

ing seats on such a heavy reduction. Why not redistribute on the lines of the 1913 Bill, leaving the commissioners to reduce or increase by one-fifth for special reasons, so as to afford the various bodies of electors, according to their respective situations, an equal opportunity to influence elections to Parliament? The redistribution proposed by the Bill is not fair, and the present is not an opportune time for redistribution.

Mr. GARDINER (Irwin) [9.9]: I move—

*That the debate be adjourned.*

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

Ayes	..	..	..	24
Noes	..	..	..	13

Majority for .. 11

#### AYES.

Mr. Angwin	Mr. W. D. Johnson
Mr. Carpenter	Mr. Mullany
Mr. Chesson	Mr. Munsie
Mr. Collier	Mr. O'Loughlen
Mr. Cunningham	Mr. Scaddan
Mr. Foley	Mr. Taylor
Mr. Gardiner	Mr. Underwood
Mr. Green	Mr. Walker
Mr. Griffiths	Mr. Wansbrough
Mr. Harrison	Mr. Willmott
Mr. Hickmott	Mr. Bolton
Mr. Holman	(Teller.)
Mr. Hudson	

#### NOES.

Mr. Allen	Mr. Nairn
Mr. Butcher	Mr. Robinson
Mr. Connolly	Mr. Smith
Mr. George	Mr. Veryard
Mr. E. B. Johnston	Mr. F. Wilson
Mr. Lefroy	Mr. Hardwick
Mr. Mitchell	(Teller.)

Motion thus passed; the debate adjourned.

*House adjourned at 9.15 p.m.*

## Legislative Council,

*Tuesday, 7th November, 1916.*

	PAGE.
Papers presented .. .. .	667
Assent to bill .. .. .	667
Question: Fruit Canning Project, correspondence ..	667
Motions: Enemy subjects in Government and private employ .. .. .	668
Pipe Manufacture, Prices of Pig Iron .. .. .	672
Sale of Liquor Regulation Act, to continue .. .. .	680
Bills: Adoption of Children Act Amendment, 3a. ....	672
Western Australian Day Funds (No. 2), 3a. ....	672
Wheat Marketing, 2a. ....	674
Special Lease (Lake Clifton), 2a. ....	685
Franchise, 2a. ....	688
Permanent Reserve (No. 1), 2a., cont. ....	690

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

### PAPERS PRESENTED.

By the Colonial Secretary: 1, Health Act, 1911-15: Wagin Municipal Council, adoption of Model By-laws. 2, Roads Act, 1911: Uniform general by-laws for regulating motor and other traffic, adopted by the Corrigin, Dalwallinu, East Avon, Melbourne, Perenjori-Morowa, Queen's Park, and Westonia roads boards.

### ASSENT TO BILL.

Mes-age from the Governor received and read notifying assent to the Postponement of Debts Act Continuation Bill.

### QUESTION—FRUIT-CANNING PROJECT. CORRESPONDENCE.

Hon. A. SANDERSON asked the Colonial Secretary: Will he place on the Table of the House the correspondence between the Agricultural Department and the Associated Fruitgrowers re proposed establishment of fruit-canning works?

The COLONIAL SECRETARY replied: As the Associated Fruitgrowers are at present engaged in delicate negotiations with regard to this matter, it is not considered expedient to lay the correspondence on the Table of the House at the present juncture; but the file can be perused by the honourable member at the Agricultural Department, if he desires to see what has taken place up to the present.

# MOTION—ENEMY SUBJECTS IN GOVERNMENT AND PRIVATE EMPLOY.

Hon. J. CORNELL (South) [4.35]: I move—

*That, as the Government has decided that all persons who are, or have at any time been, subjects of an enemy country shall be retired under "The Public Servants Act, 1915," and as it is the intention of the Government to similarly deal with all other Government workers, this House is of the opinion that the Government should frame and pass a Bill making it unlawful for any employer within Western Australia to employ any person who is, or has at any time been, a subject of an enemy country, during the currency of the war and for one year thereafter.*

Owing to the abnormal times in which we are now living, possibly I may be misjudged in my motives. However, in view of the attitude adopted by the Government on this question and of the remarks of members of the Government, I think the subject is well worthy of consideration by the House. On the 4th October the Premier was asked in another place how many Germans or alien subjects had been put off since the present Government took office. In reply the Premier said—

Up to the present two specific cases on the salaried staff have been dealt with under the Public Servants Act, 1915. The return of wages men is not yet available. The Government have decided that all persons who are or have at any time been subjects of any enemy country shall be retired under the Public Servants Act, 1915. The Public Service Commissioner is now engaged in taking action in accordance with this decision. In the case of persons whose parents (one or both) were at any time subjects of an enemy country, the Public Service Commissioner has been directed to inquire and advise the Government as to whether, in his opinion, such persons should be retained in the service.

That is, I take it, the decision of the Government inasmuch as the Premier himself announced it. It seems that all the powers conferred on the Government by virtue of the Public Servants Act of 1915 have been

given their fullest consummation. The Minister who submitted the Bill in this Chamber said it was necessary, but that it would not be put into operation except there were just causes for it. I take it that any naturalised person who was charged with disloyalty would be given an opportunity of proving his loyalty. As I understood it that was the intention in respect to the Act, but it now seems that the Government have taken full advantage of the Act, for the mandate is that any person who is or at any time has been the subject of an enemy country is to be dismissed from the public service. Going further, the Government have issued instructions to minor Government bodies, such as the museum trustees, working under a board, that enemy subjects in their employ shall be dismissed. It has gone forth to all Government departments and I take it that it is going to be enforced in respect at least to the wages staff, inasmuch as every member of a wages staff has to sign a declaration disclosing his native country. I submit that any person who is an enemy subject should not be employed by the Government and should not be employed either by any other employer in the State; but I hold that any person who has sworn allegiance to His Majesty the King and is in the employ of the Government, or of any private employer, should have the right to defend his case and should be heard. On the 27th October, the Colonial Secretary, speaking at the Skating Rink, was reported as follows:—

There was, he said, another question, and that affected the enemy in their midst. Speaking as a member of the Government he hoped that no Government in Australia would depart from the best British traditions, which laid it down that full and ample justice was to be done to every man.

How are we going to extend full and ample justice to a citizen of the Commonwealth under our law? The enemy subject is not under our law. The only way we can do justice is by giving an opportunity to every man to defend his loyalty. To show the inconsistency of the Government in this direction, I may remind members that a little while ago the working miners on the East-

ern Goldfields, after many turbulent months, decided to work no longer with enemy subjects. In consequence they came out from the mines. A deputation waited on the Government, and the Government despatched the Attorney General to the Eastern Goldfields. There the Attorney General negotiated with the men. For some time the men themselves held out, insisting that the terms of any settlement must rest on the basic principle that no man should be compelled to work with an enemy subject. After a while the miners gave way to the Attorney General. That hon. gentleman said that the question of an alien enemy should be the term under which the foreigners referred to would be tried. But when it comes to the definition of an enemy subject and the definition of an alien enemy as set forth in the War Precautions Act, the distinction is one without a difference. The War Precautions Act defines an enemy subject as the subject of a country with which the United Kingdom is at war, and defines an alien enemy as the subject of a foreign power or State which is at war with His Majesty King George the Fifth. Though it was agreed that the definition of "alien enemy" was a point upon which those foreigners should be indicted and charged, was that definition of "alien enemy" entertained by the Royal Commission? No. Those foreigners were arraigned before a public tribunal where they had a chance of proving whether or not they were disloyal, whether or not they had done anything prejudicial to Great Britain or her Allies. The fact that they were all alien enemies under the War Precautions Act, and all unnaturalised, was absolutely disregarded. Unless it could be irrefutably proved that such a man had said something disloyal or prejudicial to the Empire or its Allies, the Royal Commission permitted him to return to work in the mines.

Hon. Sir E. H. Wittenoom: Was not the Commission a good one?

Hon. J. CORNELL: The Attorney General worked might and main for the alien enemy, not the naturalised alien, to be allowed to go back to work in the mines. The policy advocated by the Attorney General as applying to the private employer, however, is not the policy put into opera-

tion by the Government. When the working man raises objection, the Government say to him, "Very well, we will consider your objection; but that objection must be established where every man will have a chance." That is the procedure upon which the Government insisted in the case of the goldfields. But what do we find the Government doing as a Ministry? They say that no person shall be employed by the State who is, or at any time has been, the subject of an enemy country. Is any tribunal set up before which those men can have the same trial, the same opportunity of defending themselves, as was placed at the disposal of alien enemies or enemy subjects on the Eastern Goldfields? The Government in effect have said that they, as employers, are not prepared, or do not intend, to extend the same right to a naturalised subject as they advocated for and extended to the alien employees of private employers. I charge the Government with being inconsistent, and inconsistent for a purpose. The policy they are advocating is not a policy of patriotism, but a policy of vote-catching. There is no gainsaying the fact that the individual who to-day gets on a public platform to say that no person of enemy origin should be employed at all in Australia is cheered to the echo. I contend, however, that even though we live in abnormal times, there is some sanity left amongst some of us, and that there should be some sense of justice left amongst us also. I know of two cases of hardship, one of which was brought under my personal notice. That was the case of a man who left Germany as a child of two and a half months to come to Australia. He has been for 20 odd years in the service of the Government of this State, and he is going to be retired under this decision of the Government. I have made inquiry and my friends have made inquiry, and everything goes to show that there has been no disloyal utterance or disloyal action on the part of this man. If we are going to carry out this policy, which is, after all, a policy of extermination, I contend we stand bereft of the last vestige of justice. My object in moving the motion is to say to the Government that if the class of persons to whom I have referred are not fit and proper persons

to work for the State, there is only one logical course for the Government to pursue, and that is to pass legislation providing that no employer shall give employment to those persons. What does the attitude of the Government mean? It means that if these men are forced out without a chance, with perhaps nothing against them but the mere fact of an accident of birth, nobody is going to employ them. The Government should be a model employer, and a person not fit to be employed by the Government is not a person fit to be employed by anyone else. If the Government, as model employers, are going to set the example by carrying out in its entirety the programme they have announced, their only logical course is to pass through Parliament a measure providing that no person of enemy origin shall be employed in Western Australia at all. Suppose the man whose case I have detailed, and others like him, are forced out of employment, and no other person employs them on the ground that, as I have said, if they are not fit to be employed by the Government, if the Government dismiss them and send them about their business without inquiry, they must be prejudicial to the State—in what position do we place those persons? They have either to starve, or to appeal to the Federal authorities. Appeal to the Federal authorities for what? Desperation will make of those men alien enemies, and they will probably be forced to commit acts of disloyalty in order to force the Federal Government to intern them. The Government cannot logically uphold their position unless they carry out their policy in its entirety. One further point I have to make. I am prepared to accept an amendment by any hon. member striking out from my motion the words "or has at any time been." I am prepared to accept such an amendment, because then the Government would be called upon to pass a Bill saying, in effect, that no enemy subject shall be employed by any private employer in Western Australia throughout the currency of the war and for one year thereafter. So far as naturalised Australian subjects are concerned, there is ample machinery for dealing with them under the War Precautions Act, and pre-

sumably there is ample authority and power to make inquiry and to ascertain whether these men have been disloyal. Presumably they could, if necessary, be tried under the War Precautions Act. Turning to the enemy subject, however, he stands as a man with no law. There is on his side no law. In this country he has no law. The man who has been in Australia for some length of time and has not become a subject of Australia by naturalisation, cannot claim any of the privileges of an Australian. One last shot: it is said that politics make strange bed-fellows. War makes a great change in ideals. I have stood up in this House, when Mines regulation legislation was being considered, to fight hard and long, in company with a few other members, so to frame that legislation as to limit the percentage of foreigners working in our mines. It is with reluctance I refer to what Sir Edward Wittenoom said on that occasion. The hon. gentleman expressed the opinion that the proposal was the most un-British thing he had ever heard of in his life, and said that he almost blushed for shame to hear it. However, the predictions then made by supporters of the limitation have come true. To-day we find the leader of the present Government, who most strenuously resisted the proposals of the Labour party in this respect, proposals for giving a statutory preference of employment to Britishers, we find that gentleman proposing to extirpate root and branch, leaf and bough, those for whom he and his party were so solicitous only three years ago.

