

tion on which information was desired he would explain it to the Committee. There was good reason for everything that was included in the Bill, and there was nothing, as he had already stated, in the clauses that was not contained in the present Act, which had been law for eleven years.

Hon. G. Randell: There was no examination of a person provided for in that Act.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: Would not the hon. member examine a person for contagious disease? There was no objection to reporting progress, but he would repeat that there was nothing in the Bill that had not been fully explained and he claimed to know everything that was in the Bill. In his opinion, it would be much better to go on clause by clause, and postpone any particularly controversial clause. If they were going to postpone the whole part they would never get any further ahead.

Progress reported.

House adjourned at 8.17 p.m.

Legislative Assembly,

Thursday, 16th September, 1909.

	PAGE
Questions: Timber trouble, Marranup ...	416
Advertising the State ...	416
Hospital Visiting arrangements ...	417
Nurses from England ...	417
Bills: Bastardy Laws Act Amendment, 1a. ...	417
Legal Practitioners Act Amendment, Report ...	417
Public Education Endowment, 2a. ...	417
Abattoirs, Com. ...	420
District Fire Brigades, 2a., Com. ...	421
Licensing, 2a. ...	429
Employment Brokers, 1a. ...	447
Motion: Bill to Legitimise Children, withdrawn ...	417

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

QUESTION—TIMBER TROUBLE, MARRANUP.

Mr. HOLMAN (without notice) asked the Premier: 1, Is he aware that owing

to the Commissioner of Railways refusing to pay the current rate paid by other employers to hewers, the hewers cutting sleepers at Marranup have ceased work? 2, In view of the possibility of the present trouble causing a serious dislocation of the peaceable working of the timber industry will the Government take the necessary action to effect a settlement of the present difficulty?

The PREMIER replied: I was not aware until the hon. member mentioned it that the hewers had ceased work. Inquiries will be made from the Commissioner of Railways in order that the facts may be ascertained.

QUESTION—ADVERTISING THE STATE.

Mr. BOLTON (for Mr. Walker) asked the Premier: 1, What is the amount to be paid to the French firm of Pathé Frères for cinematographic pictures of the State? 2, Was any offer made locally or by an Australian firm to do this work; if so, by whom and what was the amount quoted? 3, Are the Government publishing or supporting the publication by private persons of an official guide to the State. 4, If so, what are the terms of the arrangement and when was it made?

The PREMIER replied: 1, £300, subject to the pictures being presented and circulated in accordance with the terms of the agreement entered into by the firm mentioned with the Commonwealth Government. 2, Yes, offers were made, containing various stipulations regarding the purchase of the necessary plant, preparation of the pictures, etc., by Messrs. H. Hayward, H. H. Evans, Greenham & Evans, Sidney Cook, J. H. Noble, G. R. Lawrence, and J. Hindhaugh. The amounts quoted in connection with the three first mentioned were respectively £3,000, £693, and £645. 3 and 4, No financial assistance has been extended, but Messrs. E. S. Wigg & Son, who are issuing a publication entitled "An Official Guide to Western Australia," have been supplied with certain literary matter relating to State departments, industries, conditions of land settlement, statistics,

historical features, etc., which will be carefully revised by the Government before publication. In consideration of the firm mentioned inserting 6,000 coloured maps of the State, and placing a Government advertisement on the back thereof, it was agreed, on the 30th July last, to supply such maps, to facilitate the compilation of the letterpress, and to furnish photographs for the purpose of illustrating the work.

QUESTION—HOSPITAL VISITING ARRANGEMENTS.

Mr. TROY (for Mr. Horan) asked the Premier: 1, Why were a friend and myself prevented from seeing a patient in the Perth Public Hospital during visiting hours? 2, Will he take action to overcome the official methods that make it apparently more difficult for a visitor to see a patient on visiting days than any other day?

The PREMIER replied: This is a matter controlled by the hospital board. They have been referred to in the matter and report as follows:—1, During visiting hours on visiting days only two friends are permitted to be at the bedside at one time, and during the two hours as many friends as possible are allowed to visit each patient in rotation. Mr. Horan and his friend were asked to wait until the two friends already visiting retired. 2, It is not more difficult for a visitor to see a patient on a visiting day than on any other day; the only restriction being two visitors at a time. In a case of dangerous illness of a patient, visitors are not restricted as to numbers, and may visit at any time of the day or night.

