contained in the Bill last session. Not one member of the Commission supported that proposal. No evidence was given to show that it was necessary. I warn the Government that if they desire this Bill to go through before Christmas, they must drop that provision.

The Minister for Works: I would not threaten the Government if I were you.

Mr. McCALLUM: That is where I stand. There was a lot of interesting evidence given before the Commission, and if the Minister likes I will read some of it to him. At the same time, the Government will not get that provision included in the Act, if I can stand up and defeat it here. To tell a man who is working for wages and has to obey the instructions of his employer, that if he does something and breaks the law, his registration will be cancelled and he will be debarred from employment in the industry, while such a worker has no say in the management of the business but is simply there to carry out instructions, is absolutely outrageous. He should not be asked to accept that responsibility. Would the Minister for Works hold anyone responsible for doing something that he told him to do? On the contrary, the Minister would accept the responsibility for his own instructions. The Bill says that, no matter what instructions have been issued to bar tenders, if they carry out those instructions and break the law by doing so, their registration will be cancelled and—out they go.

We know very well that laws are passed not to deal with the men who act fairly, but in order to deal with unscrupulous men. In this industry, as in others, there are unscrupulous employers. Such unscrupulous employers may instruct their harmen to effect sales under any circumstances, and their employees, having broken the law, will be thrown out of work. If such employees refuse to carry out the instructions given to them, they are sacked. What sort of a position is that?

The Minister for Works: You always take up the struggle if that sort of thing is done.

Mr. McCALLUM: But the Government want to put this sort of thing into the laws of the State. If a man, who is serving behind the bar, is told by his employer to stay there after hours and serve men who require drink, and that man does not do so, he will be sacked. On the other hand, if he carries out his instructions and the police come in, he is caught in the act and, his registration being cancelled subsequently, he is deprived of any further opportunity of employment in connection with that industry.

The Minister for Works: If a man were sacked under such unreasonable circumstances, your union would take up his case; you are all-powerful.

Mr. McCALLUM: The Minister knows very well that in such cases the man would not be told why he was being sacked. The man would be told that he has come late to work, that the colour of his eyes had changed, or some other excuse would be advanced for his dismissal.

Mr. Munisie: Any excuse would be given except the real one.

Mr. McCALLUM: We have at the present time an arbitration law and it provides against employees being victimised for any action they may take in connection with a trades union or an industrial dispute. In the long history of trades unionism in this State there has only been one case where victimisation has been penalised by the Arbitration Court. Yet how many thousands and tens of thousands of cases have there been in which there has been victimisation? How many times have employees been sacked because they moved motions at union meetings, or addressed those meetings on industrial subjects? We cannot sheet home charges of this nature against employers. If an employer is spoken to about any action he has taken, he will say: "I did not know that he moved a motion at the union meeting. I did not know that my employee advocated an increase in wages. My object in getting rid of him was simply to make a change. He was not satisfactory in his work." Some such excuse will be advanced by an employer. That is what would be done in a case such as that under review. It is the business of the employer to accept the responsibility for the conduct of his hotel. If the responsibility is to be placed on the shoulders of the bar tenders and that provision is to be included in the amended legislation, I can only regard such a proposition

as outrageous, and I hope the Government will not press that provision. It was not supported by any of the witnesses before the Commission except by a few engaged in the city trade. It was by no means supported by the trade generally. Where the suggestion comes from, or who is giving the push behind the Government to have this clause inserted, I do not know. It is certain, however, that it will receive our most strenuous opposition. I do not know why the Government should name two separate bodies under this Bill. The Premier gave an assurance yesterday that the same personnel would constitute both the licenses reduction board and the licensing court. Where is the necessity for having two separate boards? Our recommendation was that the one body be clothed with all the power and authority requisite to deal with the various phases of the question. Why name them a licensing court to-day and a reduction board to-morrow? The possibility of legal complications ensuing as a result of having two separate bodies should be obviated. I regret that the Bill does not give the board power to borrow money. The Commission recommended that for the first year power be given to the board to borrow money. Without that power, their opportunity to operate will be delayed by at least a year.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: I would not give them that power.

Mr. McCALLUM: We proposed that the board should get an advance from the Government, as was done in Victoria, and as revenue from taxation was received from the trade, the Government should recoup themselves. Now, however, the board will have to sit back for the first 12 months without being able to effect any reductions. If the Government's proposal to have the first poll in 1924 is accepted, the board will not have had a chance to demonstrate the effect of their work before the vote for a wet or dry State is taken. Some arrangement should be made to enable the board to borrow money from the outset. Outside of the Government there are plenty of people who would be prepared to advance the money. I am not sure whether the Bill as drafted has not made the tax retrospective.

Mr. Mann: It is intended to do so.

Mr. McCALLUM: The Premier was silent on this point when moving the second reading. I do not know of any other tax which has been made retrospective, especially when the tax has been levied on sales for which returns have had to be furnished. Suppose a man has not kept accurate accounts, how can he say what sales he effected during the past 12 months? The Bill provides that if the licensed victualler is not in a position to supply the necessary returns, the Government may assess him. The Government will thus constitute themselves arbitrary judges of the position. Retrospective taxation is always most ob-

jectionable. I can imagine what an outcry would have gone up in this State had a similar proposal emanated from a Labour Government. We remember the cry regarding confiscation that was heard when the Queensland Government suggested a revision of land rents by a court. What would have happened if a Labour Government had suggested taxing business done 12 months before? This proposal, however, has emanated from a different source and there is therefore no squeal about it.

Mr. Munsie: There are no newspapers to make it known.

Mr. McCALLUM: The Premier did not mention this aspect of the question when moving the second reading. Retrospective taxation of this description is both unfair and iniquitous, and should not be approved by Parliament. There is a peculiar proposal which I cannot understand, and I hope the Premier will explain it later on. When the compensation is assessed, the amount to which the landlord is entitled is to be based on the probable rent for three years after deprivation, but the licensee is to be compensated on the basis of the three years preceding deprivation. Why should there be this differential treatment between landlord and licensee? If it is fair to base the licensee's compensation on the business of the three years preceding deprivation, it is equally fair to adopt the same basis for the landlord. No doubt it would be argued by the landlord that increased population and increased trade had influenced him in determining to increase the rent. All sorts of excuses of this kind would be advanced.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: I think you will find that the Bill refers to three years without the license.

Mr. McCALLUM: It says three years after deprivation.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: That means without the license.

Mr. McCALLUM: If that is the intention, it should be distinctly stated. I hope the Minister will make that point clear, because if my interpretation is correct, this differentiation is most unfair. The Commission recommended that the taking of liquor from licensed premises during prohibited hours should be forbidden, and that if any one was caught so doing the police should have the right to seize the liquor. The Government have turned down that proposal, the plea being that a boarder going out would be liable to be seized by the police and have his luggage searched for liquor. At present there is nothing to prevent a bona fide traveller entering an hotel during prohibited hours and carting away as much liquor as he likes. That is the whole trouble with the hotels along the riverside. Young fellows out yachting call at the hotels and take liquor away to consume on the banks or the boats. This sort of thing has preceded a couple of accidents which have resulted in loss of life. Another case was mentioned in evidence by the police. From a hotel in the city, liquor was consistently

carted to a house opposite one Sunday. The police watched for some time and eventually caught the yardman who, when asked what he was doing with the liquor, replied that he had purchased it from the licensee on the previous day and was entertaining some friends in the house opposite. The police were powerless to interfere. That illustrates how the law is being circumvented at present. Our suggestion would have obviated this sort of thing. The Commission's recommendation that any liquor being taken from licensed premises during prohibited hours might be seized, is a fair one. The police could be trusted not to seize and search the luggage of every decent boarder who happened to be leaving an hotel during prohibited hours. Regarding the tax the Commission did not agree on any percentage, but I think the Premier has adopted the moral so often preached to us in youthful days, namely, to aim high. He has aimed high, I suppose, with the idea of getting about half way. I cannot seriously believe that he expected the House to agree to anything like the percentage he suggested. The Premier in his opening remarks said that the Commission proposed basing the tax on the price of the commodity f.o.b. London, and that we would not agree to it being based on the price f.o.b. Fremantle. The Commission said nothing of the sort. The Premier is entirely wrong in that statement. Where he gathered that impression, I do not know. The Bill before the House last session, if passed as printed, would have necessitated the tax being imposed on the invoice cost. This would have meant that the further from Perth a man was trading, the higher the amount of his tax would be. We had taken evidence on the Eastern Goldfields, and it was not until we reached Geraldton that this aspect was brought under our notice. We found that there were local men buying from the city and doing the trade for the whole of the district, and that a man at Meekatharra or Peak Hill would have to pay on the cost of the liquor at his hotel, which would include all the handling charges, freight etc., on top of the original cost. A man in the North-West would have to pay on the added cost of wharfage charges and freight. Thus people outback would have been penalised to this additional extent. The Commission proposed that the tax should be levied on the price of beer at the place of manufacture and on the price of spirits f.o.b. Fremantle for shipment to the North-West, and on rail Perth for spirits freighted to the country districts. Under this proposal there would have been no additional impost on the man in the back country as against the man in the city. I shall not support taxation to anything like the extent the Premier has suggested. In fact, I intend to vote him as little additional revenue as possible until his spendthrift Government handle the expenditure more judiciously and show greater consideration for economy. There are many other phases which have

been dealt with by the Commission to which I shall refer during the Committee stage.

Sitting suspended from 6.15 to 7.30 p.m.

Hon. T. WALKER (Kanowna) [7.30]: I regard the measure that is now receiving the consideration of this Chamber as certainly one of the most important that can be submitted to it. I regard it in this light, not because I believe it will accomplish what is being anticipated either by the Premier or others who have spoken in support of it, but because it is a proof that there is a stir in the world for reform in respect of the liquor trade. The lamentable feature of all measures of this kind is that they show a species of partnership between the evil and the Government of the State. The measure recognises a very dangerous evil requiring the most drastic regulation in order to preserve it at all. That is the first thing it does. This is not a measure dealing with ordinary business or trade. It deals with something that has evil written upon its face, as well as mischief and disaster. The object of the Government, one would judge by the measure, is to minimise by all kinds of enactments the recognised evil of the drink traffic. It would occur perhaps to a civilised individual in the 40th century, looking back upon history as something of an anomaly that the Government existing for the welfare of its citizens, created for the betterment of the people of the State, should deliberately and for the purpose of making money out of it, enter into a partnership with what is admittedly recognised as inimical and dangerous to the community. It will be looked upon as a sort of hypocrisy. The sincerity of this age will be questioned by the ages to come. People will glance at the hour in which we live as representing times when men can hypocritically curse a trade and at the same time join hands with it and pocket the profits from it. That is undoubtedly lamentable. In all these enactments there must be a species of hypocrisy, or what may even be termed sheer humbug. This measure is looked upon by some, as all measures of this kind are, as an interference with the liberty of the people and of the individual. Even the Premier in his speech, though I credited him with large liberal mindedness, tells us that we must have a large majority for prohibition, because he objects to a bare majority telling him what he shall drink. That view has been argued. It has been sounded in every note of the octave by members who have spoken on the subject.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: Except one, the member for Subiaco.