Hon. H. MILLINGTON (North-East) [4.57]: I second the motion.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES (North) [4.58]: I am afraid I cannot support the motion, for the reason that it does not go far enough. I fear it may be thought that I hold drastic views on this subject; but, in my opinion, blood is thicker than water, and all the naturalisation papers in the country will not change a German into an Australian, nor an Irishman into an Englishman. To my mind there is only one way to deal with these aliens, and that is to treat them as enemy subjects, rich or poor, all alike. Unfortunately, that has not been done in the past; on which phase of the subject I shall have something to say before I sit down. The

only course is to put them aside until the war is over.

Hon. A. Sanderson: All aliens?

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: Not all aliens, but enemy aliens. I say put them aside until the war is over, and then send them back to their country, and tell them to stay there and work off the debt that will be owing. That view, with all due respect to other hon. members, seems to me entirely sensible. The alien enemies who have been spying over this country for the last 50 years are to be blamed for their action. I put the responsibility upon them entirely. But if we allow the thing to continue, then there will be nobody to blame but ourselves. So far as I am concerned, if I have any say in legislation dealing with enemy subjects, they will never have another opportunity to bite the hand that has fed them. They have been spying on this country for the past 50 years, and they will continue to spy on us. If they do so again we must blame ourselves. There is one matter to which I wish to refer, that is the difference with which the law is administered. I will give one instance. A few months ago I was on the Fremantle wharf when the "N2" arrived from the North-West. There was an armed guard with fixed bayonets on the wharf. When the vessel had been tied up the guard marched on the ship in all the pomp of military authority with their fixed bayonets flashing in the sunlight. They went to the fore part of the ship and took from there two helpless old men, poor devils who probably did not know that there was a war on, and marched them off in custody. In the same week the "Katoomba" arrived from Sydney, and by her one, who is probably the richest German in Australia, travelled from Sydney to Fremantle in a cabin de luxe. I am opposed to administrative action such as this, though the fault is not that of the State Government. There are the facts—two poor old wretches who were dug up in the back-blocks of the North-West were brought to Fremantle under armed guard and the rich German allowed his liberty.

Member: Were they naturalised?

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: All the naturalisation in the world would not make any dif-

ference. They were brought down under arrest, while a wealthy man was allowed to travel from Sydney to Fremantle in a cabin de luxe, sat at the captain's table, did his business in Perth, and returned to Sydney. I claim that the greatest kindness we could do these men would be to put them aside and treat them all alike, and it would be the greatest compliment we could pay them. We would be saying "You are a German and we suppose you to be loyal to your country; we appreciate that you are loyal just as we expect our people to be loyal to our country. But you have played the game on us for 50 years and we are not prepared to trust you further." Let members consider the position of a Britisher in Germany who happened to be in Germany and had the opportunity of helping England, would he not do so? If that is the attitude which would be adopted by the Englishman or the Irishman in Germany, is it not reasonable to expect a similar attitude on the part of Germans here? If a German in this country were not loyal to Germany I should despise him and look upon him as a traitor to his country, as I consider he has as much right to be loyal to his country as have our people to the British Empire. To the Englishman there is no place like England, to the Irishman similarly there is no place like Ireland—and I do not think he is far out. The same may be said of the Welshman and the Scotsman. I am reminded of one hysterical woman who was asked to vote "Yes" on the recent referendum. She replied: "I have three sons at the war and one son in camp; but Hughes is a Welshman, and I never knew a Welshman yet who was any good, I will vote No." If that attitude is adopted by our own people of the British Empire is it not only reasonable that we should expect that Germans would be loyal to their own country? I could give numerous instances of the absurdity of our treatment of Germans. In the North a few months ago there was a German travelling allegedly in the interests of science; and I do not think I am far wrong when I say that he was franked by the late Premier, Mr. Scaddan. I got that information from what I believe to be an authentic source. Mr. Scaddan was so impressed by the value

of that man's investigations from a scientific standpoint that he franked this gentleman to the North while we were at war. That man was an enemy subject. From an absolutely reliable source I have learned that even while the West Australian Government was franking this gentleman to the North, the Commonwealth Government had a man chasing him round to see what his game really was. I want that sort of thing put a stop to. We should put these enemy subjects away quietly, treat them well and if they want to work let them do so—I would even pay them for their work—and when the war is over I would send them back to their own country. That is the only thing to do; but we should treat all alike.

On motion by Hon. R. G. Ardagh, debate adjourned.

#### RETURN—PIPE MANUFACTURE, PRICE OF PIG IRON.

Hon. J. DUFFELL (Metropolitan-Suburban) [5.7]: I move—

*That there be laid on the Table of the House a return in reference to the pipes supplied by Monteath Bros., Subiaco, showing the prices for pig iron each month since December, 1914—(a) allowed in account with Monteath Bros.; (b) paid to Stores Branch by State Implement Works; (c) paid by Commissioner for Railways.*

It is not my intention to deal with this matter in any detail. I have deemed it my duty in the interests of hon. members to ask that this return be laid upon the Table of the House.

Question passed.

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

Bill read a third time and passed.

#### BILL—WESTERN AUSTRALIAN DAY FUNDS (No. 2).

*Third reading.*

The COLONIAL SECRETARY (Hon. H. P. Colebatch—East) [5.10]: I move—

*That the Bill be now read a third time.*

Hon. J. F. CULLEN (South-East [5.11]): I regret I was absent from the House when this Bill was being considered on the second reading and thus had not an opportunity of saying two or three things in regard to it which I desired to say. I know that this is not the proper time, but there are two features of the Bill to which I wish to take the opportunity of referring. The first is that the Bill passes over a most important feature. Hon. members will know that the Western Australian Day Fund was started as an act of benevolence. Nearly every donor to the fund was under the impression that the money would go to aid our wounded soldiers, and on the strength of that belief an enormous amount of money was collected for the fund. Soon after these collections were completed the committee gave notice to the public of their intention to hand over the fund to the Western Australian divisional committee of the British Red Cross. That was a very important step. The local contributors had subscribed under the idea that donors were helping wounded soldiers. This Bill does not attempt to confirm the action of the committee in placing the fund at the disposal of the British Red Cross. The first step in this Bill should have been to confirm or disallow that action. I recognise that the action has now to be confirmed; but it has not been confirmed in this Bill, and instead of the Bill preventing disputes and litigation in the future it will probably have a contrary effect. That is the main aspect upon which I wish to touch. The Bill in my opinion makes another mistake in assuming that the reference to the Supreme Court, which was necessary before confirmation of the transfer to the Red Cross Society, will remain a necessary part of the machinery of the Bill. But it is not so. As I have said, the money was subscribed from motives of benevolence for distribution amongst wounded soldiers in Australia. The Red Cross Society has been given portion of the funds to be distributed beyond the boundaries of Australia. If they were Red Cross funds, it would be perfectly justified in doing so without any reference whatever to the court. But the reference was required to be made to our Supreme Court to authorise the persons holding this money

to pay over the sum of £15,000 for expenditure by the British Red Cross beyond the boundaries of Australia; and this Bill proceeds upon the supposition that similar references are required to cover any distributions beyond Australia in the future. I will quote from the Bill—

Provided that nothing herein contained shall restrict the distribution of such portions of the said funds as may by the authority of the Supreme Court be distributed amongst military hospitals in England, Egypt, Malta, and elsewhere.

Once the fund is recognised as Red Cross money, it is perfectly legal for it to go to these outside objects. As a matter of fact, it would not be legal for it to be spent locally for returned soldiers. That is not contemplated in Red Cross expenditure. Now, the amazing part of it is that the Bill neglects to do the things it ought to have done, and performs a work of supererogation and in such a way as may involve reference to the Supreme Court. I am sorry to have to criticise the Bill in this way, but from my point of view, instead of clearing up confusion, it makes confusion worse confounded and opens the door to litigation. Happily, men are not inclined to make trouble over patriotic funds. This is the only safeguard for this Bill. If it fails to do what it is intended that it should do. It requires to make legal the handing over of this money to the British Red Cross, but it does not do so. I do not say that the money should have been handed over to the British Red Cross and I, as a small contributor, am not going to raise that point. The fund has been handed over to the British Red Cross—

Hon. Sir E. H. Wittenoom: How much?

Hon. J. F. CULLEN: The whole of it.

Hon. Sir E. H. Wittenoom: Nonsense.

Hon. J. F. CULLEN: Yes. The Western Australian Divisional Committee of the British Red Cross now holds the money. The portion authorised by the court to be spent by the Red Cross was money which the British Red Cross had the right to spend. If the money belonged to the British Red Cross they did not need any order from the Supreme Court, and the very fact that the Government caused the matter to be re-

ferred to the Supreme Court meant that the Government were in doubt about the right of handing it over to the British Red Cross. One would naturally assume that this Bill would confirm the action of handing over the money to the Red Cross, but it does not do so.

Hon. Sir E. H. Wittenoom: I am talking about the War Council. They are taking authority to hand it over to the War Council.

Hon. J. F. CULLEN: It has not been handed over to the War Council and there is no authority to do so.

Hon. Sir E. H. Wittenoom: Pardon me. If the hon. member will read Clause 2 he will find it is there.