QUESTION—NURSES FROM ENGLAND.

Mr. HEITMANN asked the Premier: 1, Is it true that a number of trained nurses were recently brought out from England under two years' engagement with the Health Department? 2, Is he aware that several of the nurses have taken the place of Australian trained nurses in Government hospitals, but are

not being paid the same salary as previously attached to the positions?

The PREMIER replied: 1, Yes. A number of nurses were recently brought out from England under engagement with the Medical Department. 2, No. They were required and have been absorbed at certain hospitals. The salaries paid are progressive, and in accordance with the scale of the department, which has been in existence for many years and has not been varied, save in exceptional circumstances.

BILL—BASTARDY LAWS AMENDMENT.

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

MOTION—BILL TO LEGITIMIZE CHILDREN.

Mr. COLLIER (Boulder) moved for leave to introduce a Bill for "An Act to legitimise children by registration under the Registration of Births, Deaths, and Marriages Act."

The PREMIER (Hon. N. J. Moore): A deputation has recently taken place in connection with this matter, and the Crown Law Department had been instructed to prepare a Bill very much on the lines of that the hon. member proposed to bring before the House. In the circumstances it was hardly necessary for the hon. member to move any further in the matter.

Mr. COLLIER, in view of the assurance of the Premier, asked leave to withdraw the motion.

Motion, by leave, withdrawn.

BILL — LEGAL PRACTITIONERS ACT AMENDMENT.

Report of Committee adopted.

BILL — PUBLIC EDUCATION ENDOWMENT.

Second Reading.

Resumed from the 9th September.

Mr. BATH (Brown Hill): It is not necessary for me to say much in regard

to the measure submitted by the Minister for Education except to express my great satisfaction that the hon. member has introduced a Bill which I believe will receive the cordial endorsement of members on both sides of the House. Had we taken the same precaution as was adopted by America before the greater portion of their lands were parted with we would now possess a substantial income for the purpose of supplementing our annual vote from consolidated revenue for the support of our public school system. If there is one defect in the Bill to which I would like to draw attention it is the fact that we make no stipulation as to what amount of land we set apart for the purpose. In the United States and, I think, Canada, when an area of land is thrown open they set apart so many sections, as they are called there, for education purposes, and now that we are adopting the principle of survey before selection, I would like to see an amendment in the Bill providing that certain portions of each area thrown open should be set apart for education endowment, or at least the provision made that the proceeds from the sale of certain blocks should be applied to the purpose. We also find that in a clause of the Bill dealing with the application of the money derived from this endowment the Minister has not discriminated between capital and income. The Minister has provided for the application of capital for the ordinary purposes for which we apply revenue to-day: but I think that if we are going to establish an endowment fund we should take care to set apart the money for a capital account and only apply the income derived from that for the purpose for which we are now providing money from consolidated revenue through the ordinary Estimates. If the Minister will turn to Clause 9 he will see that it gives the trustees power to apply capital to ordinary expenditure. I think the capital should be maintained intact and that only the revenue derived should be used for the purpose. Otherwise I have no fault to find with the Bill. I welcome it as a measure that will, perhaps not in the immediate future, but in years

to come, provide a steady source of revenue and something on which we can fall back in times of financial stress when there is a tendency on the part of the Treasurer for the time being to cut down the grants for education purposes. The Minister pointed to the great evil that resulted from that practice in Victoria, and we do not wish to resort to it here. It only means that while we make a saving for a year or two the time will come when we shall have to spend a great deal more than we otherwise would have to do to regain our former position. They are not likely to follow such a bad example again in Victoria, I am glad to say. The Premier there is taking a great step forward in educational work. Here in Western Australia I do not think we will ever find a majority in the House prepared to retrogress in the same direction as they did in Victoria. I have much pleasure in supporting the second reading of the Bill.