Hon. T. WALKER: That hon. member, it is true, did not defend the liberty of the publican to do what he liked, or the liberty of the drinker to drink what he liked. Is it not hypocritical? The member for Pilbara (Mr. Underwood) particularly bemoaned the fact of this so-called interference with his liberty and his resentment at any dictation as to

what he should participate in by way of a beverage. What is the work of this Chamber for, but the curtailment of any individual liberty calculated to injure the community? We place upon ourselves restrictions for the good of others, for the rights of others. The moment two men exist in the world the will of both must be modified, so that agreement between the two can exist. We cannot have dominancy in one when there is more than one in the world. We cannot do what we like even with what we call our own. The members of this Chamber who were defending the existence of the liquor trade, unrestrained, on the score that they would not have their personal liberty interfered with, do not own their own children, in the sense that they are not free from the operations of the will of the people. We compel a man to send his children to school whether he wants them to be educated or not. We compel him to clothe his children in decency. He cannot turn his children out into the street in a state of nakedness. They must be clothed in a state of respectability. His wife is equally under the restraint of social laws. If she dared to go out dressed in male clothing, she would be brought up in the Police Court for masquerading as a man. A man owns property, yet in the city he must build his houses in such a way that the structure is approved by the governing body. A man may take up a tract of country for the purpose of farming. The community can take a slice of it for any public work that is required. We can do nothing that we desire to do, purely untrammelled, with anything we possess, not even with our own bodies or our own frames. If the hon. member for Pilbara insisted that he had had enough of life and wished, like Cato of old, or the modern Japanese, to free himself from the encumbrances of living, and he were to attempt to commit suicide—if he succeeded he would surely go down below, but if he failed he would possibly go to gaol. We cannot call our lives our own. They belong to the community, as every individual life does. We are not allowed to eat what we like if it be poisonous. It is a crime against the State to attempt to injure either through ignorance or will that body, which is the property of the whole community. The very foundations of society rest upon the principle that no individual in the community can live for himself and himself alone. He must have a consciousness of his relations with his fellows, and must be governed by the happiness and well being of his fellows. What is the use of talking about dictation as to what we shall eat or drink? We cannot please ourselves upon these matters. People cannot buy bad meat if they want it. We have our meat inspectors to see that the sellers of tainted meat are punished if they put it upon the market. The public is prevented from eating meat of that kind. We do the same with our fruit. We have inspectors everywhere to see that no doubtful commodity is placed upon the market. Where is our

liberty? If we liked to live in the old ways, as they did in London in the middle ages, and to throw our slops from the top window without having proper sanitary accommodation, is it to be imagined that we would enjoy immunity? We must conform to our sanitary regulations. If we do not keep our premises in a healthy condition, the inspector is upon us; we are summoned to the police court and fined, and properly so. What department of life is there that is free from this control? One gets ill. It is one's body that is the misfortune: plague, or smallpox, or some other disease attacks one. Is one then allowed to seek one's own nest, to go where one chooses, to come into the heart of the city to nestle? No. One is taken out to quarantine, and compelled to live away from one's own family, it may be, for a time. What liberty can one put one's finger upon and say that it belongs purely to oneself? One cannot eat what one likes, and one cannot drink what one likes, altogether apart from this traffic. The only point is, what is dangerous to the community in this respect? The Bill admits that drink is dangerous. The member for Perth (Mr. Mann), in a very calm, deliberate, and informative speech, told us—it seemed to me, with some measure of pride—that he is not a prohibitionist. Yet this House is distinctly prohibitionist, and has been ever since it passed a liquor law. In the old measure of 1911 we make it an offence, punishable with fine, for a man to sell drink after hours. Now let us see the consistency of the Premier about being told what he shall do. In an hotel a man can drink up till 9 o'clock; it used to be up till 11 o'clock. But one minute after the hour there is prohibition.

Mr. Pickering: You cannot buy drink after nine, but you can drink it after nine. That is an important difference.

Hon. T. WALKER: If a man buys drink before nine, he does not wait until after nine to drink it. That would be a very dangerous thing to do, from a legal point of view. But there is the fact that a man is prohibited from selling drink one minute after 9 o'clock at night, or one minute before 9 o'clock in the morning. People can have a thirst after 9 p.m. Most people begin to get thirst very strongly after that hour. Or they may get thirsty before nine in the morning. If they have had too much the night before, the thirst may come before six in the morning. I am not speaking from ignorance, but from knowledge and experience. I have known what it is to have a thirst. But I have conquered it. I can do without a drink; and what I can do the whole community can do. I can work better, keep better health, and have more happiness without drink than ever with it. I say, then, that we have prohibition. But we have more. Under the 1911 Act a publican committed an offence if he sold drink to an inebriated person, one drunk. If he supplied any more liquor to such a person, he was guilty of an offence, and could be brought before the police court and treated as a quasi

criminal. This measure goes further, and says that no liquor shall be supplied to any person showing visible effects of alcohol. Those are not the words, but that is the meaning. The Premier in his speech put it "semi-intoxicated." We prohibit the sale of drink to anyone who is partly intoxicated, or semi-intoxicated, or showing visible signs of the influence of drink.

The Premier: That is a very good clause.

Hon. T. WALKER: I am not denying that. But it would be better if we prohibited the sale of drink altogether. Why stop half-way? Why not prevent a man getting any drink at all? Then there would be no need to stop him when he was half seas over. Let us start at the beginning. We admit the principle. Moreover, we have passed a prohibition law for the aborigines. Sections 4 and 5 of the Aborigines Act, which are repeated in the Criminal Code, say:—

Any person who sells, supplies, or gives any fermented, spirituous, or other intoxicating liquor in any quantity whatsoever, either alone or mixed with any other substance, or opium, to any aboriginal or half-caste, shall be guilty of an offence and liable on summary conviction to a penalty not exceeding £100, or any term of imprisonment not exceeding six months, or to both.

And then the aboriginal is guilty also. Further, it is provided that the minimum penalty shall be one-fifth of the maximum, and that "such minimum penalty shall not be liable to reduction under any power of mitigation which would, but for this subsection, be possible by the court." I want to know why we have prohibition for the blacks.

Mr. Mann: Because of their temperament.

Hon. T. WALKER: Temperament! I have seen some blacks who had as solid and firm a temperament as some whites. Why prohibition for the blacks? This is out and out prohibition for them. They are not to have a drop of alcoholic liquor.

Mr. Chesson: And they are dying out.

Hon. T. WALKER: Certainly, killed by liquor, or the effects of liquor. The whites have carried amongst the blacks the diseases generated by the liquor trade. Is there not something good in alcohol? Does it not warm one, and fortify one? Does it not build up the spirit and make a man of one?

Mr. Underwood: It makes you love your fellow man.

Hon. T. WALKER: Yes. I have heard that said in a criminal court where drink had played its part with a murderous knife.

Mr. Underwood: That man had the dry horrors.

Hon. T. WALKER: I wish to goodness the member for Pilbara would always have the dry horrors. It would be a bit of variety. We admit that there is a weak race, and in order that we may preserve the race—that is the good intention—we say they shall not touch alcohol, because we recognise that alcohol might kill them, destroy them, make

them unfit to bear life's burdens. Where is the consistency? There is prohibition, prohibition of the very strongest kind. Let us have consistency. If prohibition is good for a weak black, it is good for a weak white. There can be no question whatever about that. Every one of our laws emphasises the fact that drink is an evil, and not to be trusted.

Mr. Mann: There is provision for the weak white.

Hon. T. WALKER: What provision?

Mr. Mann: You can put him under prohibition.

Hon. T. WALKER: There again, prohibition for the weak white! I am glad of that interruption. We can put the weak white man under the prohibition portion of the Act. That is another phase of the logical administration of the law. A man gets more than is good for him, and is two or three days, or two or three weeks, under the influence, and some kind friend, or somebody having an interest in him, takes him before a magistrate, and the magistrate decrees that the man is not to be supplied with any liquor for the next six months or 12 months. And every publican is compelled by the law to refuse to supply that man with any liquor of an intoxicating nature. Prohibition for the weak white man! We have it in operation. Where is our dread of it? It is on our Statute-book now. Let me tell my friends that some of these so-called weak white men, victims of alcohol, are of the best type that we have ever had amongst us. I do not like to mention names, but they could be mentioned in a long list, of bright intellects—

Mr. Underwood: They could not.

Hon. T. WALKER: They could. I say I do not want to mention names here, but they could be mentioned, and in a long list—men of big hearts, men of a social disposition, men with illuminated imagination, men with all those qualities that make the thinker and the poet, carried away, some of them put in early graves, in consequence of the evil which we are trying to regulate by this measure. Of course alcohol never does get a strong hold upon the brainless. They can indulge to excess, and show no effects. Like the barrel that is always full of beer, they do not get drunk, because their heads, instead of containing brains, are only made of wood. There are men personally known to me who never could be affected by alcohol, because they have no brains to be affected by the poison.

The Premier: They are mostly Scotch, too, are they not?

Hon. T. WALKER: Scotchmen are particularly susceptible to the influence of liquor. I have seen them in a jolly mood more than once.

Mr. Lambert: Foo' the noo!

Hon. T. WALKER: Why impose this upon the weak man? Why impose it upon the individual who is comparatively sober for a few weeks and then requires drink? Why impose it on the man who says, with the Premier: "I object to you saying what

and when I shall drink?" There, too, the individual is confronted with prohibition! What right, it may be asked, have we to stop that man from having his drink if he so desires it? What business is it of ours to stop him getting what he wants? What interest is it of ours that we should do such a thing? It is, Mr. Speaker, the interest of the community. That is the foundation of it all. We all have an interest in the sobriety of our fellow man. Our property is endangered, our comfort threatened, our lives are in jeopardy, and our morals are in the balance when drink is loose amongst us. That is why we interest ourselves in this aspect. We insist upon it, that there shall be some regulation for the protection of those who drink and those who do not drink alike. That is for our welfare. It is our sole ground and right for interfering in this respect. I submit that the argument we have heard from the member for Nelson (Mr. J. H. Smith) in defence of drinking at the age of 13, has no substance in it. That hon. member spoke of the men who responded to the trumpet call to be the valiant defenders of our country and said that surely those men had the right to swallow their quarts if they wanted the liquor! That was his argument. I appreciate the bonhomie and good fellowship of that hon. member when he says: "We want good fellowship, comradeship, a good heart to come and have a drink." That is his story. That is his sign of civilisation—"Come and have a drink"! Cannot a man show his hospitality without filling his stomach with some kind of alcohol that goes to his brain? I scarcely think that is reasoning rationally. Is it the only way to show one's comradeship by saying "Come and have a drink?"