Hon. J. F. CULLEN: Clause 2 says—

It shall be lawful for the Divisional Committee of the Western Australian Division of the Australian Branch of the British Red Cross Society to expend the funds raised in the said State by the movement known as "The Western Australian Day for the Sick and Wounded.

Hon. Sir E. H. Wittenoom: Read the next paragraph.

Hon. J. F. CULLEN: The Clause goes on—

It shall also be lawful for the said Divisional Committee, in its discretion, from time to time out of the said funds to pay moneys to the War Council of Western Australia to be expended by such Council.

That is of course right. This Bill goes further and provides for a reference to the Supreme Court to do what this Divisional Committee, as representing the Australian Branch of the British Red Cross, would be perfectly justified in doing. The Bill has failed in its intention in my opinion, but fortunately there is this safeguard, that only some miscreant here or there might be inclined to raise trouble over benevolent funds; but insofar as this Bill is intended to prevent action on the part of such individuals it has failed. I do not ask a re-construction of the Bill at this stage. If the Government are satisfied, they are the people responsible.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

## BILL—WHEAT MARKETING.

*Second Reading.*

The COLONIAL SECRETARY (Hon. H. P. Colebatch—East) [5.20] in moving the second reading said: In submitting this Bill for the approval of hon. members I desire briefly to state the circumstances which have rendered it necessary. It will be remembered that the Commonwealth Government combined with the Government of the wheat exporting States to market the harvest of the 1915-16 season. The Commonwealth Government had the necessary power to do this under War Precautions legislation, but the individual States concerned had not the necessary legal authority. In Western Australia, the Government acted without legislative authority and this Bill is intended to cover that defect, to give sanction to what has already been done, in addition to making provision for future action. New South Wales and South Australia had indirect authority under war legislation, whilst Victoria had a special Act passed dealing with the matter of the marketing of wheat. It has been considered advisable, and has, I understand, been recommended by the Federal authorities, that uniform legislation so far as practicable, in view of the different conditions existing in the different States, should be passed, based largely on the lines of that in the Victorian legislation. This Bill has been framed on the basis of the Victorian Act with such alterations as have been deemed desirable to suit local requirements. I do not think it is necessary for me to dwell on the question of the necessity for a national scheme for handling the harvest at the present time. That necessity arose out of the great shortage of freight, something like half of the world's shipping having been either destroyed or engaged for war purposes, which necessarily made a very acute shortage of freight. The object of the scheme generally was to secure to the wheat growers an equal opportunity for each individual in the marketing of his harvest, and also to endeavour as far as possible to give each grower London parity for his wheat. It was also designed to give to the farmer what he could not otherwise have secured, that is, an immediate cash payment for his wheat. Failing some scheme of the kind it might have been extremely difficult

for the farmer to secure an immediate cash payment, because of the difficulty in exporting wheat. The scheme came into operation on the first December, 1915. Its management is vested in an Interstate board in Melbourne, known as the Australian Wheat Board, a London Board, and State Advisory Committees. The Australian Wheat Board is comprised of the Prime Minister (Mr. Hughes), the Ministers for Agriculture of Victoria, New South Wales, and South Australia, and the Minister for Industries in Western Australia. The functions of this Australian Wheat Board are to control shipping and marketing of wheat, to fix the price of wheat for local consumption and to generally finance the scheme. This board had the assistance of an advisory committee consisting of representatives of Messrs. John Darling & Co., James Bell & Co., and Dalgety & Co., all well known wheat dealing firms. The London Board consists of the Commonwealth High Commissioner and the Agents General of the four wheat producing States affected, namely, New South Wales, Victoria, South Australia, and Western Australia. Its functions are to deal with the overseas realisation of the wheat exported, and its selling agents are Messrs. James Bell, John Darling, and Dalgety. The Western Australian local committee, known as the State Wheat Marketing Committee, acts as an advisory committee to the Minister. The personnel of this advisory board, whose members serve in an honorary capacity, are Messrs. Sutton, the State Wheat Commissioner, Mr. Deane Hammond, the local manager of Elder, Shenton & Co., and a representative of Messrs. George Wills & Co. The functions of the local committee are to secure wheat, ship it, and effect local sales. The acquiring agents and shippers are Messrs. Dreyfus & Co., John Darling, Dalgety, and the Western Australian Farmers' Ltd., whilst the local millers are also acquiring agents for the wheat required for milling purposes. The local agency agreements, running until 30th September, 1916, have been continued by the Minister to the 30th January, 1917, to enable the wheat on hand to be shipped. Some modification of the terms of these agreements will be made, but these have not yet been decided upon, and in some particulars will be sub-



mitted to arbitration. The shipper acquiring agent has to guarantee the out-turn of the wheat at the port of discharge of equivalent value to that shown in the certificate that he hands to the farmer, and he is under a bond of £20,000 to make good his certificates.

Hon. W. Kingsmill: Up to the 30th September?

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: Up to the 30th September, and this is being continued to the 30th June, 1917. As I have stated, some modification of the agreement will be required, because of the extra period that he is expected to carry the wheat, though the terms of the modification, if they cannot otherwise be agreed upon, will be submitted to arbitration.

Hon. Sir E. H. Wittenoom: Are the bonds extended to June, 1917?

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: To June, 1917, because of the difficulty of getting the wheat away. The original idea of the Federal Government was that the whole of the wheat could be got away by the end of September of this year. Now, I think it is apparent that the whole of the 1915-16 harvest will not be got away very much before the 30th June, 1917.

Hon. Sir E. H. Wittenoom: I understand the bonds of the agents have been extended to June, 1917.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: Yes; the scheme is being extended. Their remuneration is, for acquiring wheat at the siding and shipping 3d., for acquiring direct at the port of shipment 1½d., and when received at the siding and disposed of locally 1¾d. This commission is payable to the extent of 1½d. when a certificate is issued, and the balance of 1½d. when the wheat is shipped. The miller acquiring agents, that is, millers who purchase wheat for turning into flour and for local consumption, are under a bond of £500 and a £1,000, according to the size of the mill. The lower bond is regulated by the fact that they buy a smaller quantity of wheat than the shipping acquiring agent buys. The miller's remuneration for acquiring wheat that is afterwards consigned to the shipping agent by order of the Minister is 1½d., the same as a shipping acquiring agent under similar circumstances. For acquiring wheat for his own

milling purpose, the miller receives no payment at all, but he pays for wheat obtained direct from the farmer's wagon a premium of ½d. The farmer was entitled in the first instance to an advance of 3s. per bushel f.o.b. for f.a.q. wheat, the certificate issued entitling him also to receive any interim dividend, and to participate in the final distribution on the termination of the pool. The second advance of 6d. per bushel was paid during last month, making a total of 3s. 6d. f.o.b. In Western Australia, approximately an additional 4d. to this advance has been paid by the State Government, who made special financial arrangements for that payment, were enabled to bring that about, so that practically, in this State, the growers have received what is equal to 3s. 10d. f.o.b. as against 3s. 6d. received in the other States. This arrangement was made in the first instance by the preceding Government, who said that they would deduct from the 3s. only the railway freights, leaving the agency charges to be met subsequently out of the pool. That arrangement was carried out so far as the first 3s. was concerned; then, when the subsequent 6d. came along it was represented by the authorities governing the wheat pool generally that it was not fair that the Western Australian farmer should have an advantage as compared with the farmers of the Eastern States. It was pointed out by the Government that the position of the farmers here was far more serious than that of the farmers of the Eastern States, because, generally speaking, there was a greater number of new farmers who had not had time to establish themselves or to prepare for an emergency of this kind. Finally, permission was given for the payment of the extra advance to be made if the State Government were prepared to guarantee it and also to find the money for the purpose. That was done and the advance was made. Roughly, the payment of 3s. 10d. f.o.b. means the value of the wheat at sidings at 3s. 2d., average railage 3¾d., excess port handling charges ¼d., port handling charge 1d., commission for the acquiring agent 3d.; making a total of 3s. 10d. Of course, for inferior wheat, pinched and rust, the lower price of 1s. 6d. a bushel has been paid. So far as wheat at present stacked

in the country is concerned, generally speaking it is understood from the reports of experts who have visited these stacks that they are in very fair condition, particularly in view of the length of time they have been there. In some cases inexperience on the part of sub-agents has resulted in defective stacking, but this is a matter in regard to which it is hoped an improvement will be made so far as next harvest is concerned. The experience of the past year will, doubtless, lead to better methods in the future, but this bad stacking is not general. It applies only to a limited number of cases and, generally speaking, those who have inspected the stacks on behalf of the Government are fairly well satisfied with their condition.

Member: Did the agents pay for the bad stacking.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: In some cases the agreement cast the responsibility on the agents but in cases where bad stacking can be demonstrated, there is no doubt that the agent will have to pay. At Albany where there are something like 50,000 bags the wheat is safely housed in well appointed stores. At Bunbury the stacks are particularly well built and are opening up well. There are 190,000 bags stacked there. At Geraldton most of the wheat suitable for shipment abroad has already been cleared. At Fremantle there are traces of weevil but the stacks generally are opening up well. The total stacked there at the present time is  $1\frac{1}{4}$  million bags.

Hon. Sir E. H. Wiltcnoom: Has any damage been done by mice?

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: There has been a certain amount of damage done by mice but not nearly as much as was at one time feared was the case. The wheat on hand at the present time amounts to 7,821,000 bushels, of which 4,499,850 bushels is at ports, 2,650,950 is at country sidings, and 670,200 at the mills. There has been shipped 4,566,950 bushels and  $2\frac{1}{2}$  million bushels have been sold locally for milling purposes, making a total disposed of of 7,163,000 bushels, or nearly half of the total harvest. That was somewhere in the

neighbourhood of 18 million bushels. Doubtless two or three million bushels were kept back for seed and other purposes and sold independently of the pool. The value of the wheat certificates issued amounted to £2,247,279 and the second advance of 6d. represented £374,601, so that up to the present time the farmers in this State have had an advance from the pool of £2,621,880. The total cash receipts for wheat sold amount to £1,727,794. If the charges for these are added it will be found that an amount of £1,144,000 is still outstanding. So far as the Australian wheat pool, covering the four States, is concerned, the total wheat acquired was 161,000,000 bushels, easily a record for Australia. The quantity shipped and disposed of to date has been 65,328,000 bushels and the wheat on hand totals 96,411,000 bushels. These figures are of some interest as indicating that Western Australia has not been badly treated in the matter of shipments. In Western Australia practically half the wheat has been disposed of, which suggests that we have our full share of tonnage in the past. The advances involved for the Commonwealth amount to £28,416,000. The amount so far realised for sales made by the pool has been £16,582,000, leaving a balance owing against the crop of £11,834,000. In addition to this, half a million tons has been purchased by the Imperial Government, who have undertaken to send ships out to take the wheat away. The value of that wheat will be something like four millions sterling, which will reduce the overdraft against the pool to between seven millions and eight millions sterling.