The PREMIER (Hon. N. J. Moore) : The Bill was brought in as the result of a promise made in the pre-sessional speech. At the same time provision was made during the term of office of the present Minister for Works, when Minister for Education, to make certain reservations. This was two or three years ago, and as the result of a conversation with me as Minister for Lands, I arranged for certain areas to be reserved in different parts of the State. The outcome of that policy is that some lands have been set apart within the boundaries of town sites to the extent of 2,287 acres, totalling in value, it is estimated at the present time on an unimproved basis, £18,671. At the present time arrangements have been made whereby in every town site that is laid out certain reservations will be made in order to carry out the same principle. We have under consideration the reservation of something like 360 acres when each new town site is declared, and it is proposed to make this liberal reservation because we realise that although the value at the present time may not be very high, in the near future, in the event of financial stress, it will be possible to derive considerable revenue from these endow-

ment lands. As a matter of fact, I think in New Zealand at the present time considerable revenue is obtained. This is also the case in South Australia. In New Zealand the revenue derived from endowment lands is set apart for primary and secondary education and university purposes. They are receiving at the present time £56,000 a year for primary schools, £45,000 for secondary schools, while the University is benefiting to the extent of £21,000, making a total of £122,000. One can therefore see the value that this Bill should be to future generations, and it is to be regretted that provision was not made earlier in the history of the State in this direction. In South Australia at the present time the revenue derived from these endowment amounts to £9,447. While making provision for developmental purposes, it is well that the Parliament of the State should make such provision to enable education to progress with the State's development, and when it is recognised that last year the education vote was just about £180,000, it will be realised how much it has gone up during the last few years, and how necessary it is that this very important provision should be made at the present time, when land is comparatively cheap. I am glad to have heard the remarks of the Leader of the Opposition, and I feel sure the measure will commend itself to the good sense of the members of the House.

Mr. Bolton: It was very nearly robbery when they took these areas last time. From one municipality they took 154 acres, nearly all they had.

Mr. KEENAN (Kalgoorlie): Before this Bill is read a second time, I would like the Minister in charge to inform the House what are the exact objects contemplated in the term "public education." Is it intended to use the revenue derived from the lands and handed over to the trustees to supplement the funds provided by Parliament for elementary education or is it meant to accumulate the funds to afford the opportunity of starting secondary education in the State? If it is merely meant to buttress up the annual vote for elementary education, it

does not seem to be a matter of importance; on the other hand, if it is the starting point for some scheme of secondary education, it is of great importance, but we should know definitely the road we are asked to enter upon. To give odd bits of land here and there in the country to trustees, without desiring to achieve some definite purpose, is only playing with education. When the Minister is replying, I would like him to turn his attention to the vote we at present have on the Statute Book for secondary education. I refer to the vote for the High School. If there is to be any scheme of secondary education in the State it is about time that scheme was brought forward, and made available by means of State schools or that the moneys that are available should be distributed indiscriminately to all the schools carrying out that work. These are a few matters I would like some information upon. At the same time I agree that it is a wise and proper thing, and that it is time in the history of the State that we should set apart land for so laudable a purpose, and that we should take reasonable means to do so.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL (in reply): In reply to the member for Kalgoorlie, I may say that the term "public education" used in the Bill is used in a very wide sense, and rightly so. It will apply, I take it, to all education for which the State is directly responsible, and if the State is responsible, as we know it will be now that we are providing for secondary education, these endowments will also be available for the purposes of secondary education. It is not contemplated that land reserved under this Bill shall go towards the university endowment, because, as members are aware, the endowment for the university is already provided for by another Statute. With regard to the High School, the fact is recognised that the intention of the Government with reference to secondary education may necessitate some alteration of the policy hitherto adopted as far as that particular school is concerned. I may say, therefore, that the matter of the treatment to

be accorded to that school by the State is now under consideration, and necessary steps have been taken in order to make effective whatever action the Government may decide upon in the future. With regard to the matters referred to by the Leader of the Opposition I shall give consideration to the question of specifying what land shall be reserved. I am inclined to think that there may be something in it, and that in every new town-site to be declared some portion of the blocks should be specifically set aside for the purpose of endowments for public education. I do not wish, however, to make any promise on the subject, beyond saying that I will give the matter full consideration, as to whether there should be a specific provision made in the Bill itself. Again, as to the question of expending the capital, I will look into the clause to which the hon. member referred.

Question—put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

BILL—ABATTOIRS.

In Committee.

Mr. Daglish in the Chair; the Minister for Lands in charge of the Bill.

Clauses 1 to 3—agreed to.

Clause 4—Power to establish abattoirs:

Mr. JOHNSON: There was an amendment on the Notice Paper standing in his name, but the Minister for Lands intended to move a somewhat similar amendment to Clause 11, having the same object in view. If the Minister for Lands intended to proceed with that amendment he (Mr. Johnson) would not press his.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: It was his intention to move the amendment to Clause 11.