Mr. Underwood: That is one way.

Hon. T. WALKER: And a poor way.

Mr. Underwood: It won the war.

Hon. T. WALKER: It won the war! Is that the only companionship we have, Mr. Speaker?

Hon. M. F. Troy: It was Billy Hughes who won the war.

Hon. T. WALKER: It was certainly one way in the olden days. That was in the time when people thought that they could not be happy unless they were absolutely blind to the interests of the world, and unless they were gushing, with tongue loosened and eyes glistening, in consequence of the effect of alcohol. In those days that was supposed to be the only happiness attainable.

Mr. Lutey: They pushed ahead in those times.

Hon. T. WALKER: Is there no companionship of emotion that is normal? Must we have our minds stimulated by narcotics before we can show what good fellows we are? Is it necessary for us to become half drunk before we can prove that we are companionable men?

Mr. Pickering: There is no need to become half drunk.

Hon. T. WALKER: Well, let him be a quarter drunk! I do not care how much the hon. member requires, but is it necessary for men to be so stimulated before they can prove their companionship?

Mr. Underwood: I think it is.

Hon. T. WALKER: The hon. member should not try to be funny. I would ask the hon. member to go and live with the black men who have prohibition and where they have had experience of it.

Mr. Underwood: Don't be nasty!

Mr. SPEAKER: Order!

Hon. T. WALKER: Then do not be funny! The hon. member has had his chance.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! Will the member for Kanowna address the Chair?

Hon. T. WALKER: I think it is pitiable that we have an hon. member of that type that exhibits itself by vulgar interruptions and by a defence of the greatest evil to himself that he can put his hand on. It is a sad thing in our public life; it is a sad thing in his life.

Mr. Underwood: Why not go further?

Hon. T. WALKER: I do not intend to continue along those lines. I wish to deal with the arguments put forward by the hon. member freely and frankly and to deal also with the arguments advanced by the member for Nelson, who has an enthusiasm for the "come-and-have-a-drink" chap, and who referred to all others as "wowzers."

The Minister for Works: What is a "wowser"?

Hon. T. WALKER: No one knows exactly what a "wowser" is. He is apparently a man who will not patronise the publicans. From what I can understand now, he is a man who will not spend all his money in shouting.

Mr. J. H. Smith: No.

Hon. T. WALKER: Then what is a "wowser"?

Hon. M. F. Troy: He is a kill-joy.

Hon. T. WALKER: What joy?

Mr. J. H. Smith: Drink makes one merry.

Hon. T. WALKER: What joy is killed?

Hon. M. F. Troy: Any joy.

Hon. T. WALKER: Where is the joy in guzzling? Where is the joy in drinking inordinately? If that were the position, one might feel proud of the term "wowser." What joy is there that a drunken or half-drunken man can have, that a sober man cannot enjoy?

Mr. Willcock: The same thing applies to food.

Hon. T. WALKER: Exactly.

Mr. Willcock: A man may be a gourmand, just as he can be a drunkard.

Hon. T. WALKER: That is so. One can cheer himself up by over-eating, just as he can by over-drinking.

Mr. Willcock: And he can make himself just as miserable.

Hon. T. WALKER: Quite true. What does this imply? Does it imply that food in itself is bad?

Mr. Willcock: Yes, if you have too much. The same applies to drink if you have too much.

Hon. T. WALKER: Alcohol in itself is bad.

Mr. J. H. Smith: Who is the judge of that?

Hon. T. WALKER: Science.

Mr. J. H. Smith: You are not advancing your own judgment?

Hon. T. WALKER: No, I would scorn to put my judgment above that of the hon. member in ordinary matters. I have, however, endeavoured to make myself familiar with the facts. I have endeavoured to get at the truth regarding these things.

Mr. Underwood: And you have not succeeded.

Hon. T. WALKER: No matter where it is to be found, I have sought for that information, and I have consulted the latest, most skilled and accomplished of instructors as to the effect of alcohol on the human system. It is not a food.

Mr. Lutey: Certainly it is.

Hon. T. WALKER: Everyone knows that alcohol contains carbon, hydrogen, and oxygen, but not one particle of nitrogen, so that it cannot be a food.

Mr. Underwood: The Prices Regulation Commission decided that it was a food.

Hon. T. WALKER: There is not the slightest evidence to show that it is a food. On the other hand, the authorities deny that there is any food value whatever in alcohol.

Mr. Willcock: You can get high opinions on the other side.

Hon. T. WALKER: You cannot do so.

Mr. Willcock: Just the same as you can get different opinions from lawyers.

Hon. T. WALKER: Who has the hon. member consulted? Has he investigated this question?

Mr. Willcock: Yes.

Hon. T. WALKER: What authorities have said that alcohol is a food?

Mr. Willcock: We will discuss that afterwards.

Hon. T. WALKER: Very well. I say it has been absolutely demonstrated that alcohol has no nutrition, and there is nothing body-building about it. Some say it is a heat food, and is a heating force. That argument has been entirely dissipated by the investigation of Dr. Richardson and others.

Mr. J. H. Smith: And why do leading doctors give champagne to patients?

Hon. T. WALKER: Some leading doctors, to begin with, are still in the old school.

Mr. J. H. Smith: The best of them, too.

Hon. T. WALKER: The doctors who comprise the new school know the effects of alcohol and they occasionally give it to sick people just as they will give strychnine to others. Strychnine and arsenic are both administered as medicines.

Hon. M. F. Troy: And mercury, too.

Hon. T. WALKER: They are admittedly poisons but they are given to counteract other poisons. Alcohol, instead of a heat producer, is a cold producer, and for that reason the

consumption of alcohol was prevented in Russia, where prohibition was enforced in the army on account of the cold weather. It was found during the great march from Moscow by Napoleon's army that the men who best survived the cold were either the moderate drinkers or the teetotallers, while those habituated to alcohol succumbed readily. Dr. Richardson—

Mr. Underwood: Who is Dr. Richardson anyhow?

Hon. T. WALKER: He is certainly not one of the hon. member's friends.

Mr. Underwood: But who is he?

Hon. T. WALKER: Dr. Richardson made an experiment to demonstrate the effect of alcohol on certain animals. He experimented more particularly with pigeons. He submitted the birds to certain temperatures. One bird was without alcohol; another was half poisoned with alcohol, and the other was made insensible with the liquor. When the cold was administered, it was found that the bird that was altogether drunk, died, the other one with difficulty survived, and the one without liquor survived well.

Mr. Chesson: It must have been bad liquor.

Hon. T. WALKER: It was the same liquor for each bird. All alcohol is bad; there can be no question about that. I am not going to enter upon the ground I have traversed before.

Mr. Underwood: Do you think a man is a pigeon?

Hon. T. WALKER: I take it that hon. members are familiar with the facts of modern science, and that alcohol is particularly injurious to the nervous and brain system of man. That has been demonstrated by every orgy experienced or witnessed by hon. members of this Chamber. We know the effects of it. Some hon. members talk about "wowzers"! Was Shakespeare a "wowser"? Yet it was he who said, "Oh that men should put an enemy in their mouths, to steal away their brains."

The Minister for Works: He took it himself.

Hon. T. WALKER: It was the same Shakespeare who said—

O thou invisible spirit of wine,

If thou hast no name to be known by,

Let us call thee Devil!

Is there a great thinker or teacher of the world who has not condemned the use of alcohol as a beverage?

Mr. Underwood: You can't put too much reliance on these poets.

Hon. T. WALKER: And we can't put too much reliance on those members who keep interrupting. If one is called a wowser for holding these views, he is at least in good company. We are fighting, those of us who are convinced of the truth of the views I have expressed, not for ourselves. Why should it matter to me how others abuse their bodies or their lives? It is not for me to

worry. I can do without liquor, can be happy without it. There is no good joke I cannot enjoy, no good feeling I cannot experience, no comradeship I cannot cherish. My nature, I hope, is as open and as warm as are most other people's. I miss nothing in that. Why, then, am I desirous of speaking in this way, of making myself unpopular, a bad fellow instead of a good fellow? Simply because I know it is for the good of the country and of the people that we should be without drink, and the sooner the better. To show how people are prejudiced on the matter, the hon. member for Perth (Mr. Mann) quoted last night from a paper published in Montreal. There is in this paper another evidence of the necessity for dealing with the question in some way or other. In Montreal they are afraid of prohibition coming on them because they have some other measure, some other restriction, some other way of dealing with the drink question; which means a Government monopoly of the whole thing, an abolition altogether of the publican; which has abolished the saloon, practically killed the business of boot-legging, reduced drunkenness about 75 per cent., placed beer within the reach of those who want to buy a glass, and submitted to chemical analysis all spirituous liquors.

Mr. Mann: Under a board of control similar to what has been recommended here.

Hon. T. WALKER: Not quite the same. It is Government control. The saloon is abolished. The Government, through the board, say it is a most stringent regulation, abolishing the trade as a trade, and that nothing but prohibition could be more drastic. But they are satisfied with that law because it is a Quebec law. In order to substantiate it, I want to show how these people can quote to suit their own ends, without giving the whole facts of the case. The article concludes—

In order to better resist such an unwarranted attempt all should keep well in mind the statement of Abraham Lincoln in the prohibition controversy of 1840: "Prohibition will work great injury to the cause of temperance. It is a species of intemperance within itself, for it goes beyond the bounds of reason in that it attempts to control a man's appetite by legislation and makes a crime of things that are not crimes. A prohibition law strikes a blow at the very principles on which our Government was founded."

That is quoted as from Abraham Lincoln in 1840. Let me give the House the benefit of later opinions of Abraham Lincoln on that very point, which this man does not quote, but which he was able to quote had he so desired. President Lincoln in 1853 at Springfield said—

The most effectual remedy would be the passage of a law altogether abolishing the liquor traffic. There must be no more attempts to regulate the cancer. It must be eradicated.

On the morning of the day on which he was assassinated, President Lincoln used these words, almost his last words—

After reconstruction, the next greatest question will be the complete overthrow of the liquor traffic.