Member: Is there any specified time for lifting that wheat?

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: I do not think so, but they are beginning to feel the need of wheat.

Hon. E. M. Clarke: Has the price been disclosed?

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: I do not think so, but I think it will realise about four millions sterling. In order to place the whole thing on a sound basis, we shall require to realise 2s.  $5\frac{1}{2}$ d. per bushel for the remaining wheat. The purchase of half a million tons by the Im-

perial Government is understood to have netted the pool 4s. a bushel, so that a still further reduction can be made from that 2s. 5½d. per bushel which is required to square up the pool. It may, therefore, be said with confidence that the pool is in a sound position financially, and that neither the Commonwealth nor the State Government is likely to lose a penny. As to the subsequent dividend that will be obtained, a good deal will depend upon the amount that proves to be lost in the stacks through the long detention of the wheat, and a great deal also will depend upon the price realised for the remainder of the last harvest. So far as the future is concerned, there is good reason to suppose that the price will be highly satisfactory. The price, we learn, is going up steadily because of the shortage in America, and there should be another dividend for the grower, and it is important to remember that, so far as loss through detention in stacks is concerned, any loss that may take place in the other States will not fall upon the farmer here, any more than the loss here will fall upon the farmer in the other States. We may take it that the loss will not be any greater than is inevitable as the result of holding wheat for such a long period. This Bill not only authorises the arrangements made for the previous harvest, but gives power to enter into similar arrangements for the future harvest. So far as the future harvest is concerned, I think it may reasonably be expected that in Western Australia it will not be very much less than that of the 1915-16 harvest. There is a lesser area sown in most districts but, speaking with the knowledge that there are other members more competent than I am to express an opinion, I think I can say that in a great majority of districts the average per acre will be higher than that of last year. Therefore, it is possible that the total harvest, if it does not reach the record of the 1915-16 season, will closely approach it. The future of the pool management will, to a large extent, be determined by the result of the conference which commences its sittings in Melbourne either tomorrow or on Thursday, and to attend which the Minister for Industries, who is in charge of the pool so far as this State is concerned, has proceeded to Melbourne. There is only one contentious clause in

the Bill, and it is the clause which has no reference to the real subject of the measure. Hon. members will agree that the attitude I intend to take up in regard to that clause is the proper one. I am not going to say anything about it at this stage, for the simple reason that, after the Bill was passed in another place, it was decided to refer the particular clause to a select committee. I do not know whether that is a usual course to follow, but it has been taken. It is highly desirable that the Bill should be passed without unnecessary delay. At the same time I have no intention of asking the House to deal with the Committee stage until the select committee have completed their inquiries; when we receive their report and recommendations we can proceed with the Committee stage. I move—

*That the Bill be now read a second time.*

Hon. Sir E. H. Wittenoom: Clause 7 of the Bill seems to be very much involved.

Hon. W. KINGSMILL (Metropolitan) [5.45]: It may strike hon. members as strange that I, representing a metropolitan constituency, should have anything whatever to say on the Bill; but it must be remembered that I have among my constituents those who are known as St. George's-terrace farmers. The name was applied to them in the first place as a term of reproach and ridicule; but, in dealing with this question, the knowledge they have somewhat painfully acquired of farming is backed up by an additional knowledge of business which they, as city dwellers, undoubtedly have, and which is extremely useful to them in considering the provisions of the Bill. Many of them have put their money into farming; some of them have lost it, some can see it in the far distance, though without any evidence of its coming back their way, while others among them are doing very well. As I say, in addition to their experience of farming, they have undoubtedly a knowledge of business which some of the farmers who live on the land are without. I do not know that the farming community as a whole has been altogether pleased with the management of the wheat pool. I am led to believe it is not so. At all events, they are inclined to cavil at the circumstance that they have not been adequately consulted about the provisions which have been made.

and that they are not represented on the advisory board, while it is further said that, even if they were so represented, that advisory board has absolutely no power whatever. I have been furnished with certain statements in regard to the Bill by a number of my farming constituents. The contentions therein contained are such as to indicate that this Chamber or any Chamber would be very unwise to pass the Bill in its entirety without sufficient inquiry. The leader of the House is not quite right when he says that the only contentious clause is that relating to the millers. There are other clauses which will stand looking into, and I understand that the millers, who have been very busy in enlisting the sympathies of hon. members are the last who have cause to complain of the operations of the wheat board.

Hon. Sir E. H. Wittenoom: Wrong.

Hon. C. F. Baxter: No, quite right.

Hon. W. KINGSMILL: Last month there sat in Melbourne an Australian gathering of representatives of the farming industry of Australia, and I have yet to learn that the conclusions those representatives came to, and which were embodied and voiced at a deputation which waited on the Prime Minister and also on Mr. Hagellthorne—who has taken a leading part in the pooling of the wheat—that the representations they made had any effect on the legislation since produced in Victoria, or which is now being produced here. Let me briefly mention a few points which these gentlemen object to in the Bill. In the first place they say that the system which it is sought to perpetuate by this measure is not satisfactory to them, is a system which might with advantage be altered on the lines indicated in the information they have given to me. I have already said they bitterly complain that a farmers' representative has not yet been included in the composition of the advisory board.

The Colonial Secretary: They have a representative on the board.

Hon. W. KINGSMILL: Well, I am glad to hear that, and I will be glad if the Minister will reply to each of the points as I make them. Secondly, they say that no political appointment should be allowed, that if there is to be a representative on the advisory board it should be settled by what

can easily obtain, namely, a system of ballot among the vendors of last year's harvest. That is a practicable and inexpensive method of settling the question. The representative should be thoroughly representative, and, as I understand, it is an honorary board, there is not likely to be a wild rush of applicants.

Hon. J. F. Cullen: It is not honorary.

Hon. W. KINGSMILL: I understand that it is. Subclause 2 of Clause 5 provides as follows—

All acts and proceedings heretofore done and taken by the Government of the State of Western Australia or the Premier or other responsible Minister of the said State in the premises are hereby ratified.

That is a very big thing indeed to ask. Of course we know all these things have been done with the best intentions, but some of the farming community maintain that, recognising those best intentions, the best results have not been obtained.

Hon. J. F. Cullen: "Condoned" should have been the word, instead of "ratified."

Hon. W. KINGSMILL: "Condoned" has an unpleasant significance, which, no doubt, the hon. member fully appreciates. In Clause 7 the agency agreements are ratified and confirmed, apparently on the basis which obtained last year. I understand that an agreement was made with the agents, whereby those agents should accept the responsibility of agency up to the 30th September last, after which a modification might be made. We have in the Bill the agreement entered into between the Minister and the agents, but not the modifications which were made for the succeeding period.

The Colonial Secretary: They are not complete yet.

Hon. W. KINGSMILL: I understood they were. These agents have apparently done fairly well out of the work, because I am informed that £124,991 has been paid to them as agency fees.

Hon. Sir E. H. Wittenoom: How much did they put up as a guarantee??

Hon. W. KINGSMILL: Some £20,000.

The Colonial Secretary: The agreement cannot be completed until after the conference in Melbourne.

Hon. W. KINGSMILL: That will be held between the Prime Minister and the other gentlemen whom you mentioned, with

Mr. Mitchell as representative of Western Australia. Mr. Mitchell has gone away, having no doubt consulted the wishes of the farming community of Western Australia in this connection.

Hon. C. F. Baxter: No.

Hon. W. KINGSMILL: I am glad to elicit these points, if only to show hon. members that Clause 7 is not the only clause worth inquiring into, and to suggest that perhaps a little more time might be given to the consideration of the Bill. I understand that when the Bill was first brought down in another place a desire was evinced to have it put through all stages as quickly as possible, so that it might be finally fixed up before last Saturday. Obviously such a course was unnecessary, because our representative in this conference would not reach Melbourne until Thursday next, and I presume the conference will last for several days. Anyhow, I fail to see that the Bill has very much to do with the conference.

The Colonial Secretary: There is no occasion to hurry.

Hon. W. KINGSMILL: I am glad to hear that, for I am fast coming to the conclusion that not merely Clause 7 should be referred to a select committee, but that the whole Bill should be so treated.

Hon. Sir E. H. Wittenoom: No.

Hon. W. KINGSMILL: With all due respect to my hon. friend's very lengthy experience of Parliament, I am not prepared to accept his verdict on this particular occasion. Clause 9 provides that the contracts are not assignable, and that the certificates are not negotiable instruments. That was, perhaps, a wise provision, in that when the arrangement was first made the certificate issued was supposed to be of a more temporary nature than has proved to be the case. But now that we find the operations of the Bill are extending from one harvest into another, and when we find that the men who hold the certificates are desirous of using them for the purpose of financing, it is obvious that this clause should not find a place in the Bill. I understand that some farmers desired that the certificates should not be negotiable in order to prevent trafficking in them; but it seems to me that one might just as well attempt to prevent trafficking in pound notes. In many cases the certificates

are all that the farmer has to meet the world with. It is provided that the certificate shall continue to be not negotiable until the Minister—why the Minister should be dragged in I really do not know—has given his consent in writing. Undoubtedly this clause is open to some question. Clause 14 deals with the protection of the Government's property in wheat. It will have one or two effects which I think were not contemplated. It reads as follows—

The property in all wheat in the possession of agents, including wheat appropriated to the purposes of Clause 10 of agreements made in the form in the second schedule and in the products of such wheat shall continue in the Crown until supplies are taken by the agent and paid for as in the said Clause 10 provided.

This clause has another effect: The miller, under his agreement, stacks wheat at his mill. Until he buys for his requirements all products of this belong to the Government. This will mean that the miller need not make payment for wheat held by him until he has actually milled it.

The Colonial Secretary: That was the contract under his agreement.

Hon. W. KINGSMILL: I am informed not, and I am told that the outcry raised by the millers in connection with the Bill is very much misplaced.

The Colonial Secretary: He has to pay for his wheat.

Hon. W. KINGSMILL: No, the clause says "the property in all wheat."

Hon. J. J. Holmes: The wheat has to be paid for.