Clause passed.

Clause 5—Appointment of officers:

Mr. BATH: Would the Minister for Lands give some idea as to what the proposal of the Government was with regard to the appointment of officers. Was it their idea to constitute another staff to control the abattoirs, or did they have sufficient officers available, either in the Agricultural Department or the Health Department, to supervise the control of abattoirs throughout the State, suppos-

ing they were erected. We wanted to avoid giving power to build up another department when we had already sufficient authority for the control of these abattoirs that were to be erected.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: An officer to control these abattoirs was already on the staff of the Agricultural Department. The building up of any unnecessary staff in connection with those works would certainly be avoided. Still it was necessary that someone should have the control of the abattoirs, and it was necessary also that the appointing of inspectors under this Bill should be avoided when, perhaps, inspectors were already appointed in the Health Department.

Mr. Bolton: It was understood that the meat inspectors under the Health Act would be taken over under the Bill. Was that not so?

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: Their claims would certainly be considered. Only a very small staff would be required for Kalgoorlie, and if the men were suitable, in all probability they would be taken over. At any rate it would be necessary to have a staff of controlling inspectors. He could assure hon. members that nothing would be done calculated to operate against the men already appointed.

Clause put and passed.

Clauses 6 to 10—agreed to.

Clause 11—Abattoirs may be placed under local authority:

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: Seeing that there was an amendment on the Notice Paper for the insertion of a new clause in place of this one, it would be necessary to strike out the clause.

The CHAIRMAN: It would be better for the Minister to vote against the clause and then move the proposed new clause.

Clause put and negatived.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS moved as an amendment—

That the following be added to stand as Clause 11:—

(1) The Governor may, by Order in Council—

(a.) extend to and confer upon any local authority, or any two or more

local authorities jointly, the powers conferred on the Governor by this Act, or

(b.) place any abattoir under the control and management of any local authority, or of any two or more local authorities jointly, and thereupon the powers conferred on the Governor by this Act may, either generally or in respect of such abattoir, be lawfully exercised by such local authority or local authorities jointly:

Provided that all regulations made under this Act shall be subject to the approval of the Governor.

(2.) Any local authority to which such Order in Council applies may expend its ordinary revenue for the purposes of this Act.

(3.) Any Order in Council made under this section may, at any time, be revoked by the Governor.

New clause passed.

Schedule, Title—agreed to.

Bill reported with an amendment.

£820 was expended in connection with the Perth board. In the year 1907-8 the subsidies amounted to £1,886; special grants to £500; demonstration at Boulder, £750, and the Victorian demonstration, £194; totalling £3,980. Last year the amount so expended was £2,848. To a large extent the fire brigades rely for their expenses on contributions they receive from municipal councils; and as the municipal subsidies are decreasing, the municipalities find it necessary to curtail expenditure in so far as fire brigades are concerned. All things being considered it will be recognised that it is an equitable provision. It seems only reasonable that the insurance companies, which at the present time contribute absolutely nothing to country brigades, should be called upon to contribute their quota to these brigades, whose work of course benefits these companies more than any other section of the community. And this work has been carried out in the past, so far as the volunteer firemen are concerned, without any pecuniary reward. In this connection I would like to pay a tribute to the work done by these volunteer firemen throughout the length and breadth of Western Australia. They have carried out their duties in a public-spirited manner, without reward, spending their time and energy in the endeavour to qualify themselves for the hazardous work of fire-fighting. The total number of brigades affiliated under the Fire Brigades Association is 34—of which 11 are in the metropolitan area—the membership being 555. On more than one occasion in connection with these demonstrations it has been pointed out by the member for Murchison and others, what a splendid body of men these firemen would make as a nucleus for any defence movement should the necessity arise. In addition to the 34 brigades now affiliated, I understand there are eight in course of being established, while the value of the total plant owned by these brigades falls little short of £11,000, and the value of the land and buildings amounts to something like £9,000. The main financial provisions of the Bill are that the cost of upkeep shall be borne by the municipalities, the Government, and the insurance companies.

BILL—DISTRICT FIRE BRIGADES.

Second Reading.