Compare Lincoln in 1840 with Lincoln in 1853 and with Lincoln in 1865, and it will be seen that as he grew older he became more emphatic. "The complete overthrow of the liquor traffic." And Lincoln was not a wowser!

Mr. Underwood: Which of his opinions was the right one?

Hon. T. WALKER: The last, the matured, the convinced, the experienced. If I desired, I could keep the House for some time upon this. Few of us have had experience of what is called the dry Kansas in America. Here is what has been written of it in late years, 1917—

Kansas is one of the very few States in the union without bonded indebtedness. On the basis of property assessed from taxation Kansas has the greater per capita wealth of the Union, 1,773 dollars for every man, woman and child within the State. Kansas has more than 454 million dollars deposited in her banks, an increase of more than 160 million dollars in one year. Kansas under prohibition is one of the two States of the union having the smallest number of persons who cannot read and write. It is significant that the other exceptional State is also a prohibition State. Kansas has 40 counties out of a total of 105, which did not send a prisoner to the State penitentiary last year. The prison rate for the entire county is 121 to the 100,000 of population. In Kansas it is 50, being one half of one thousandth per cent. Thirty-two Kansas counties have abandoned their county poor farms. With one exception Kansas has the lowest death-rate of all the States within the registration area recognised by the Federal Government. Again the exception is a prohibition State. An investigation by the chief of the medical staff of the Osawatimie State Hospital for the Insane at Osawatimie, Kansas, show the ratio of insanity having its origin in drunkenness is only 1.7 in Kansas, whereas the national average is 10.1 per cent.

If that is not a testimony, I do not know what is. But that is not the whole of the evidence one may obtain.

Mr. Underwood: It is not evidence at all; it is only a statement.

Hon. T. WALKER: I would certainly prefer the bare statement of the gentleman I have quoted to the statement of the member for Pilbara. I want to take the evidence of Governor Stubbs, of the State of Kansas. Surely he has some standing! He was a candidate before the whole of the State was prohibition, and in spite of the threats of the publicans and boot-leggers he declared his

intention, and won as a prohibitionist. He said—

I assert that Kansas is more free from mental and nervous diseases than any other State in the Union, and that authenticated scientific facts will prove that our temperance policy for 30 years is largely responsible for this condition. Kansas has 54 counties without an idiot. It has 87 counties without an insane inmate. Cook county alone sends more of her people to insane hospitals at Dunning than Kansas has in all her charitable institutions of every sort, including blind, deaf, dumb, insane, feeble-minded, incorrigibles and orphans. With 20 per cent. of the population of New York, Kansas has less than 10 per cent of its insanity. The brewers go so far as to say that temperance increases divorces, although we have made it plain to them several times that the very first few years of prohibition in Kansas showed a 45 per cent. decrease in divorces. Their logic seems to be that a man must keep drunk and beat his wife in order to intensify her love for him. Ninety-six counties in the State have not a single inebriate. Six of the nine counties furnishing inebriates last year were, strikingly enough, counties bordering on the wet sections of Missouri.

That, of course, was in the early portion of the fight. Since 1881 Kansas has had prohibition. During that time she has increased her wealth and prosperity out of sight of others. Of course, other States have recently come into line with her. It is significant that wherever for any length of time this policy of prohibition has continued, there insanity has decreased and crime has decreased.

Mr. Underwood: It must be pretty good in Turkey.

Hon. T. WALKER: This man cannot think of anything but turkeys. He has fed on them for so long that they permeate his whole system. The other night he struck the heroic when he said, "People have told me what I might have been if I had never touched the drink. I might even have been a Turk, enjoying the exhilarating pleasure of massacring my neighbours." The inference was that massacre and all the crimes associated with bloodthirstiness belong to and are exclusively the property of the Turk and belong exclusively to the teetotal section of the community.

Mr. Underwood: Well, it is so.

Hon. T. WALKER: I do not wish to harrow this House with long stories of the blood-curdling adventures of those who drink, but is it not a fact that the war was started and fought, not by teetotallers, but by armies who believed in rum and other drink?

Mr. Latham: It was won by some of the armies that believed in rum.

Hon. T. WALKER: There are some who are ignorant enough to talk in that way. When the war broke out one of the first things done in Britain and in Australia was to put a check upon the drink traffic. People were not allowed to drink as they pleased. And

to this day the trading hours of nine to nine are due to war legislation. Stoppage, limitation, and prevention of the traffic is due to this cause, and the same applies the world over. In some of the States six o'clock closing resulted, and in whole towns when an army or portion of an army was passing through, the hotels were closed altogether. Why were they closed if drink was so good? And when the men came back, the hotels were again closed.

Mr. Underwood: The war was over then.

Hon. T. WALKER: When our soldiers were going and when they were coming, the drink was stopped.

Mr. Latham: They were afraid there would not be enough to go round.

Hon. T. WALKER: Surely there should be some dignity about a discussion of this kind. No more important question has engaged the attention of the House. The hon. member answers himself. In times of calamity when courage and clear-headedness were necessary, the authorities stopped the drink by law. It is not the teetotaler who is the most bloodthirsty in history. If the hon. member talks about the Turks, I, without desiring to be offensive, could talk about the Christians in the same way.

Mr. Underwood: Misguided Christians.

Hon. T. WALKER: Of course, they did not know the hon. member. When Count Raymond, of Toulouse, was defying some of the sacerdotal authorities, a crusade was declared against him. When the battle raged and when there commingled both the Albigenses and the Crusaders, Arnold the legate of the Pope who was leading the Crusaders, was asked how the faithful should be known from the infidel and his reply was "Kill them all; God will know his own." There were no Turks there; they were Christians. They are not all Turks in unhappy Ireland at this hour. They are not all teetotallers in unhappy Ireland at this hour. If it comes to an examination of causes, what might the Turks not have been if they drank, for they have a peculiar religion? It is the Koran which says—

In the shadow of crossing swords
Paradise shall be found.

They believe in killing the infidel. In this way they prepare the ladder for their heaven. Their heaven consists of being attended by beautiful, angelic, black-eyed houris. It is not necessary to bring in drink; there is the allurements and the inspiration. Stand in the shadow of crossing swords and you get to paradise, and there you have four beautiful, black-eyed, large-eyed maidens welcoming you. Sneer about the Turks! There have been some things about the Moors who were associated with the Mohammedans in days gone by that one might well be proud of, before the clans and sects had reduced them to superstitions that put fetters upon their intelligence and their arts. To this hour we talk about their alchemy, their foundation of the science of chemistry. To this hour we

speak of the magnificent architecture of the Alhambra. These Mohammedans were teachers. The alphabet comes from these teachers. Our present chemistry comes from these people and our engineering and the making of roads. Astronomy comes from the astrology of these same people. They were the teachers of Europe, the leaders, liberal in thought and mind. They were the doctors when all Europe was in darkness and superstition. They gave a light from which the world has benefited. We are benefiting to this day from the learning, achievements, and thinking of these men who were teetotalers.

Mr. Underwood: They embraced lemonade later on.

Hon. T. WALKER: I am speaking of the Moorish civilisation in Spain.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member must confine his remarks to the Bill.

Hon. T. WALKER: I am answering arguments which have been used. One argument was "I might have been a Turk." I say the hon. member ornaments the Turkish regime more than he ornaments the civilisation of the 20th century. There is no point in arguments of that kind. The Bill itself is an attempt to make a compromise; it is linking arms with the devil, so to speak. It is going into partnership with what is admitted as a wrong and a degradation. The hope is that the evil may be diminished; that it will gradually go out. The member for Perth (Mr. Mann) said "I believe in mitigating the evil; I believe in going step by step to abolition." We cannot get to it in any other way. Before ever this nation can have the full strength of its mental manhood, we must go step by step towards the abolition of the drink traffic. I am not foolish enough to think there are no other evils or that we can get a law which can be easily administered. There is not a single law of the criminal code which is not hard to administer. We have laws against theft, but still we have people brought up every day for stealing. In America there is such a thing as bootlegging or brewing your own beer or getting whisky surreptitiously by private stills. We cannot get prohibition, but we can get as far towards it as we get towards perfect honesty in this community even with our criminal code. Every law of the land is violated. The expense of administering justice is enormous. Shall we have no laws against theft because in spite of them people still thieve? Shall we have no laws against murder, because in spite of them murders are still committed? Shall we have no laws against fraud, because fraudulency is rampant at times in our midst? We insist that our laws be administered in times of crises, and when there is an outburst of crime the limits become more drastic and the laws are administered with greater speed, urgency, and certitude. I admit that if we got prohibition to-morrow, we would have some people trying to evade it. In Kansas they tried to evade it for 30 years, but there the evil has been mastered. In other parts of the

United States it has also been mastered. In some portions there are still those who try to evade the law, but as time goes on, the excellence of this method is realised by the citizens themselves. I may say that even for those who sit with me, engaged in the great work of trying to help the lower dog to a happier position in life, the reform I am speaking of is a necessity. A Labour leader in Iowa details the reasons why the majority of the executive board of the State Federation of Labour favours prohibition in America. This is worth reading, and should be known by hon. members:—

Prohibition has been a benefit to organized labouring men and women. Trade union activities are directed principally along two lines—the securing of better wages and working conditions, and legislation that will be beneficial to labour. If a union is to be successful in bettering the conditions under which its members work and increasing their wages, it is necessary that the membership give the organisation their co-operation and support. This can be done in no better way than by attending the meetings and taking an interest in affairs. Practically all business of the union originates in the meetings. In the days when the union meeting was competing with the saloon for attendance it was usually the rule that the saloon was more attractive to some than the union meeting. This fact alone deprived the union of a number of men who would have been active workers and whose counsel would have been beneficial. Many of the best workers we have in the trade union movement to-day were a few years ago taking little interest in union affairs. You ask about their families. I take the position—and it is not original—that anything that is of real benefit to the working man is of equal benefit to his family. I believe that a dollar invested in the home or for food or clothing is better for the family than the same dollar invested in liquor would be. Before prohibition became effective the wet and dry issue entered into nearly every political campaign in the nation, state, county and municipality. The result was that a great number of labouring men voted for a candidate who was wet or dry and paid little attention to his attitude on questions which were of vital interest to labouring men and women. It was a difficult matter to get labouring men to unite on a candidate who was fair with labour, as they were usually split by the injection of the wet and dry issue. We have now eliminated this question, and it will be easier to get our own membership aligned with candidates for public office who are fair when labour legislation is being considered. I believe that the future elections will show this to be a fact.