Hon. W. KINGSMILL: Yes, but he has not to pay for it until he mills it. That, I think, justifies an inquiry into the circumstances, and justifies me in saying that the millers have been very generously treated in the Bill. I have not much more to say about this Bill, except to express my relief at having learnt that the leader of the House does not intend to unduly hurry the measure. With the experience which is available in this Chamber the measure, if not unduly hurried, will be thoroughly threshed out, and a good working agreement arrived at to settle the question. To me it seems that the matter has been the subject of one of those charitable impulses to which Mr. Cullen has alluded in

another connection; and therefore the provisions of the Bill have not, perhaps, received from the Government so much consideration as they merited. It is another case of good intentions, and I trust we shall not proceed along the road which good intentions are asserted to pave. I earnestly hope that the Bill, after having been referred to a select committee, will meet with the approval of the farming community and also of the people generally for whose benefit it has been introduced.

On motion by Hon. C. F. Baxter debate adjourned.

#### MOTION—SALE OF LIQUOR REGULATION ACT, TO CONTINUE.

Debate resumed from the 31st October on the motion by the Colonial Secretary, "That the Sale of Liquor Regulation Act, 1915, shall continue in operation for the further period of twelve calendar months, from the 31st December, 1916, that is to say, until the 31st December, 1917."

Hon. J. DUFFELL (Metropolitan-Suburban) [6.2]: I support the Colonial Secretary's motion, as I consider the measure to which it relates is one of the most effective war measures that have been passed by this or any other Parliament. Looking around the city of Perth one cannot fail to realise the many advantages which have accrued from legislation of this character. There is no doubt that much has been gained, that savings have been effected, and that temperance reform has received an impetus, thanks to this Act. When first it was suggested, in 1914, that the hours for the sale of intoxicating liquor might be reduced to 12, from 9 a.m. to 9 p.m., it created some surprise in this Chamber. Right here I wish to point out that the scandalous action of some hooligans in the city of Perth last Friday week can in no way be attributed to the provisions of the 9 to 9 Act. According to the reports of this disgraceful episode, the whole of the participants appeared to be perfectly sober, and in no way under the influence of liquor. Therefore it cannot be said by the most ardent advocate of temperance reform, or so-called temperance reform, that the fact of

the hotels being allowed to remain open till 9 p.m. was at all responsible for the actions in question. As one who has taken a keen interest in the 9 to 9 movement, and as one who first introduced the 9 to 9 proposal in this Chamber, I take more than an ordinary interest in the subject. Realising that we have in our midst men who are supposed to be staunch advocates of temperance reform, but who lend themselves to putting into print statements of an utterly dirty character, one cannot but feel a certain degree of irritation. I refer to statements made by one of the so-called temperance advocates in a paper of which he purports to be the editor, *The Reformer*, which I believe to be a temperance paper. The journal reaches me from time to time, but I do not read it. Like, I suppose, other hon. members, I consign it to its proper place, the wastepaper basket. Therefore the fact of my becoming aware of a certain paragraph in its September issue is not due to the fact of my having received a copy. However, I consider it not out of place to read the paragraph in question, which deals with the subject of a deputation that waited on the Premier when the question of hotels closing at 6 p.m. was under discussion—

Quite an array of names as the representatives of liquor organisations were present to show cause why the Premier, as the leader of the Government and the servant of the people, should disregard the wishes of the electors who desire to be consulted as to the trading hours of hotels. Mr. R. S. Haynes, K.C., was there to say the barley growers would be injured if the requests of the electors in the above respect were granted. When not engaged in growing barley for brewers, the eminent King's Counsel seems to make a decent amount by defending or prosecuting, among others, a number of people who have tried the stuff made from some of the barley.

So far, so good. But the paragraph does not stop there. It continues—

No mention is made in the list we have read of the gentleman who, during the parliamentary session, helps to make laws for Christians, and in the period when the House retires from its labours makes a living by selling corks to brewers.

A cheap advertisement. The paragraph concludes—

He was probably there. Be this as it may, we are satisfied that when the rights of the people are being discussed in the "Upper House" he will be on hand to see that the brewers get fair play.

I am indeed sorry that the writer of the paragraph is not in the gallery. I moved the adjournment of the debate, hoping that he would accept it as an intimation that something worth his listening to was about to be uttered. However, I shall have to proceed with my eulogy of the gentleman in his absence. True it is that when Parliament is in session it is my privilege to help to make laws for Christians. It is also my privilege, when necessity arises, to help to make laws to deal with parasites, to help to place on the statute-books Acts limiting the boundaries within which swine may be kept. I do not wish to infer that the writer of the paragraph is either a parasite or a swine, but I did feel some more than ordinary interest in this piece of his writing. That being so, I took upon myself to search out what the individual is who has written these lines. There is only one book to which I could resort for information. It was the Book of books, the Book upon which all laws are founded. In the early pages of that volume I discovered a man by the name of Esau, an Ishmaelite, a man whose hand was against every one, and every one's hand against him. Not being quite satisfied that this description filled the bill, I searched further, and later I found reference to one Ananias. Ananias is well known to every thinking person, and I suppose I should be justified in saying that the name of Ananias has been taught to most of the children in the fourth standard of the State schools. Ananias is universally acknowledged to be the king of liars. Therefore I find that the man who penned these lines is a hybrid, a cross between an Ishmaelite and an Ananias.

The PRESIDENT: Perhaps the hon. member will get to the Sale of Liquor Bill.

Hon. J. DUFFELL: I am trying to show the depth to which some people who pose as temperance reformers will stoop in endeavouring to spread the poison which permeates their own minds. An article such as this is worthy of the scathing remarks which

I have applied to it, and which show that I am heartily in sympathy with the motion before the House proposing to extend the operation of the 9 to 9 regulation for another 12 months. I am satisfied that the measure in question is the best in force in the Commonwealth to-day. We need only look to South Australia to see the effect of curfew legislation, which has been in operation in that State since March last. The South Australians, instead of gaining what they hoped by the closing of hotels at six o'clock, have done an incalculable amount of harm by forcing people to consume liquor in their own homes, and under the eyes of their children. I make this statement, fully assured that it is beyond contradiction. The sale of liquor in South Australia has increased very considerably since six o'clock closing came into force, as compared with the sale when the hotels shut their doors at a later hour. This is borne out by the fact that one of the largest breweries in South Australia has increased its sale of bottled beer by something like 50 per cent. What this one brewery has gained, the others must also have shared in. Indeed that deduction is supported by the excise returns furnished by the breweries. I have experienced much pleasure in ventilating the feeling which I have pent up for some time on this question, and I have also much pleasure in supporting the motion before the House.

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

Hon. J. J. HOLMES (North) [7.30]: I desire to say only a few words in connection with this motion and shall not detain the House long on the subject. In my opinion the 9 to 9 clause has worked very satisfactorily. Of course I recognise that it is merely a war emergency measure, but it has given such good results that I think it is likely to become permanent. Certainly the country will never go back to anything after 9 o'clock closing, even though we do not agree to further curtail the hours for the sale of liquor. I think Mr. Duffell might have been fair when he pointed out that under 9 to 9 the consumption of bottled beer had gone up very considerably. That may have been, and was no doubt due to the fact that the bulk beer consumed in hotels has

been reduced to a far greater extent than the increase in the sale of bottled beer. When telling the House that under 9 to 9 the consumption of bottled beer had gone up, it was only fair that he should have told the House that the consumption of bulk beer had been reduced to a far greater extent. My principal object in speaking is to urge upon the Government to administer special legislation in this matter. Parliament has passed special legislation empowering the Government to close hotels at any time under certain circumstances. I blame the Labour Government because it did not give effect to that special legislation, and this being a purely non-party House I now blame the Wilson Government and urge upon the Colonial Secretary the necessity for taking some action in connection with the closing of hotels when disgraceful scenes occur, as they have done in the past. I claim it to be the clear duty of the Government to close hotels when a transport anchors in Fremantle and men are liberated in hundreds. In the earlier days of the war we had some disgraceful scenes, but I had thought the difficulty had been got over by the military authorities by not allowing men to land from transports. When these men come ashore they are supplied by the hotel-keepers. I have myself seen them supplied in the presence of the police. I have seen men full of beer go into hotels and be served. And in my opinion the only way to deal with that difficulty is to close up hotels when a transport arrives.

Member: What about dealing with the policeman?

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: I presume the policeman could also be dealt with; but the principal culprit in this case is I think the publican, for supplying, or allowing to be supplied, liquor to soldiers who are not in a fit condition to carry any more. It would not be fair to victimise the policemen; we should punish the publican—if he will not properly conduct his hotel he should be made to face the consequences. There was a Bill introduced to Parliament providing for a referendum on the subject of the reduction of hours for the sale of liquor. I am glad that another place has dealt with that matter as it should be dealt with. We have had

enough of referenda, whether on the liquor or any other question. As representatives of the people we should deal with public questions here and not attempt to shift our responsibility on to hysterical women and narrow-minded parsons. Had the Referendum Bill been introduced a month earlier and come up to this House I feel certain it would have been thrown out. Even the Lower House seems to have had enough of referenda. The Referendum Bill having failed, and there being very little possibility of reducing the present hours of 9 to 9, there is one thing Parliament might do, and I hope the House will have an opportunity shortly of legislating on the question of anti-shouting. I am convinced that the 9 to 9 scheme has worked well, and while I admit that it is not possible by Act of Parliament to prevent men from getting drink if they want it, we can do much to lessen the evils of drink by an anti-shouting measure and thus prevent the youth and young men of to-day acquiring the malicious drink habit. I hope to introduce a Bill in a few days making provision to prevent one man from supplying another with drink. I have no more to say except to express my opinion that the 9 to 9 clause has worked remarkably well. I desire at this stage just to draw attention to another matter. In Fremantle one may often see young men in hotels, not drunkards, men of between 15 and 20 years of age, who get together and they shout for one another, and before they know where they are, they are the worse for liquor. I think it is the duty of the Government to protect these people from themselves.