The PREMIER (Hon. N. J. Moore) in moving the second reading said: This is a revival of a measure which was introduced in the House in October, 1907. It is now presented as it passed the Committee of this House, and was forwarded to another place. There it was not successful in passing the second reading, it being contended that sufficient time was not at the disposal of hon. members in that Chamber to allow of due discussion of the measure. As pointed out by the member for Kalgoorlie, who was then the Minister in charge of the Bill, one of the chief objects of the measure is the more economical and efficient working of brigades, while another is to encourage the development of the volunteer system. As a matter of fact the Government have subsidised various fire brigades £ for £ on moneys collected, and have also given special grants in connection with the initiation of new brigades. During the year 1906-7 the amount placed on the Estimates for these purposes was £3,590, while in addition to that, an amount of

The Government are to contribute one-fourth—that is to say, two-eighths—the insurance companies three-eighths, and the municipalities three-eighths. The board is to consist of nine members, of which three are to be appointed by the Governor, one to be elected by the local authority in each fire district, two by the insurance companies operating in the fire districts, and one by the volunteer brigades in each fire district. Local committees are also to be appointed, to consist of three members, in each sub-district. The Governor by proclamation may, as occasion arises, constitute any portion of a district a sub-district, and in these sub-districts certain powers shall be exercised by the local committee, consisting of one member elected by the local authority—the municipal council, or roads board as the case may be—one by the brigade or brigades in each sub-district, or, if no such brigades exist, then by the Governor; and one elected by the insurance companies insuring property within such sub-district. Members of the board, and of local committees are to be elected for a term not exceeding two years, and may receive from the funds of the board a sum not exceeding £250 per annum in the aggregate. This was the amendment to Clause 12 made on the motion of the member for Ivanhoe when the Bill was passing through the House. If hon. members will turn to Clause 30 they will find that it gives power to the board to take steps in the formation of brigades, to determine the number of permanent and volunteer brigades necessary for the protection of any district, to establish schools of instruction, and to issue certificates of qualification. Under Clause 3 this Bill shall not apply to any municipal district to which the Fire Brigades Act, 1898, applies; provided that the Governor may, on the petition of the council of such municipality, by proclamation declare that the provisions of the last-mentioned Act shall cease to be in force in such municipal district. This would mean that the Perth municipal council or the Fremantle municipal council could make provision afterwards in this respect if they so desire. Clause 33 refers to the appointment of officers of a permanent

brigade, whilst the next succeeding clause makes provision for an officer to be the chief officer of the district fire brigades. Suspension or removal of deputy chief officers will lie with the board, and the provisions in respect to these officers are embodied in Clause 35. Generally speaking the Bill has met with the approval of the Fire Brigades Association, and quite recently a deputation from that body was introduced to me by the member for Murchison, when, in compliance with their request, I stated that I would be prepared to introduce the Bill as it left the Assembly in 1907. On the occasion of that deputation it was pointed out that the fire brigades were equally as necessary in the smaller towns as in the larger ones, and that in larger towns there was a better chance of their receiving financial assistance than, generally speaking, in the smaller centres. Stress was also laid upon the fact that it was very hard on these men working as volunteers, to have to go cap in hand to obtain funds for their support; that these brigades were maintained almost entirely in the interests of insurance companies, and that it was only fair and reasonable that the companies so benefited should contribute to their upkeep. It was further contended by these gentlemen who had had experience, not only in Western Australia, but also in the Eastern States, that this proposed legislation would result in a much better system of organisation. The system obtaining in Victoria at the present time, I understand, has been in operation for about 20 years, and it is not, I think, too much to say that so far as that organisation is concerned it is generally recognised that it is one of the most up-to-date and efficient in the world. There are two separate boards under the Victorian Act, one administering the metropolitan boards in Melbourne, and a separate one, having its headquarters in the capital, administering the country brigades. In that State the country fire brigade boards control some 200 brigades.

Mr. Holman: About a hundred.

The PREMIER: The men in the country brigades number some 4,000. The Metropolitan Board control 50 brigades and 350 men. The greatest distance be-