If this struggling mass of humanity, which is now in the lower strata of society, and seeking to emerge into a greater light and a greater knowledge with more comfort and enjoyment, is to be successful in its efforts, it

must be freed from the iniquity and the effects of intoxication. We cannot measure the inefficiency of a drinking nation as compared with the efficiency of a sober nation. It is certain that the man who does not muddle his brains, who always has his head clear and his nerves healthy, is capable of better work, and higher achievements, than the man who is poisoned by the drug. No one can deny that it is costing this State an enormous sum to run its gaols, its courts, its asylums, its institutions and charitable homes, that are filled with people who have been affected by alcohol.

Mr. Mann: In this State only 8.44 per cent. of the inmates of asylums are there through drink.

Hon. T. WALKER: Through immediate drink.

Mr. Underwood: You cannot get the test of the teetotaler, of course.

Hon. T. WALKER. There is not a single man in the asylum who is there through teetotalism.

Mr. J. H. Smith: Yes.

Mr. Underwood: About 50 per cent. of them.

Hon. T. WALKER: Here is the best test, the business and hard matter of fact test, wherein there is no sentiment, and nothing to be gained by sentiment. The insurance societies will take less risk on the life of a publican than they will on the life of a teetotaler. They will take less risk on the life of a drunkard than they will on the life of an abstemious man.

Mr. Underwood: No.

Hon. T. WALKER: That is the case. The business is run on sound lines. It weighs the chances of the man who is addicted to habits of intoxication and issues its policy accordingly. Doctors tell us that the man who is a drunkard has less chance of coming out of an operation than he who has lived an abstemious life. You, Sir, as chairman of the Perth Public Hospital committee, know that this is so. There is a danger and a risk to those who are under the influence of drink. It affects a man, and does not give him the same chance of living. Not only does it affect the individual, but it affects the lives of his children who are born from him under those circumstances. There is no question about the hereditary nature of the evil and its ill-effects. This has been demonstrated over and over again. I only ask that this burden on the community shall be lifted. We have now said to the people, "We are only going to have one vote—not one for continuance, increase, or reduction, but one simple question—yes, or no, drink or no drink." The question of prohibition is to be submitted at the next election. With the details of the measure I shall deal in Committee. Knowing as I do that this is a bargain with the publican, I shall see that the publican is given

a fair deal. How much better would it be if we had the courage of our convictions and stood out for the public good and abolished what is known to be a dangerous evil? I know I am right; time has proved that I am right. Twenty years ago a speech such as I have delivered to-night would have caused me to be boo-hoed in an Assembly like this.

The Minister for Works: No.

Hon. T. WALKER: I have heard very few interjections, and then only from sources I could well expect to hear from them to-night. The fact that we have a measure proposing to place before the public at the next election the question of prohibition is proof of the way the tide is flowing. The very fact that we have shortened the hours of drinking in hotels, that no one now considers it an honour to be seen drunk, that it is a species of disgrace for a man to exhibit himself in a public place or in private in an intoxicated condition, shows the way the tide is flowing. It is a matter of education. It will spread. It only requires the facts to enter into the minds of the people. It only requires courage to face the citadel of vested interests and to tell the truth. It only requires a little waiting. We cannot force it; it is a growth. Time was when all men were supposed to test their manhood by the amount they could drink and the frequency with which they could drink. It is not so now. We have grown out of that. We are now growing more enlightened. So surely as the most enlightened nation in the world, so far as its people in the lower ranks are concerned, and in some of its higher scientific achievements, the greatest nation among times, has set this example, just as surely will other nations follow. It is the pathway to the sun; it is the growth of normal life. This is the cause by which the clouded brains of the people are cleared. It gives its protecting care to the infant in the cradle. We are dealing with an evil that enters into the sanctity of the home. It enters into the domestic and family relationship. It gives the mother a prayer that is ever active in her bosom, that her child may be free to manhood from the dangers of this curse. It enters into society, and people are now painting in blackest colours the man who is drunk. Its sympathies extend to the dregs of humanity, who are dragged to and degraded in our police courts, and thrown into foetid cells for their indulgence and friendship with Bacchus. Temperance acclaims the man who possesses his full brain power in consequence of normal health and strength without the use of abnormal stimulants. Prohibition carries with it every hygienic principle for the building up of a strong and happy nation. It is a cause that will triumph, and the hill of victory, so to speak, is almost within our sight. In some parts of the world it is within our reach. It only needs a little more patience, a little more energy, and a little more courage and we shall here have a sober dominion under the Southern Cross.

Mr. DAVIES (Guildford) [8.58]: I purposely refrained from addressing myself to this measure—

Hon. P. Collier: In order to reply to my colleague?

Mr. DAVIES: Until members of the Royal Commission had spoken. The member for Subiaco (Mr. Richardson) said the evidence given before the Commission was overwhelming, but he did not say whether it was overwhelming in volume or in logic. He also read an interesting table, which is to be found in the report, and endeavoured to prove by the last local option poll that where the least number of licenses were now in existence to the greatest number of people, and where the least number of people had the greatest number of licenses, local option had not done its work in the right way. It will be found from the table that in Broome, where there are 175 people to one license, continuance was carried, and that in Leederville-Subiaco, where there are 3,870 people to every license, reduction was carried. I take it that the Commission came to the conclusion that local option has not worked satisfactorily, from the evidence of that table. But the real issue before the House at this juncture is whether we shall have a State wide poll or local option, a three-fifths majority or a bare majority vote. The member for Subiaco (Mr. Richardson) is still of the opinion that local option should prevail, notwithstanding his having been a member of the Commission. He has quoted this very table as proving the ineffectiveness of local option to bring about reduction of licenses where it is most needed. Notwithstanding that, he still adheres to the principle of local option. But he said it must rigidly follow the lines of the State electorates. Another member of the Commission said that while in the past he had consistently supported local option, his opinion had changed owing to that table. He gave as his reason that others ought to be consulted besides those living in the neighbourhood. I still adhere to local option, and again I ask who has a better right to say whether an hotel shall be in his neighbourhood than the man who resides there day in and day out, year in and year out? After their lengthy sittings the members of the Commission are not likely to rest content without referring their recommendations to the logical conclusion of divisions. I do not for one moment agree that any persons except those resident in the neighbourhood should have a say. This measure suggests that a licenses reduction board shall be brought into existence. That board may consist of the same people as the licensing bench; it will be the same tribunal under a different name. If a licensing board receive a petition from the majority of the people in a locality for an increase in the number of licenses, they may grant that increase. But the same tribunal, sitting as a licenses reduction board, would not be able to reduce licenses on receipt of a petition to that effect. If that is not inconsistency, I do not know

what inconsistency is. In this Bill it is provided that juniors, meaning young people under the age of 21 years, may not be served with liquor. At the same time such young people can work in an hotel and serve liquor to their elders.

Mr. Mann: Hardly "serve"; "convey."

Mr. DAVIES: If that is not playing with words, what is? As regards serving juniors with liquor, would it be "serving" if a senior and a junior went into the parlour of an hotel, and the senior went to the bar and procured liquor for himself and shared it with the junior? I say it would not be "serving" in the strict interpretation of the Bill, since the liquor would not be "served" by the publican or his servant, and since the junior would be treated by the customer.

Mr. Mann: Another clause of the Bill prohibits that.

Mr. DAVIES: The only effective means of obviating it is to prevent juniors working in an hotel at all. My chief object in rising to-night is to discuss the three-fifths majority. We hear a lot about democratic control, and we hear it contended that those who resist the State wide poll on a bare majority are undemocratic. I am a liquor law reformer, but not a prohibitionist; I have not been a teetotaler since I was 15 or 16 years old. But I say that if we once get the reform in this State, we do not want to have to go back to the question within the next three or five or 10 years, or in fact ever. If prohibition is carried by a bare majority, and then in a few years' time that decision is reversed, our last state would be worse than our first. It is said that Parliament is elected on a bare majority. But in viewing the effect of deciding a question by a bare majority, there is no likeness whatever between Parliament and the liquor question. Indeed, one gets better legislation from a Parliament elected on a bare majority vote. I have before referred here to the question of our betting laws. While Cabinet prohibited the use of spinning jennies, one could go into towns and see the public and members of the police force and members of Cabinet having their modest shilling on a spinning jenny. We do not want such a reform as that in connection with the liquor traffic.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: How do you know Ministers were betting on a spinning jenny?

[The Deputy Speaker took the Chair.]

Mr. DAVIES: Because I saw them.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: I should have kept it to myself.

Mr. Mann: It is not a discredit.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: But the fact is being used in a discreditable way.

Mr. DAVIES: I do not intend that. I have not said what Cabinet Ministers. The point I want to make is that if we have a law, the least we can do is to observe it. Now, a law cannot be observed if the people are equally divided regarding it. No law in the world will stand under such circumstances. Three-fifths is not an overwhelming majority. Before we attempt to bring about prohibition,

let us be sure that at least three-fifths of our electors are in favour of it. Referring to the table which has been brought before the House by members of the Commission, is not one right in saying, as the result of analysis of that very table, that where there are the least number of licensed houses in the most congested districts the evil is greater than where one has the greatest number of licensed houses in the least congested parts? Take Leederville-Subiaco. In that district there are 30,000 people with eight licensed houses, or 3,870 people to every licensed house. Subiaco-Leederville carried further reduction. On the other hand, such a place as Cue, where there are only 57 people to every licensed house, carries continuance. What does that suggest to the minds of hon. members? Does it suggest that the principle of local option has failed, or that where there is the least number of licenses with the greatest congestion of people a further reduction of the liquor traffic is desired? That is what it conveys to me.

Mr. Chesson: Cue is a big place, and the people there have broad views.

Mr. DAVIES: It might be said that Cue is a very hot place; but Broome is in an exactly similar position. Mt. Magnet carried continuance, and Mt. Magnet has an hotel for every 58 people. Then there is Collie, a mining district. Collie carried reduction, although it has 815 people to every hotel. Moreover, prohibition was lost at Collie by only a dozen or two votes.

Hon. P. Collier: Why should there be any idea that Collie would not vote reduction?

Mr. DAVIES: Because Collie is a mining camp, and where there are miners it is held by the people to whom the member for Kanowna (Hon. T. Walker) referred as voters—

Mr. Wilson: They are all Presbyterians there.

Mr. Mann: The explanation at Collie was badly conducted hotels.

Mr. DAVIES: One would think that the police would be able to look after the hotels where there was only one hotel to every 815 people. I suggest hon. members should take that phase of the question into consideration when determining whether to continue local option or a State-wide poll. To the Commission, and especially to its chairman, I give great credit for the indefatigable nature of their efforts. I regarded their report as a work of art when I saw it in the Press, but I am bound to say—

Hon. P. Collier: That it does not improve on acquaintance.