Hon. J. E. DODD (South) [7.40]: I would like to say that I am sorry indeed that the Government has not seen fit to take steps to take a referendum on this question in this State outside the goldfields area. I am not altogether in accord with what Mr. Duffell has said, despite the fact of the recent referendum. The Government should certainly give the people in those portions of the State where a referendum has not been taken an opportunity of expressing their views on this question. I agree with what the Colonial Secretary said when speaking on the Anti-betting Bill. He said then that



at a time like this when we should place all our resources at the disposal of the Empire, we cannot tolerate such a thing in our midst as unrestricted gambling. That applies also to the liquor question. Notwithstanding what Mr. Duffell has said regarding South Australia, I am not prepared to admit the accuracy of his statement. I think the statistics will prove him to be wrong. Had it not been for the restriction placed on the sale of liquor in the United Kingdom, I am certain as I am standing here that the British Government would never have been able to make the effort they have made in connection with the war. I thoroughly concur in the remarks of the Colonial Secretary when he says that we must endeavour to husband our resources, and I cannot think that we are doing this while we are spending £2,000,000 per annum in Western Australia on liquor. While it may not be possible to make men perfect by Act of Parliament, I say that at a time like this we should make some effort to restrict the waste which is going on in regard to liquor. I am sorry indeed that in those portions of the State where a referendum has not been taken the people have not been given a chance to decide this question. It seems to me that the Government have abdicated their responsibility altogether and have sought to place on the shoulders of private members of Parliament responsibility which they should themselves take. Mr. Duffell has referred to some statements that were made by some members of the W.A. Alliance. I should also like to refer to statements made on the other side by some gentlemen on a deputation which waited on the Premier. One gentleman went so far as to say that the Labour Government had condemned certain buildings. That statement was as remote from the truth as it could possibly be. It is a pity that statements of this nature should be made on either side. I was present at the meeting in the Town Hall called by the Temperance party at which most injudicious and unfair statements were made. To these I take strong exception. It seems that we cannot discuss this matter without indulging in these personalities which do no good to anyone. I might refer to the statement in regard to the 1914 Bill that the powers exercised by that measure were not used as they

should have been. That was purely an emergency measure, and it was passed in this House on the understanding that it was an emergency measure. Had it been otherwise than an emergency measure it would not have been passed, judging by the remarks of some of the hon. members who spoke. Some hon. members were very dubious indeed about giving the Government the power that they were asking for in the Bill.

Hon. J. J. Holmes: Do you claim that the emergency had never arisen?

Hon. J. E. DODD: I am not prepared to say that the emergency did not arise. The emergency may have arisen in which the Bill should have been put into operation, but I do say that the late Government have been blamed for many things in connection with the Bill for which they should not have been blamed. They were also blamed by the present Premier.

Hon. J. J. Holmes: The only time that hotels were closed was at the request of the publicans.

Hon. J. E. DODD: I am not altogether too sure about that. The fact remains that the Bill did not deal with the general aspect of the question. It simply dealt with any emergency which might arise. I have much pleasure, however, in supporting the Bill as it stands seeing that we have no other option than to support it. There is no doubt that it contains a certain amount of good.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY (Hon. H. P. Colebatch—East—in reply) [7.47]: In regard to the remarks made by the Hon. Mr. Holmes, the incident to which he referred has not come under my notice, but I will undertake to have inquiries made and see whether the occasion did arise when the emergency Act should have been put into operation. I think the hon. member will agree with me when I say that if hotels are open and there is a large number of soldiers in the street it is impossible for the police to do more than maintain order without giving rise to resentment on the part of the soldiers. At the same time, as I have repeatedly stated in the House, I think it is a great pity that there are not more frequent prosecutions against publicans for serving drunken men with liquor, although when they are dealing with the soldiers it may

often be the only course open to them. I will have the matter inquired into, and if it appears necessary that action should be taken on occasions like that, I am sure the Government will not hesitate to take such action. So far as the remarks of the Hon. Mr. Dodd are concerned, I must dispute his assertion that the Government in any way shirked its responsibilities. The Government shirked nothing. The Government was asked to introduce a Bill providing for a referendum on the early closing of hotels, but they said, "We are not going to do anything of the sort."

Hon. W. Kingsmill: The Bill provided for the shirking of their responsibilities.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: That is so, and it also provided that we should pass the responsibility on to the people. The Government were asked, provided a private member was prepared to bring forward a matter of this kind, if they would facilitate discussion upon it and the Government said "Yes." There was no shirking of responsibility there. The measure came forward in another place, and it is noteworthy that every party in Parliament furnished a majority against the taking of a referendum on the question. The majority of the members of the Labour party was opposed to it, the majority of the members of the Country party was opposed to it, and the majority of the members of the Liberal party was opposed to it; and I personally trust that this may be taken as an indication that for the future no party at present in Parliament is prepared to abrogate its responsibilities and that they regard Parliament as a proper place in which a question of this kind should be decided. If it can be demonstrated to the Government that an improvement would be made by the early closing of hotels the Government will not hesitate to introduce that as a measure to Parliament, but not as a measure to refer it to other people who cannot possibly have the same knowledge of the circumstances, and should not be expected to know as well, what are the requirements of the country, as are the members who are elected by the people. If it is shown that the earlier closing of hotels is necessary and desirable the Government will not hesitate to introduce a Bill for the earlier closing of hotels.

Hon. J. E. Dodd: Do not your remarks apply equally to the bookmakers Bill?

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: Quite so. The Government are not prepared to refer the question of the continuance of bookmakers by way of referendum to the people. The Government say they are satisfied that bookmaking is an offence and that they will introduce legislation with the object of suppressing it. If the Government can be similarly satisfied that the shortening of the hours for hotels will do good they will introduce a Bill making provision for this. My present impression, and I think that most of the members of the Government take the same view, is that our 9 to 9 provision is acting well and is probably doing more good than a more extreme measure would do. I believe there is room, however, for a difference of opinion, but personally I think that if we close hotels at 6 o'clock we would probably create a great many abuses and perhaps do more harm than good. I have not had an opportunity of closely studying the experience of the States which have adopted the 6 o'clock closing. I do not accept altogether the opinion that 6 o'clock has failed in those States, neither am I prepared to say that it has entirely succeeded. I do say that in Western Australia alone we have the 9 o'clock opening. I am perfectly satisfied that from what I have seen, particularly in the country districts, the curtailing of the hours in the morning and opening at 9 o'clock instead of 6 o'clock has probably done much more good than if we had closed a couple of hours earlier in the evening without altering the opening hours in the morning. In some of the other States the hours are from 6 to 6, and whilst I am prepared to admit that possibly it might be shown that 9 to 6 would be even preferable, if I had to make my choice from the temperance point of view between 6 to 6 and 9 to 9 I would say that the 9 to 9 is the more reasonable proposition, and one more likely to do good to the country and minimise the consumption of liquor, besides preserving the best energies of the people.

Question put and passed.

On further motion by the COLONIAL SECRETARY, resolution transmitted to the Assembly for concurrence.

# BILL—SPECIAL LEASE (LAKE CLIFTON).

## *Second Reading.*

The COLONIAL SECRETARY (Hon. H. P. Colebatch—East) [7.57] in moving the second reading said: The object of this Bill is to ratify an agreement made by the late Government and the then Minister for Works (Mr. W. D. Johnson) with a Mr. J. H. Johnson in connection with certain lime deposits at Lake Clifton. Incidentally it authorises the construction of a railway from Lake Clifton to Waroona. I have here plans which I will lay on the table of the House for the information of hon. members showing the locality of the Lake Clifton lime deposits, and approximately the route which this railway which is about 15 miles in length will travel. The history of the discovery of these deposits is briefly as follows: In December, 1912, Mr. Claude Newnham of Boulder Farm, Waroona, wrote regarding certain lime deposits discovered by him. He brought the matter under the notice of the Government with a view to securing a special lease of the lake for the purpose of working the lime deposits for the manufacture of Portland cement and agricultural lime. An analysis of the samples submitted by Mr. Newnham was reported on as follows:—

The material submitted was a fresh marl composed mainly of carbonate of lime precipitated partly by organic and partly by inorganic chemical agencies in a finely divided state. The analysis on a sample showed the presence of 48.88 per cent., carbon dioxide 27.07, organic matter (including nitrogen) 8.93, silica 1.61. The low percentage of silica is a satisfactory feature.

Magnesia 1.1.

And the low percentage of this is also a satisfactory feature.

Iron oxide and alumina .24, sulphur trioxide .39, phosphoric oxide .09, salt 2.02.

This low percentage of salt is also regarded as being satisfactory for the purpose of lime for agricultural requirements. A lease of portion of the lake was granted to Mr. Newnham and was subsequently surrendered by him in favour of a larger scheme. In February, 1914, Mr. J. H. Johnson, a partner of Mr. Newnham, applied for a right to

work the whole of the lake for lime, with the right to use and sell the produce for any purpose, and also to be allowed to construct a railway from Waroona to the lake. He required a 21 years lease and was prepared to expend £100,000 on the proposition. The agricultural commissioner to whom the matter was referred, estimated the maximum price for lime with a content of not less than 80 per cent. carbonate at 12s. 6d. per ton and the minimum production at 10,000 tons per annum. Hon. members will see by the lease that the production is to be 50 tons per day which would work out at 15,000 tons per annum as against the minimum of 10,000 tons suggested by the agricultural commissioner. Later on Mr. Johnson submitted a supplementary proposal to the late Government stating that his partner and himself owned land on the route of the suggested railway on which were deposits of clay suitable for the manufacture into Portland cement. He suggested that the proposed manufacture of cement would supply the industry to justify the construction of the line. In September of last year, 1915, he undertook to build a railway, or to finance its construction, leaving with the Government the option of resuming the line at any time at its actual cost, plus bank interest. The Public Works Department estimate of the cost of this 15 miles of railway is £26,908 and the annual freight, including lime, cement, etc., at railway rates, would approximate £2,487. Messrs. Connor and Moody, agricultural commissioners, recommended that, provided Mr. Johnson could satisfy the Government's financial advisers that the promoters were in a position to build the railway and establish the works to the satisfaction of the Government, the concession sought should be granted on condition that agricultural lime of not less than 80 per cent. carbonate be delivered at Waroona, or other approved depot at a price not exceeding 7s. 6d. a ton; but the recommended price was later altered to 10s. unscreened and 12s. 6d. for screened lime. In a preliminary report on an examination of limestone deposits in the South-West, Mr. St. Smith, field geologist, concludes—

Of all the propositions I have examined, this (Lake Clifton) appeals to me most strongly, for not only is there a large de-

posit of high grade marl, but the facilities for placing it on the market are excellent, particularly for the South-West.

The lease applied for comprises the whole of Lake Clifton. It is approximately 12 miles in length and half a mile in average width. It is required that Reserve 998 be included as a site for treatment works. The litho. on the table of the House also shows the approximate line of the railway. Briefly, the Bill provides for a lease of Lake Clifton and reserve 998 for a term of 42 years at a rental of £200 per annum. The conditions of the lease provide that the lessee shall, within two years from the commencement of the lease, or within such extended time as, under existing war conditions or other special circumstances, the Minister for Lands shall deem advisable, construct a line from Waroona to the lake, along such route as may be approved by the Minister for Lands, at his own cost and subject to the requirements of the Railway Department.

Hon. R. J. Lynn: Is there any hope of that?