tween any two boards in Victoria is nearly 200 miles, whereas in this State we have brigades situated 1,500 miles apart. The contribution towards the funds in Victoria is in the following proportion—Government one-third, five insurance companies one-third and the municipalities one-third. This provision is the same in New South Wales, Queensland and Tasmania, while the proportion in South Australia is Government three-ninths, municipalities two-ninths, and insurance companies four-ninths. I do not think it is necessary for me to enlarge any further on this Bill, as it embodies the wishes of the House as previously constituted. As there are other members who have a more intimate connection with the working of fire brigades than I, any further information desired by members will I have no doubt be provided by them. With regard to the regulations, those existing in the other States have proved to work most satisfactorily, and consequently will be followed here as far as possible. Of course by reason of the different conditions prevailing in Western Australia, and especially having regard to the fact that this country is so sparsely populated at present, and also owing to the distances between the towns, it would be impossible to work exactly on the lines of the Victorian Act. I am anxious that this Bill should reach another place as early as possible so that the objection previously levelled against it in that House cannot be repeated on this occasion. This is the third time the measure has been before this Chamber, so there is no necessity for me to deal further with it. I have very much pleasure in moving—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

Mr. HOLMAN (Murchison): I do not intend to delay the passage of the measure. As the Premier correctly stated it is introduced at the earnest request of the association representing all the fire brigades (with the exception of the two metropolitan brigades), and it is necessary that it should go through Parliament as rapidly as possible. I am very pleased indeed to know that the Premier has pushed forward the matter so

speedily. It has been a cause for regret that during so many years past the splendid work done by the various brigades has not been properly recognised, and that the insurance companies who reap practically all the benefit from the work of the brigades have been allowed to get off scot free without contributing anything towards the upkeep of the institutions. Although the measure now before us is not perhaps the most suitable that could be brought down in order to help the brigades, it is one which should receive the support of members. So far as I personally am concerned, and speaking from an intimate knowledge of the brigades in Western Australia for a period extending over eleven years, I am glad the time has come when there is a possibility of having an Act to control the brigades. Speaking also with a practical knowledge of the system in Victoria I can say I have never seen a more economical and better system established in my life. It has been said by those who have visited various other countries that the system in Victoria is equal to, if not better than, anything in the old world. So far as our system here is concerned we have built it up on practically the same lines as in Victoria. The association now has the control of about 600 volunteer firemen who are ready at all times to do all they can to save life and property, and many splendid acts of service have been done by members of the brigades, while much valuable work has been done in protecting property. Time after time the members of the brigades have risked their lives in trying to save property; some unfortunately have lost their lives, while on many occasions firemen have been very seriously injured. We should see that the Bill is passed so that the insurance companies who receive so great benefit from the work of the firemen should pay a fair amount towards the upkeep of the brigades. The danger to a fireman is hard to realise to those who do not understand the actual work they have to go through. I will give an instance to show the class of men comprising volunteer brigades here. Every year a fire brigades demonstration is

held and is attended by firemen from all parts of the State. We have had some nine or ten demonstrations altogether and at each one hundreds of firemen gather together. There has never been one act of disorderly conduct, nor anything of that kind in connection with the demonstrations. This is a credit to the discipline of the firemen we have, and as the Premier rightly said, in the event of trouble arising in Western Australia we would not have a more efficient band of disciplined men than the firemen located in different parts of the State. The fire brigade system is growing and in every centre, so soon as a village becomes of any importance there is a fire brigade formed. It is absolutely necessary that we should pass this Bill in order to see that those men have protection and are provided with the funds necessary to enable them to carry on their work. In all the other States the insurance companies are compelled to pay their quota towards the upkeep of the brigades, and it really is a marvellous thing that we should have carried on the whole system throughout Western Australia (with the exception of the two metropolitan districts) without receiving any monetary assistance from the companies. There is nothing in the measure that should cause unnecessary delay in its passage. I should like to have seen a provision to the effect that the State, the local authorities, and the insurance companies, should each contribute one-third towards the expenditure instead of the quota mentioned in the Bill.

Mr. Bath: In South Australia insurance companies have to pay four-ninths.

Mr. HOLMAN: If they had to pay one-third at the start it would be sufficient. I do not know whether the Premier would oppose an amendment in the direction I have indicated.

The Premier: Insurance companies get the greatest benefit and should pay the most.

Mr. HOLMAN: All that is saved from the fire virtually belongs to the companies.

Mr. Angwin: How about the men who pay the insurance fees?