Mr. DAVIES: Not after hearing the views expressed by the members of the Commission. That members of the Commission should deny the three-fifths majority and with one exception, namely, the member for Subiaco (Mr. Richardson), recommend a State-wide poll to be taken, with an 85 per cent. vote before the decision can become effective, passes my comprehension.

Mr. A. Thomson: There has never been a vote of that percentage in Western Australia.

Mr. DAVIES: With all respect to the members of the Commission, surely they could not have considered the position of a State like Western Australia with its population spread over thousands of miles. Western Australia is not like a city such as London, with a population of seven millions, or of Melbourne or of Sydney, with its population of a million. On the contrary, ours is a State of immense distances with the population of a moderate sized town, scattered throughout the whole of our vast area. Yet it is coolly suggested that instead of local option, we should submit to a bare majority, and that 85 per cent. of the people should go to the poll.

Mr. Mann: That was with compulsory voting.

Mr. DAVIES: If we are to wait for prohibition in Western Australia until such times as we can get that vote, we will never get prohibition.

Hon. P. Collier: You are pessimistic.

Mr. DAVIES: I am not.

Mr. Munsie: It is evident that you cannot get it for a long time if you are trusting to local option polls.

Mr. DAVIES: We might get in in some places.

Mr. Munsie: Yes, where it is least required.

Mr. DAVIES: I have in mind one particular portion of the metropolitan area. I refer to the little town of Bassendean, which is a manufacturing centre. In Guildford, we have only ten licenses spread among 15,000 people. The town I refer to is without a license, and every time the people have been consulted in that particular locality, they have voted consistently for "no-license."

Hon. W. C. Angwin: They can do that under the Bill.

Mr. DAVIES: If they could get a greater number of people in that town, not in the electorate—there is a difference there between this Bill and that before us last session—to vote in favour of an hotel, all they would have to do would be to get the people in that particular place—

Hon. W. C. Angwin: No, in the electorate.

Mr. DAVIES: Not so.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: It says so in the Bill.

Mr. Mann: It says, "In an area to be defined by the board."

Hon. W. C. Angwin: That is rotten.

Mr. DAVIES: It is so.

Hon. P. Collier: It does not say that either.

The Premier interjected.

Mr. DAVIES: The Premier cannot interpret what may be the mind of the court. I wish to correct a statement I made last session when speaking on the Licensing Act Amendment Bill then before us. I was one of those members who referred to the degeneration in the quality of the beer that was being brewed. The Commission have now enlightened

me on that matter and I wish to apologise, if it be necessary, for my utterances on that occasion. I had no intention of reflecting upon the brewing trade; I was relying upon what is regarded as a popular fallacy. I was misled by the man in the street who says that beer is not so good as it was in former days. The member for Kanowna (Hon. T. Walker) referred to Shakespeare in support of his condemnation of alcohol.

Hon. P. Collier: Did not Shakespeare say something about cakes and ale?

Mr. DAVIES: He did so! I think the member for Kanowna was hardly fair to the House in referring to Shakespeare to bolster up his case, because I am reminded by the Swan Brewery in the daily papers, when they appear, that Shakespeare said: "Blessings on your heart; you brew good ale."

Hon. P. Collier: He wrote from both sides of the question.

Mr. DAVIES: I think he wrote according to the company he was in. In any case, I think it is due to the brewers to make this explanation because I have no desire in my advocacy of liquor law reform, to rely upon anything that is not correct. If we want a lasting reform, we must face the position squarely and not hide anything. If we do that and bring about that reform, we can then be satisfied that we have done the best for our race and for those who come after us. When the Government admit the evil—it must be an evil when they say that persons under 21 years of age cannot partake of liquor—what is the use of paying attention to those who say that it is not an evil?

Mr. Willcock: The Government are not always right.

Mr. DAVIES: The hon. member will admit that if a man goes down the street with two of his children, in 99 cases out of 100 that parent gives his children a few coppers and sends them away to buy lollies, while he himself enters hotel premises in order to get drink. Those men do not take their children with them.

Mr. Willcock: They are not allowed by law to do so.

Mrs. Cowan: You know that it is wrong.

Mr. DAVIES: A man is not allowed to take his children into a bar.

Hon. P. Collier: Nor on premises where liquor is sold.

Mr. DAVIES: It may be prohibited where the liquor is dispensed, but a boarder may live in an hotel with his children.

Hon. P. Collier: But he is not allowed to take his children into those portions of the hotel premises where liquor is sold.

Mr. DAVIES: There is another point about the Bill to which I desire to make reference. It is provided that cubicles shall not be permitted in Australian wine saloons where people, desiring drink, can hide.

Mrs. Cowan: Quite right, and that should be extended to the hotels as well.

Mr. Mann: Do you know of hotels where there are cubicles?

Mr. DAVIES: We know there was the Gun Alley tragedy.

Mr. Mann: That was in a wine saloon; not in an hotel.

Mr. DAVIES: If it is bad for a wine saloon, it is bad for an hotel.

Mr. Johnston: There are no cubicles in hotels that I know of.

Mr. DAVIES: I hope not. In conclusion I hope that whatever is done by this Chamber, regard will be had for the rising generation. Undoubtedly this is an evil and without endeavouring to prevent the legitimate drinker from having his liquor, we should be able to do something to assist those people who cannot control themselves.

Mr. Mann: The law provides for that already.

Mr. DAVIES: But that law must be put into operation. To-day things are winked at. If we could get a preponderance of the people in favour of genuine liquor reform, there would be a chance of getting the law effectively carried out. If it had been administered in that way in the past, as it was always intended it should be, there would not be the cry for prohibition that there is heard to-day. The evil has been flaunted in our face. Take the position that arose when the men came back from the war. The hotels had to be closed and many people said they quite agreed that the hotels should be closed. It was pitiable to see men in the street in the condition in which some were to be found only too frequently. That is a condition that can be brought about through the abuse of these privileges. If the law were not so abused, we would not hear so much about prohibition.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

BILL—MINERS' PHTHISIS.

Second Reading.

Debate resumed from 30th August.

Hon. P. COLLIER (Boulder) [9.27]: When this Bill was first introduced and I read the title of it, I was encouraged in the belief that at last we were going to have legislation which would deal with an important subject which has been occupying the minds of members of this House, and of a large section of the community, for many years past. Having heard the Minister move the second reading and having had an opportunity of learning the contents of the Bill, I confess I have never been more disappointed in any measure introduced in this Chamber for many years past. The question of the men working in our mines who are suffering from tuberculosis or from those complaints generally embraced under the comprehensive term "miners' phthisis," is one which has been very much discussed on the goldfields of Western Australia. The subject has gone entirely beyond that of speculation.

We have passed the stage of doubt in the minds of any person who has given consideration to the subject, as to the prevalence of miners's complaint, as to its causes and as to the general effect it has on the men working in our mines. That being so, we might have hoped that when the Government undertook to deal with the matter by way of legislation, they would at least have given us something comprehensive in the Bill, something that would approach meeting the needs of the situation as it exists. What is this Bill? It merely takes power to have men working in our mines compulsorily examined for symptoms of miner's phthisis, or for tuberculosis. And in the event of their being found to be infected by tuberculosis, the Minister will have power to exclude men from further working in the mine. But surely the stage to which miner's complaint has reached in this State warrants the Government in making provision, not only to deal with men affected by tuberculosis, but also to deal with the whole question of miner's phthisis. I cannot understand why the Government have neglected to do that. From the remarks of the Minister, the only explanation would appear to be that they have not yet sufficient detailed information to enable them to deal with the question in the manner in which it has been dealt with in other countries. Yet we know that the whole question was the subject of a Royal Commission in this State in 1910, when Dr. Cumpston went most exhaustively into the position and presented a very able and thorough report on the question. We know also from returns supplied by the Wooroloo Sanatorium of the number of miners who enter that institution, and the number of deaths that take place there year by year. I cannot understand why it is contended at this stage that there is any need whatever for further information on the subject. It is all contained in reports compiled by the Mines Department and in the records of the House. The Minister himself is well acquainted with every phase of the subject. There is nothing more we require to learn about it. But what is required is that there should be some legislative enactment dealing with the whole question. I believe in periodical examinations, and even in the principle of total exclusion from the mines, not only of men affected by tuberculosis but of men affected by various forms of miner's complaint as well. It stands to the discredit of us all—I am not singling out the Minister or the Government for particular condemnation—it is a reflection on the Parliament of a State where mining has been carried on to such an extent for the last quarter of a century, that we have not advanced one yard in the matter, save for the small provision made in the mine workers' relief fund, and that large numbers of men are to-day, just as they were 15 or 20 years ago, wearing out their lives with this dreaded disease, while no provision is made for compensation for those excluded from the

mines. But, having decided to introduce legislation dealing with the matter, the Minister, in my opinion, has entirely failed to meet the situation. Here we have a Bill to say that we are to exclude from the mines those suffering from tuberculosis, without touching that much larger number of men affected with miner's complaint. And, having decided by statutory authority to prohibit tubercular men from working underground, to cast them out upon the world deprived of their occupation without making provision for their maintenance is one of the cruellest pieces of legislation which Parliament could be called upon to deal with.

The Minister for Mines: But they come under the mine workers' relief fund.

Hon. P. COLLIER: That fund, in its present condition, is wholly inadequate, and the Minister knows it. Moreover, I think I am right when I say that men suffering from tuberculosis are not entitled to relief from that fund.

Mr. Boyland: No, they have to go to the sanatorium.

Hon. P. COLLIER: To obtain relief from that fund, they must be suffering from some form of miner's complaint. If tubercular, they are not entitled to any relief.

Mr. Mullany: Before touching that fund they must be in such a state that they cannot work.

Hon. P. COLLIER: Even then I doubt if tubercular patients could get relief. The Bill proposes to take out of the mines every tubercular man, without paying him any compensation. Nowhere in the world where mining is carried on, certainly not in Australia or in South Africa, has there ever been legislation to compulsorily exclude men from the mines and so deprive them of their livelihood, without compensating them.

The Minister for Mines: We have it in several of our Acts, such as that dealing with the manufacture of food.

Hon. P. COLLIER: In the Health Act, yes, but not in any mining Act, the world over. We know that mining as an occupation predisposes men to tuberculosis. Of those who under the Bill would be excluded from the mines because suffering from tuberculosis, the majority would have contracted the disease through their occupation as miners.

The Minister for Mines: That is so.