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: Undoubtedly, with the reservations made. If he cannot get the rails of course his time will be extended, otherwise there is no doubt the terms of the lease will be complied with. The railway is to be laid out and constructed under the supervision and to the satisfaction of the engineer-in-chief, or such other officer as may be acting for him. It is provided in the Bill that where the railway traverses unalienated land, a strip of not less than one chain in width shall be reserved, and where it traverses alienated or demised lands a strip one chain in width will be acquired by the Government, subject to payment by the lessee of the cost of such acquisition. Land so acquired or reserved will be demised to the lessee for the term of his lease without additional rent. So soon as the railway is completed, the lessee shall, so far as there may be a demand for same, and to the extent of the output for the time being, supply lime to the public containing not less than 80 per cent. carbonate, at a price not exceeding 12s. per ton screened or 10s. per ton unscreened, delivered at Waroona. Provision is also made for the purchase of the railway by the Government at any time during the currency of the lease at a sum equal to the cost of

construction less depreciation, for forfeiture in the event of breach of conditions or default in the matter of rent for a bond in the sum of £1,000.

Hon. E. M. Clarke: What is the meaning of screened and unscreened lime?

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: There is a difference in value of 2s. per ton. I am not aware of the technical difference between the two, but I will find out for the hon. member. An important provision is that requiring the lessee to carry goods and passengers at rates to be approved by the Minister for Railways, such rates to be not less per mile than is charged on the Government railways. The agreement was entered into by the previous Government. It has been very carefully considered by the present Administration, and we are satisfied it is a proper agreement to enter into. The time for the construction of the line is limited to two years with the provision that I have already referred to in the event of war conditions making it impossible to commence operations. Then, of course, any extension, as the Minister may deem fit will be granted. The usual provisions in such cases are made in connection with the rolling stock. The lessee will be compelled to keep both line and rolling stock in good condition. It might have been argued that it would have been a good thing for the State to take up this deposit and work it and enter upon the manufacture of cement, but, in view of the fact that our predecessors in office who, I think were rather inclined to Government enterprise in this and other directions, have in this particular case deemed it wise that private people should be given the right to exploit this industry, the present Government will hardly be blamed for endorsing their opinion. With the difficult times ahead of us, all the energies of the Government and of private enterprise will be necessary to exploit and develop the resources of the State. I believe the granting of this lease will make not only for the provision of lime, which is large indeed in the agricultural industry, but will also lead to the establishment of a cement industry in Western Australia of considerable importance. I move—

*That the Bill be now read a second time.*

Hon. J. F. CULLEN (South-East) [S.S.]: This House would be untrue to its principles

if it did not afford fair encouragement to private enterprise. I am prepared to vote for this Bill, but there are three or four improvements which I think ought to be made in the contract, and, of course, the contract is subject to revision. It is the essence of the Bill. If Lake Clifton were the only lime lake in the State, I should object to locking up the whole deposit there, some 4,000 odd acres, in one single enterprise. But it is not so. There are plenty of other deposits to be worked in various parts of the State, and it is a strange contradiction on the part of the preceding Government to hand over without a qualm to private enterprise what might have been a glorious opportunity for State enterprise. I am not going to question their wisdom in that respect, but I do think it is a mistake to fix a lump rental irrespective of the development of this property, and I certainly think there should be a small royalty, as a matter of right, to the Crown. I do not want it to be a prohibitive or a greedy royalty, but there should be a royalty as a matter of principle. We have royalties on gold mining and on timber cutting. The resources of the State are being developed in the interests of the State, as well as in the interests of the enterprises, and it is a fair thing to the State that there should be a small royalty, say, of 3d. a ton or whatever the Government may think a fair thing, and the rental should merge in that. That would recognise the Crown right as owner and would not unduly hamper or handicap the development of the lime. Then coming to smaller matters, I think the contract should say when that small bond should be put up. It should have been put up on the signing of the contract. That is business. It is not business to say that there shall be a bond sometimes. There is a maximum price fixed which is really too vague to mean anything. It is provided that the screened and unscreened lime shall be delivered at the railway. How is that to be done? Is it to be delivered in bags? If so, that means an additional cost of 50 per cent. The buyers will say "thank you" to the legislature for protecting their interests and fixing a maximum, but when they come to take delivery the company will say, "if you please we want 6s. to 8s. per ton for

bags," which is what they cost at the present time.

The Colonial Secretary: Surely it is clear enough in the agreement.

Hon. J. F. CULLEN: It is not. The lime, therefore, will cost 10s. or 12s. plus 6s. or 8s. for the bags and plus the freight. It is not an agricultural proposition to pay 10s. or 12s. for the lime plus the other charges which I have mentioned. It must be remembered, too, that this is not strictly a fertiliser, it is simply a chemical to sweeten the soil, and it cannot be reckoned as a manure in comparison with other fertilisers. I am simply stating what agriculturists know. However, it can be made clear what the price of the lime is. If the company is going to do business, bulk lime will have to be sold at Waroona at from 5s. to 7s. 6d. per ton. There are one or two other small matters which can be dealt with in Committee. For instance, it is provided that the railway is to be operated by any fuel. The Government cannot do that. The Government are hampered all through each summer by the necessity for using costly fuel. It is not safe to put those words into a Bill under which the Government will be looked upon by the community as a party with the promoter. Of course the meaning is that either electricity or coal can be used, but the meaning that will be accepted is that they can use any fuel they like and raise as many fires as they like. The Government will be held responsible if the Bill is slipshod and opens the door to litigation. It should be distinctly provided that the railway authorities will control the fuel used. The contract is carelessly drawn in other ways. The Minister for Lands is made the controller of a number of railway questions. Of course all railway questions must go to the Minister for Railways. However, that can be amended in Committee. I hope the Colonial Secretary will not take the ground that this contract is finished. The contract is the essence of the Bill. I want to see this promoter get fair play, but I do not want to see gratuitous risks of litigation. I will support the second reading.

Hon. J. EWING (South-West [8.18]): I want to emphasise what appears to me a serious point, namely, the starting of this

work. The farmers of the South-West have been calling out for this line ever since I have been connected with the South-West. The late Government intended to introduce a Bill to give them the line, but the difficulty was that the Bill did not get before Parliament. The present Government are simply carrying out what was put into form by their predecessors. It is prescribed in the schedule that two years shall be allowed in which to build the railway, provided the conditions are satisfactory, and if they are not satisfactory any time may elapse before the farmers will get the benefit of the line. I would provide against that. I would like to suggest to the leader of the House that the Government have at present a large number of old 45-lb. rails which could be well and easily utilised for the building of this line. It is not necessary to carry freight of this character at any great speed, and there will be no danger in using the old rails. If this were done we would have the railway started at a very early date. I do not doubt the bona fides of those who have the matter in hand, because it has been before the Government for a long time. However, we require to make ourselves absolutely sure on that point, and see to it that the country is not being simply exploited. Those deposits are very valuable for sweetening the soil, and I know from my own experience of the South-West that it is required down there. I understand the Federal authorities have already given their consent to the raising of the necessary capital. Indeed it is stated that the capital is available at the present time. When we reach that position, why should we hesitate in asking those who have both the necessary money and the authority to go on at once with the work? I would suggest that the Government offer those old rails to the promoter and let him make use of them until he is able to get other rails. When in Committee I will certainly move to eliminate "two years" and insert "six months" in order to test the bona fides of the promoter who has this concession from the Government. I believe, of course, that he is quite satisfactory. If it is so, and we can get these old rails, why should not the work be commenced at once? The points raised by Mr. Cullen are of considerable importance,

especially that in regard to the use of either fuel. But if Mr. Cullen were to visit that district he would find that it is practically impossible to start a fire down there, so the nature of the fuel seems to me to be of but little moment. In any case, a fire there would not do much harm. However, I hope the fuel to be used will be the native fuel, of which, unfortunately, too little is consumed to-day. I hope the Colonial Secretary will recognise the necessity of having the work started at once. When the Minister for Works was through the district he was repeatedly asked how soon the line was to be started. He told them that it would be 12 months.

The Colonial Secretary: It has been hung up for two years.

Hon. J. EWING: That does not justify its being held up any longer. I think the suggestion I have made to utilise the old rails is a valuable one, for I am sure they will suffice for the traffic. Any expense to which the contractor may be put in laying the old rails and afterwards having to replace them with new ones could reasonably be borne by the Government in the interests of the immediate construction of the line in order that the South-West may have the advantage of it.

On motion by Hon. C. F. Baxter debate adjourned.

## BILL—FRANCHISE.

### *Second Reading.*

The COLONIAL SECRETARY (Hon. H. P. Colebatch—East) [S.25] in moving the second reading said: This is a very brief measure intended to protect the franchise of the soldiers during the period they are away on active service. Under the Electoral Act of 1907 an elector is eligible for enrolment only in the district in which he lives. He can vote for that district after removal from the district, provided he has not been away more than three months. Within three months he is supposed to enrol in the new district to which he removes. Soldiers leaving their own districts would, of course, go into training camp and, under the existing Act, about the time they had completed their training and were ready to leave the State

it would be necessary for them to transfer from other districts to the district in which the training camp was situated. This it is considered by the Government highly undesirable, because it is not in conformity with our principles of representative Government that large bodies of men, who may be in a particular district with only just sufficient time to qualify themselves to appear on the roll, should possibly disturb and destroy the vote of the resident population of the district. But, following on that, of course, as soon as a soldier had been away from the State for three months his name would be removed from the roll altogether and he would have to enrol again on returning. The object of the Bill is to provide that any elector whose name is on the roll for an electoral district, and who is on active service shall, during such service, be deemed to continue to live in such electoral district as he was enrolled at the commencement of such service, namely, the date on which he went into training. It is further provided that he shall be deemed to live in the district in which he actually lived immediately prior to the commencement of such service. Provision is also made that an elector of the Legislative Council shall remain on the roll; that is to say, an elector who is qualified by occupation of a house of the annual rental value of £17 per annum. The Bill provides that he shall remain on the roll of the Legislative Council even after he has left the State with His Majesty's forces, provided that he continues as a tenant of the dwelling house, although not personally occupying it; in other words, provided his family continues to live there.

Hon. J. F. Cullen: The freehold qualification should also hold.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: Of course it will. That holds without any special Act of Parliament. No Act is required.