Hon. P. COLLIER: If that is so, does it not follow that although technically they would be described as tubercular cases, in reality they are suffering from an occupational disease, a disease contracted in the course of their employment? If any man be affected with a disease contracted because of his employment, and if we legislate to preclude his following that employment any longer, we have upon us an obligation to provide compensation for him and his dependants. The question of payment of compensation to tubercular patients is not new. In South Africa they pay tubercular cases the same compensation as they pay to those

affected with miner's phthisis. That is what is known as the temporary stage, and a lump sum is paid to those excluded from the mines on that account. If the complaint is complicated by silicosis, the sufferer is entitled to the highest compensation—what is known as the secondary stage. That is what obtains in South Africa, and it should obtain here also. If a tubercular patient working underground contracted the complaint entirely apart from his occupation, it might perhaps be argued that he was not entitled to compensation; but when we know that the majority of the men contracted their disease through their occupation, the complaint in effect becomes miner's disease, a disease of the occupation, and the sufferer should receive compensation. In his report presented in 1910, Dr. Cumpston had this to say:—

In paragraph 15 it is stated that tuberculosis of the lungs must be considered more in the light of an infectious than an industrial disease. This statement must not be misunderstood. The fact that tuberculosis is most common in men engaged on machine work has been interpreted as indicating primarily that this class of work, by reason of the close association of the two men working upon one machine, offers the greatest facility for personal infection. It has, however, been generally accepted that lung tissue which has been impaired by the action of dust is thereby rendered more susceptible to the action of tubercle bacilli. So far as I have been able to ascertain, there is no direct experimental evidence upon this point, but the fact that tuberculosis is found in all countries to be excessively prevalent amongst men engaged in other dusty occupations—for example, knife grinders, pottery makers, etc.—must be accepted as indicating the correctness of this commonly-accepted belief. Therefore, while tuberculosis amongst machine men is more an infectious than an industrial disease, it appears certain that the action of dust does predispose to the action of the tubercle bacillus. In this connection, the significance of the existence of a large number of cases of fibrosis must not be lost sight of.

There we have the opinion of Dr. Cumpston that the occupation predisposes a man to the disease. That being so, we ought not to say he shall no longer follow that occupation, unless there is provided in the Act a measure of compensation to which he shall be entitled. We cannot even guarantee to any man excluded under the provisions of the Bill employment of any kind, and should the mine workers' relief fund board pay compensation to him—I am certain they would not—we know that that fund has become so insolvent of recent years as to render the board unable to meet half the justifiable claims made upon them.

The Minister for Mines: Not quite so bad as that.

Hon. P. COLLIER: I have taken out figures from the annual reports of the Health Department regarding the treatment of male

cases at the Wooroloo Sanatorium. In 1914, 150 male cases were treated, of whom 55 were miners, or practically one-third of the total. In 1915 223 were treated, of whom 81 were miners; the deaths in that year were 45, and of that number 14 were miners. In 1916, 365 cases were treated, of whom 125 were miners, again more than one-third of the total. In 1917, 327 cases were treated, of whom 114 were miners, again more than one-third of the total; in that year there were 108 deaths, of whom 28 were miners. In 1918, 317 cases were treated, of whom 115 were miners, and there were 92 deaths, of whom 37 were miners. In 1919, 341 cases were treated, of whom 128 were miners, and there were 84 deaths, of whom 37 were miners. In that year, therefore, nearly one-half of the patients who died were miners. In 1920, 373 cases were treated, of whom 133 were miners, and the deaths numbered 78, of whom 34 were miners. In 1921, 360 cases were treated, of whom 137 were miners; the deaths numbered 72, of whom 41, or considerably over one-half, were miners. Each year the percentage of males treated has increased and the percentage of miners who have died has increased. These figures are well known to the Minister and to everyone who has taken an interest in the matter. They show what a great hold miner's complaint has gained in this State. The figures would be more striking if we had particulars of the number of males engaged in other occupations as compared with the number engaged in mining. Having regard to the number of males following all other occupations, however, and the fact that miners numbered more than one-third of the total and that more than one-third of those who died were miners, we realise the very serious hold that tuberculosis or miner's complaint, has gained in this State.

Mr. Boyland: That is nothing like a complete record.

Hon. P. COLLIER: No, because, as Dr. Mitchell comments—

With regard to the occupations of those treated, it will be observed that the miners still predominate. The number submitted might have been further amplified as many labourers, and some engaged in other occupations, have drifted from mining into other walks of life.

Many men affected with miner's complaint have left the mines and gone to other parts of the State, worked there for a while as labourers or in other occupations, and on entering the sanatorium have been classified as labourers or according to the occupation they were following at the time, whereas in reality they were miners. Therefore, the figures do not disclose the true result.

Mr. Boyland: And there are those men who go away and die outside the sanatorium.

Hon. P. COLLIER: A great proportion of the men who follow mining came from the Eastern States. When they are no longer able to work, or for other reasons leave the goldfields, they drift back to their friends in other parts of the State or in the Eastern

States and do not come under the notice of the sanatorium authorities, and they are therefore entirely lost to this record.

The Minister for Mines: Every tuberculous case outside of mining does not go to the sanatorium.

Hon. P. COLLIER: And every tuberculous case which is a mining complaint does not go through the institution, either.

The Minister for Mines: But a great proportion do.

Hon. P. COLLIER: Yes, but quite a number do not. Quite a considerable number spend a term in the sanatorium and return to the fields.

Mr. Boyland: That does not make the position any better.

Hon. P. COLLIER: No, but I am speaking of the extent to which the disease exists. Dr. Mitchell, in his report dated 7th July, 1920, stated:—

Although the age incidence of cases treated at the sanatorium is valueless from a State statistical point of view, yet it serves to demonstrate the high proportion of cases in the third stage which arrive for treatment. Practically all miners admitted are in that stage, having contracted successively fibrotic mischief, superimposed tuberculosis, and bankruptcy in reserve strength. It is astonishing how many, after being warned concerning their health and probable future development, refuse to leave the mines, their main contention being that they do not feel competent to follow outdoor occupations. It therefore appeals to one that some system of vocational training should be at the disposal of those desiring to leave the industry on the score of ill health, and such a scheme would indeed be a worthy State insurance. It is insufficient to wait until there is a breakdown and then provide the wherewithal to live.

He points out that tuberculosis is superimposed upon miner's complaint. That is the point I made earlier in my remarks. A large percentage of those cases described as tuberculosis as distinct from miner's complaint owed the origin of their complaint to their occupation as miners. Dr. Mitchell says it is surprising how many refuse to act on advice to leave the mines before the disease has secured too great a hold upon them. If Dr. Mitchell knew the conditions obtaining on the fields, and the real reason, he would not be surprised at the facts. The reason why they do not leave the mines and seek other occupations, which might have the effect of restoring them to health, is that the Parliament of this State has failed in its duty to make provision for them by way of compensation. The blame does not lie with this House. The Government of which I was a member, and of which the present Minister for Mines was leader, endeavoured on more than one occasion to make provision for men affected by this complaint, but the Bills failed to pass another place. It is a standing reflection that adequate provision has not

been made for these men, particularly when we remember the comprehensive way in which similar cases are provided for in South Africa and other countries. Now that the Minister has introduced this Bill, why not tackle the question and make another attempt in this House to deal with the problem in a thorough manner, taking the chance of it passing another place? Let us deal not only with men affected by tuberculosis but men in the various stages of miner's complaint back to fibrosis and silicosis; and, by statutory enactment, compel these men to undergo examination periodically as in South Africa, and when found to be affected to such an extent that their health is in danger, prevent them from continuing the occupation any longer. We would only be justified in doing this if we made adequate provision in the way of compensation for them and their dependants. Surely we are not so bankrupt that we are unable to do this.

Mr. Boyland: We have only to become copyists. The scheme has been laid down in other places.

Hon. P. COLLIER: That is so. Other countries have passed through all the experimental stages and we have their legislation to guide us. The whole thing resolves itself into a question of £ s. d. We have only to decide who shall pay the compensation and what the amount shall be. This is a debatable question with which I do not intend to deal at length to-night. In South Africa the employers have to bear the whole of the financial responsibility. Most complete provision is made there for the compensation of affected miners. When a man is excluded from the mines in South Africa, he is paid compensation. A man with a wife and three children receives £5 to £6 per week, and in the event of death of the husband, the payments are continued to the wife and the children—children even to the age of 16 and not 14 which is usually considered the working age in this country. Dependants other than the wives and children are entitled to compensation. Those who come under the designation of dependants are brothers, sisters, step-brothers, step-sisters, fathers, mothers, grand-fathers, grandmothers and illegitimate children. Therefore the compensation is not confined to the immediate relatives of the person concerned; the only proof to be established is that the claimants were dependants of the miner in question. The whole of the financial burden has to be met by the employers in South Africa. I admit they are perhaps more wealthy in that country than we are here, and are in a better position to meet the demands made upon them in this respect than would be the employers in Western Australia. We cannot shut our eyes to what the industry has done for this State.

The Minister for Mines: At present the employees carry all the burden.

Hon. P. COLLIER: The men carry it now, and they drift on to the Charities Department and thence upon the State. The

mining industry has been responsible for the rapid development of this State during the last quarter of a century. This country was scarcely known outside its own boundaries until the discovery of Coolgardie. Since then gold to the value of about £148,000,000 has been produced, and no less than £28,000,000 has been paid to shareholders in London by way of dividends. Some individual mines in Boulder have paid considerably over £5,000,000 in dividends. Whilst the mines have been producing this fabulous wealth, hundreds of men have laid down their lives at an early age in producing it. It has been recognised in most countries, and clearly and emphatically recognised by the legislation of South Africa, that the responsibility of providing the necessary funds for compensation for those who are injured or lose their lives in occupational diseases rests with the employer. The South African Commission of 1921 in their report confirmed the legislation which existed previously with regard to the liability and responsibility of the employers for the payment of compensation. They considered that no industry was entitled to live unless it made provision for those who fell by the wayside in the course of their occupations. We should not hesitate to legislate along the required lines at the present stage. Keenly anxious as I am to take out of the mines men who are affected by disease, I would not vote for the second reading of this Bill. The medical authorities tell us that nowhere can we find a better breeding ground for the typical germ than in the dark, moist atmosphere of our mines. Every individual who is affected with T.B. is a menace to every other man working in the mine. It is not only a question of taking him out for his own health's sake, but it is a question of considering the health of his fellow workers. The information given by some of the authorities is astonishing.

Mr. Boyland: They are going to take him out of the mines where he is a menace, and put him into some other employment where he would be just as great a menace to the other employees.

Hon. P. COLLIER: We know the urgent need there is for taking the men out of the mines, by compulsion if they will not go voluntarily. My remarks are not confined to the man who is affected with T.B., but embrace the man who is suffering purely from miner's complaint, and whose end is nevertheless as certain as that of the man affected with T.B. I would by legislation prevent him from going as far as to endanger his own life. To this end we must make provisions for compensation. Since 1911 there have been some 12,000 white men employed in mining in South Africa. Of these no fewer than 10,000 have been taken out of the industry by legislation, and absolutely excluded from it during the past 10 years. In all probability these represent 10,000 lives which have at all events been prolonged. Had they been left

underground, these 10,000 men would probably have gone to their graves before the end of that period.

Mr. Davies: Did they compensate them?

Hon. P. COLLIER: They gave them full and complete compensation. Not only is provision made in South Africa for payment to the miners and their dependants, but this compensation extends to the whole of the native population as well. There are something like 137,000 natives employed in the industry in South Africa. Shall it be said that in Western Australia we cannot do as much for our mine workers as has been done for the natives of South Africa? It is a scandal that we have not done something in the matter earlier than this. We have made an effort, but have been prevented by another place. Are the mine owners going to say that because the industry is declining it is too late to take action, that they are not in a position to find the money necessary to compensate those who will be excluded from mining? Whether the mines can afford to pay or not, whilst there is a pound being paid by way of dividends in Western Australia, I say there is a claim upon the mine owners, if not to pay the whole lot, to contribute a sufficient sum to moneys which may be obtained from other sources to enable us to deal with the matter as it should be dealt with. I do not lay it down as the principle from which we might not depart that the owners should pay the lot. I would prefer to see the mines closed down to having the men waste their lives as they are now compelled to do. Already thousands of some of the finest manhood in Australia have been sacrificed in the industry. Are we to continue this, and to pass this Bill merely to take out of the mines those who are affected with T.B., so that they may go to the Charities Department and obtain the necessities of life for the rest of their days if they are unable to find employment for themselves? We must take the men out of the mines if they are affected with miners' complaint or T.B. Realising how urgent this is, I ask whether Parliament is merely going to throw these men on the scrap-heap, and allow them to scramble for a living without making any provision for them. To do that would be one of the most cruel and callous things which Parliament has ever done.

Mr. Davies: Is not that an additional argument for national insurance?

The Minister for Mines: Nothing is ever done unless it is suggested something more should be done. We must make a beginning.

Hon. P. COLLIER: This is not a beginning.

The Minister for Mines: The conditions are no different from what they were in your time. Why did you not do something?

Hon. P. COLLIER: We tried to make provision under the Workers' Compensation Act.

The Minister for Mines: What did you do?

Hon. P. COLLIER: I did all I am asking the Minister to do now.

The Minister for Mines: The Commission you refer to sat and carried that, as shown by their report.

Hon. P. COLLIER: I know they did. We only failed in doing something because of another place. That is no reason why we should not try again. I ask the Minister to make another attempt, and if he fails to get legislation through, the responsibility will not be his or ours. The report of the Commission of 1910 dealt mainly with miners' complaint. At that time there was no legislation in other parts of the world to guide us in any action we might take. To-day the position is different. The South African legislation dates from 1911. The latest and most effective legislation only dates from 1919. The Minister wants to know why I did not deal with it when I had an opportunity. He says now by way of explanation, that the reason why he is not going any further than is proposed in the Bill is that he wants to obtain data and information. If that be so, how could the question have been dealt with five or six years ago, seeing that, according to him, there is not sufficient information available now?

The Minister for Mines: We have never applied the same methods for getting data as was applied in South Africa in 1911, and upon the basis of which they now have complete legislation.

Hon. P. COLLIER: Their Labour legislation was, I suppose, based on the legislation of 1911 with improvements. The Minister says he has not sufficient information to enable him to go further than he now proposes to go. The Commonwealth authorities are going to establish a laboratory in Kalgoorlie. He hopes as a result of the examinations that will be made by doctors there, and the data that will be forthcoming, to be able to do something more later on. This Bill is no good. If the Minister does not possess the information, and does not think he can go any further, it is not worth his while proceeding with such a Bill. I will vote against it unless I have an assurance that it will be possible to amend it in Committee, so as to carry it further than is now proposed. It is no use whatever to turn a few men suffering from tuberculosis out of the mines.

The Minister for Mines: Let me tell you that you will get the support of the Chamber of Mines in voting against the Bill.

Hon. P. COLLIER: I know that, but the Minister knows perfectly well that the reasons of the Chamber for Mines would be quite different from those actuating me.

The Minister for Mines: But the result would be the same.

Hon. P. COLLIER: If as the result of the second reading being negatived, nothing else is done, the result will be the same. However, I oppose the second reading, because I think

we can go, and ought to go, further than this Bill goes.

The Minister for Mines: The proper place for you to take action is in Committee.

Hon. P. COLLIER: Yes, if the Minister will give an assurance that he will afford opportunities for amendment in Committee. Then I would like the second reading to pass. But the Minister knows it is not possible for a private member effectively to amend the measure in Committee. Such amendments as are required can be moved only by the Minister.

The Minister for Mines: That is so, but there are means by which an expression of opinion can be obtained from a Committee for the Minister's guidance.

Hon. P. COLLIER: Yes, and that is my reason for speaking as I have spoken. If, as the result of the expression of opinion on the second reading—

The Minister for Mines: Those opinions were expressed years ago.

Hon. M. F. Troy: We will express them next year, too.

Hon. P. COLLIER: In view of the fact that the Minister has expressed those views, does he think that this Bill goes far enough?

The Minister for Mines: I have not said that it goes far enough.

Hon. P. COLLIER: If the Minister knows that the Bill does not go far enough, why has he not seen to it that the measure goes further?

The Minister for Mines: The Leader of the Opposition was here when I said, in moving the second reading, that until compulsory examination was established, we could not do all that was necessary.

Hon. P. COLLIER: But the Minister knows there is no reason why we should not go further in this Bill, while making provision for compulsory examination. The Chamber of Mines, of course, will oppose any legislation whatever dealing with employment of men underground. They may be firmly convinced that this Bill is harmless to the mine owners, but nevertheless it is the general policy of the Chamber of Mines to oppose all legislation of this nature, because they know that such legislation will not stop there, but will go on and on. The Chamber of Mines will oppose legislation of this kind at every turn. They do not want any such legislation.

The Minister for Mines: I do not know that. They are voluntarily contributing to the fund as it is.

Hon. P. COLLIER: Yes; £5,000 a year out of all the millions they have taken out of the industry! The mine owners themselves have been absolutely indifferent on this subject. During the time I was at the Mines Department I had to go so far as to tell the mine owners definitely that I would prosecute them if they did not do certain things. For months and months they resisted the installation of water supplies and water sprays in the mines, a matter which cost the whole of the Boulder group only about £2,000—a mere £2,000! They resisted that proposal for

months, declaring it was impracticable. Their opposition only ended when I said to them, "Practicable or impracticable, we will try it; and until the system has been installed, I will prohibit you from operating." The system was installed, and it proved practical and remedial, and no more was heard about it. I do not want to say anything that will reflect upon the mine managers of this State, but I must express my view that in comparison with the South African mine managers they have shown an absolute indifference. We know that the defeats of our attempts to secure amendments of the Workers' Compensation Act, defeats in the Upper House, were due to the efforts of the Chamber of Mines. In view of our huge majority in this Chamber, the mine owners did not trouble about the measure here; but they took care to block it in another place. For weeks they had their representative in Perth, in touch with members in another place, and supplying those members with information in typewritten form. It may be that as servants of the companies the Chamber of Mines had to do their best for those whom they serve. Perhaps they were only doing their duty. But it was a cold-blooded attitude to take up. My endeavour will be to see that the Chamber of Mines and the dividend-snatching companies are no longer allowed to have their way as regards casting on the scrap heap the men who have provided the gold and the dividends. The responsibility should be on the mine owners to see that those men do not die in poverty, and that provision is made for their dependants. There are very few members in another place who represent goldfields constituencies. Nevertheless, whenever a measure affecting the mining industry from the Chamber of Mines point of view is before that place, we see members there who represent pastoral and agricultural or city interests, rising to speak most learnedly on mining matters—men who have never seen the goldfields. It is true that they speak from typewritten information supplied to them by the Chamber of Mines. They speak on legislation which is supposed to hamper the gold mining industry. It is "the industry" all the time. I do not want to touch on matters of sentiment, but if an industry will not provide for those who are broken in its maintenance, it is time the industry died. If the Minister is prepared to accept what he regards as the consensus of opinion of the House, disclosed on the second reading, and if he is prepared to endeavour to improve the measure in Committee, I for my part shall vote for the second reading. But if the Bill is to go through in its present form, I shall have no hesitation whatever in voting against the second reading.

On motion by Mr. Mullany debate adjourned.

House adjourned at 10.25 p.m.

Legislative Council,

Thursday, 7th September, 1922.

	PAGE
Address-in-reply, presentation	620
Motion: Water Supply Department by-laws, to disallow	620
Bills: Nurses' Registration Act Amendment, 2a., Com.	625
Light and Air Act Amendment, 2a.	627
Broome Hill Race-course, 2a., Com. report	628

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

ADDRESS-IN-REPLY—PRESENTATION.

The PRESIDENT [4.33]: I desire to state that this morning I delivered to His Excellency the Lieutenant Governor and Administrator, the Address-in-reply which was adopted last evening. I have His Excellency's reply, which he has been pleased to forward to us. It is as follows:—

Government House, Perth, 7th September, 1922. Mr. President and Gentlemen of the Legislative Council, I thank you for your Address-in-reply to my Speech with which I opened Parliament and for your expression of loyalty to our Most Gracious Sovereign. R. F. McMillan, Lieut.-Governor and Administrator.

I may say I was accompanied by the Leader of the House, the proposer and seconder of the resolution, and we were received under the most favourable circumstances by the Administrator.

MOTION—WATER SUPPLY DEPARTMENT, BY-LAWS.

To Disallow.

Hon. A. LOVEKIN (Metropolitan) [4.34]: I move—

That by-laws promulgated by the Metropolitan Waterworks and Sewerage Department, dated 24th March, 1922, and numbered 7, 43, 52, 69, 93, 100, 105, 125, 130, 131, 132 be and are hereby disallowed.

In days of old, Parliaments were very jealous of their rights in respect to the imposition of taxation. Recently we seem to have got into a new era, when people have become subject to taxation by means of regulations. Mr. Harris mentioned some instances yesterday and I propose to quote to the House some further cases this afternoon, in the hope that Parliament will discountenance this method of governing the people by regulations and taxing them by regulations. We have perhaps a unique opportunity to deal with the by-laws of the Metropolitan Water Supply Department at the present juncture because the old by-laws and regulations have been repealed and a new set, in an amended and consolidated form, has been placed upon the