Hon. J. F. Cullen: It is required to keep the name on the roll.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: I think not. If the hon. member can show that it is necessary, provision can be inserted in the Bill, but it seems to me that one's temporary absence from the State does not involve his removal from the roll. However, I am quite open to consider the question in Committee. Provision is also made that the Chief Elec-

toral Officer shall, so far as practicable, cause an asterisk or distinguishing mark to be made on the roll against the name of an elector who has joined the forces, and shall append to the roll an explanatory note. It is deemed desirable that some provision of this sort should be made, because there are objections to the inclusion on the roll of a number of people who have really forfeited their qualifications, and although we are keenly desirous that the franchise of the soldier should be maintained, it is deemed advisable that steps should be taken to prevent any abuse. If we are going to have on the rolls thousands of people who, under the Electoral Act as it stands, are disqualified from appearing on the roll, it is deemed advisable that there should be some distinguishing mark against their names, otherwise impersonation may be practised to a large extent. There will always be a danger of impersonation if we have on the roll the names of hundreds of men who are out of the State and therefore unable to vote here. Anyone who presents himself to vote and has the distinguishing marks opposite his name, can easily satisfy the electoral officer that he is the person referred to. If there were no such distinguishing mark, it would be possible for people to personate the absent soldier, which is the thing we wish to avoid. I move—

*That the Bill be now read a second time.*

Hon. J. E. DODD (South) [8.31]: I intend to support the second reading, and also to support the Bill in Committee; but the measure does not go quite far enough. While we are attempting to do justice to those who are serving at the Front, there is a danger, as regards the Legislative Council franchise, of doing an injustice. The Bill provides for the retention of the vote of the soldier who is at the Front so long as he continues to be the tenant of the dwelling house in which he has resided. The wife may remain behind and may be paying rent for the house, but still she cannot become a voter for the very reason that the vote is to be retained to the soldier. Again, in regard to the Assembly franchise, there are quite a number of women whose husbands are at the Front and who are also changing their residences. I have in mind one case where three women from Katanning, who are Katanning elec-

tors, live in one house, their husbands being in camp or on their way to the Front. We provide that the soldiers shall retain their votes in the Katanning electorate, but we say nothing whatever about the votes of their wives. This applies to a much greater extent on the goldfields, from which the wives of many of the soldiers who enlisted there have moved to Perth. It seems to me that something might be done towards allowing the wives of soldiers to retain the franchise in the district from which they came, if they so desire. Those are the only points in which, so far as I see, the Bill may be bettered. I trust this may be done in Committee.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

#### BILL—PERMANENT RESERVE (No. 1).

##### *Second Reading.*

The COLONIAL SECRETARY (Hon. H. P. Colebatch—East) [8.33] in moving the second reading said: This Bill was prepared by the late Government, and has for its object the excision of such portions of the National Park in the Darling Ranges, and the leasing thereof, as may be found suitable for mining for molybdenite. As originally drafted, the Bill provided only for the excision of an area applied for by Messrs. Gull Bros. and Edwards so long ago as 1914. When the Bill was before another place, an amendment was agreed to extending the scope of the measure so as to permit of the granting of further areas for the same purpose—the mining of molybdenite, that is—instead of one specified area only. Leases may be issued in respect of other portions of the park. As members are aware, before any portion of a class A reserve may be alienated, it is necessary for an Act of Parliament to authorise such alienation. The land contained in the National Park has been declared a class A reserve; hence this Bill. As I have said, the application for the particular area which resulted in the preparation of this Bill was received in 1914. The then Government favoured the application, and the Bill was drafted, but for one reason and another was never presented to Parliament. With

the exception of the amendment made by another place, the Bill is the same as the late Government proposed to present to Parliament. The object of the proposed lessees is to mine the land for molybdenite, which mineral, on account of the war, is just now commanding a high price—about £450 per ton for 90 per cent. quality. The greater part of the world's supply of molybdenite comes from Australia, but until now it has only been mined for on a small scale at Leonora, Mullewa, Southern Cross, and one or two other places. Molybdenite is used in the preparation of a special grade of steel, and therefore its production is a matter of national importance at the present juncture. It has other uses also in connection with chemical, porcelain and dye-making. The land embraced in Messrs. Gull Bros. and Edwards' application is situate one and a half miles north-east of Swan View railway station, in the direction of the tunnel. In view of the importance of molybdenite production, I think members may agree to the amendment of the Class A reserve in this instance. I move—

*That the Bill be now read a second time.*

Hon. W. KINGSMILL (Metropolitan) [8.37]: I second the Colonial Secretary's motion. Perhaps what I say may be of interest to hon. members, because I know a good deal about the locality, and also about the molybdenite there. There is no doubt as to the occurrence of molybdenite, and it is a wise step to include in the Bill the power to excise any area which may subsequently be found to carry this metal. It occurs not only at the place where the working has taken place, but also in another spot about half a mile or three-quarters of a mile distant from the first spot. I support the second reading, and hope that subsequent events will justify the House in passing the measure and that the industry will become profitable. Hon. members need have no fear about spoiling the park. I think the creation of this reserve for the purposes of a National Park is more or less a legislative joke. I have not seen many places less fitted for a National Park than the area under consideration.

Hon. J. F. Cullen: What is the area of the park?



Hon. W. KINGSMILL: About 4,000 acres, which is obviously absurd for a National Park.

The Colonial Secretary: More than that, is it not?

Hon. W. KINGSMILL: Not much more.

The Colonial Secretary: I think it is about 10,000 acres.

Hon. W. KINGSMILL: In that part of the country, the bigger the area the worse it is suited for a park. At all events, I support the Bill, which I consider is justified, and I hope events will still further justify the House in passing the measure.

Hon. J. F. CULLEN (South-East) [S.40]: In my opinion the Government are making a serious mistake in this proposal. They ask Parliament to sign a blank cheque to the Government in regard to a Class A reserve—a course that Parliament has hitherto always refused to take, and quite properly so. It would set a precedent which might become exceedingly dangerous. Mr. Kingsmill laughs at this as a National Park. I would like to know, on what ground? Is it that the area is too small? If so we shall not improve it by lessening it. Is it that he thinks the area too rough?

Hon. W. Kingsmill: Too rough, no shade, no water.

Hon. J. F. CULLEN: The roughness is one of the charms of a park. I should like the hon. member to go to Sydney—

Hon. W. Kingsmill: I have been there.

Hon. J. F. CULLEN: And have a look at the national parks there.

Hon. W. Kingsmill: I know them well.

Hon. J. F. CULLEN: The charm of those areas is the varied landscape, from deep ravines to high, rough hills. On one side of Sydney is a park of 35,000 acres, and on the other side there is a park of 35,000 acres, each with extensive water frontage. Again and again people have asked the Parliament of New South Wales to excise pieces from the 70,000 acres; and the answer has always been, "Not an acre." Those parks will cause posterity to bless the wisdom of the people that protected the areas. And Perth has this twopenny park of 4,000 acres! I am amazed that Mr. Kingsmill, of all members, should consent to the giving of a blank cheque

regarding park lands. If there is a valuable metal in the area, by all means let it be developed; but let the Government bring down a specific proposal to grant to the right men—men who are prepared to develop it—the particular area that they select. The House should insist on that. The Bill says "any portion." That means the whole of the park. The Government, under this Bill, will be able to do what they like with this Class A reserve. That power should not be given. Parliament will create a very dangerous precedent if it assents to such a proposal. The next thing the Government will ask for will be permission to excise any portion of King's Park. If they will bring down a concrete Bill saying, "There is a contingent contract with such and such persons, who have given evidence of their ability to carry it out, and we ask power to give them a lease on terms satisfactory to the State," Parliament will immediately assent. But to say that at any time the Government like they can lease any portion of this park, or even the whole of it, is a thing Parliament ought not to say. As a protest I shall vote against the second reading of the Bill, though I am prepared to support a proper and businesslike, concrete Bill granting the necessary area to suitable persons.

Hon. E. M. CLARKE (South-West) [S.43]: I shall certainly support the Bill, because I know something about that rocky country to which the last speaker has referred. If one sees that country once in a lifetime, it is about all one cares about. Sentiment is a wonderful thing, but my sentiment does not run that way. Mine runs in this direction: if there is a valuable mineral deposit in that park, Western Australia wants that deposit developed. The production of the metal is important, and I would go even further than the Bill. I agree that there should be a safeguard in the direction of providing that if the lessees do not work their area, it may be turned over to somebody else. However, the deposit has been lying idle for, I suppose, a few thousand years; and it will be of no earthly use until it is dug out and turned into money.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

*In Committee.*

Hon. W. Kingsmill in the Chair; the Colonial Secretary in charge of the Bill.

Clause 1—agreed to.

Clause 2—Power to grant mineral leases on portion of reserve:

Hon. J. F. CULLEN: I would like the Minister to make some statement on this point. Is it intended that the Government shall handle the whole of the area of the park? I move an amendment—

*That after the word "lease" the words "not exceeding 250 acres" be inserted.*

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: The Bill as originally drafted set out exactly the land proposed to be leased, but it was pointed out in another place that it would be a mistake to give the Government power to grant one lease only and refuse permission to the Government to grant other leases should it be found subsequently that molybdenite existed in other portions of the park.

Amendment put and negatived.

Clause put and passed.

Title—agreed to.

Bill reported without amendment, and the report adopted.

*House adjourned at 8.53 p.m.*

**Legislative Assembly,**

*Tuesday, 7th November, 1916.*

	Page
Paper presented	692
Questions: State Trading Concerns	692
Bricks, Price to Government Departments, Requirements of Government Departments	692
Government Offices, waste of electric light	693
Annual Estimates	693
Assent to Bill	693
Bills: Flinders Bay-Margaret River Railway, Message	693
Trading Concerns, Message	693
Special Lease (Stirling Estate), report stage	694
Electoral Districts, 2a., postponement	694
Treasury Bills Act Amendment, 2a., Com.	696
Tollisator Duty Act Amendment, 2a.	704
Kingia Grass Tree Concession, 2a., Com.	708
Special Lease Enabling, 2a.	713
Execution of Instruments, 2a., Com.	719
Zoological Gardens Act Amendment, 2a.	714
Roman Catholic Church Property Acts Amendment, returned	714
Adoption of Children Act Amendment, returned	714
Western Australian Bay Funds (No. 2), returned	714
Permanent Reserves, (No. 2), Com.	714
Flinders Bay-Margaret River Railway, 2a.	718
Trading Concerns, 2a., discharged	718
Select Committee, Wheat Marketing Bill	693
Resolution: Sale of Liquor Regulation Act, Message	714

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

**PAPER PRESENTED.**

By the Minister for Works: Uniform general by-laws for regulating motor and other traffic adopted by various road boards.

**QUESTION—STATE TRADING CONCERNS.**

*Brickworks, Sawmills, and Engineering and Implement Works.*

Mr. ANGWIN asked the Premier: 1, Have the Government decided to dispose of the State Brickworks, Sawmills, and Engineering and Implement Works, as published in the *West Australian* of 2nd November, 1916? 2, If so, will he give Parliament an opportunity to approve or otherwise of the conditions or any agreement concerning same before disposal?

The PREMIER replied: 1, Yes, if suitable offers are forthcoming. 2, The State Trading Concerns Bill to be introduced will empower the Governor in Council to approve of the terms and conditions of sale.

**QUESTIONS (2)—BRICKS.**

*Price to Government Departments.*

Mr. ANGWIN asked the Minister for Works: 1, What was the number of bricks