Mr. HOLMAN: Those fees are paid whether benefit is derived from the fire brigade or not. The man who insures has to pay higher here than in the Eastern States. If there is to be protection against fire someone will have to pay for it, and as the insurance companies get the benefit they should be the largest contributors. I intend to give this measure all the support I can for it has been my desire for many years past to see such a Bill become law. I am convinced that once it goes through the House and gets into working order there will be no trouble about subsequently remedying by an amending measure any defects which may be found to exist in it. I am satisfied that we could control the fire brigade system of the State with one board, and I believe that after this measure becomes law the two brigades in existence now under the Metropolitan Fire Brigades Board will come under this measure, and then we will gradually work up to the system of having only one board. I intend to work in that direction as I am satisfied that with a properly managed system we could have a very efficient fire brigade service with only one board, the work of which would be carried on at a minimum of expense. In Victoria there are over 1,000 men in the hundred country fire brigades, and the total cost of upkeep and administration of those boards is only £11,000 a year. Members will realise what a splendid service this is and how well it is administered. With the experience most of the firemen here possess—many of them have come from Victoria—we can bring about the same efficiency here as in the other State. I have very much pleasure in supporting the second reading and hope the Bill will be sent on to another place at the earliest possible moment. I trust that before the end of this session the measure will have passed through both Houses and that thus provision will be made for protecting the fire brigades in the State.

Mr. ANGWIN (East Fremantle): The Premier seems to be anxious to get this Bill through, but as it has only just come into the hands of members I trust

he will not refuse an adjournment before the Committee stage to allow the municipalities and other local authorities to see what the Bill contains. The member for Murchison has dealt with the Bill from the point of view of the fire brigades, but it must be remembered there are other sides that need consideration. There is not the slightest doubt that for some time past it has been necessary that a Bill should be brought forward for the regulation of the fire brigades. We should all realise that, considering the large body of firemen working here and the good work they have been doing in the past, and still are doing, their services should be recognised. I am pleased to see there is a clause providing that the volunteer fire brigades shall be represented on the board. With regard to the working of the Victorian fire brigades board I had some experience of it and I do not think the position is quite so happy a one as has been stated, or as was expected before the Act there came into force. I was connected with the fire brigade in Malvern, Victoria, at the time of the formation of the Metropolitan Fire Brigades Board. At that time, while the Malvern district had to contribute to the increase in general costs, the actual cost for fire brigade maintenance in that district was reduced by the board; the cost of the brigade to the Malvern council, previous to the formation of the board, was only £200 per annum. The contributions to the board amounted to £400, one-third being paid by the various local governing bodies, one-third by the Government and one-third by the insurance companies; therefore, they received £1,200 for maintaining the fire brigades in that particular district. According to the contributions made from the district, the whole amount allowed to be expended at that time was the paltry sum of £150. The strength of the brigade was greatly reduced, and the district was in great danger from fire. This is a matter which has not been taken into consideration, but we shall have to see that the various districts associated with the fire brigades get as good protection as at the present time under local control. No doubt repre-

sentation will be there, but we are to allow two representatives from the insurance companies, who contribute exactly the same proportion as the local bodies, and only one representative is to be allowed from the local bodies, according to the way in which I read the clause.

The Premier: No.

Mr. ANGWIN: It says one representative of the local bodies from each fire district, and two representatives from the fire companies in that district.

The Premier: Two districts and one board.

Mr. ANGWIN: Does it mean that? Two from the insurance companies must come from each district; it would be 10 if that is so. It is not quite clear, and it is necessary that something should be done to make the clause more clear; whether the insurance companies only elect two in each district, and what number the local governing bodies elect.

The Premier: First of all there are three to be nominated by the Government, two by the local bodies in each local governing district, two by the fire brigades in each district and two by the insurance companies; that makes nine.

Mr. ANGWIN: I am glad to hear the Minister say that is the intention of the Bill, because I do not see why one body similar to another should have different representation. I often think that we are under a mistaken apprehension as to the contributions to the boards. We have to bear in mind, no matter what bodies contribute the money it has to come from the people in general. If the Government contribute one-third, each resident of the State has to contribute towards that one-third; if the municipalities have to contribute a portion, the people again have to contribute that portion which the municipalities have to give; and if the insurance companies contribute, the people again have to contribute. The position which we come to is that one body, the great bulk of the people, have to find the money for running the boards. I object to the formation of such a large number of boards. In fact, we shall be governed by boards.

in this State, and there will be no need for a Parliament at all.

Mr. Bath: And buried in boards.

Mr. ANGWIN: I will not delay the passing of the second reading, but I hope the Premier will give time to look through the measure and see what the intention of the Bill is.

Mr. SCADDAN (Ivanhoe): I agree with the member for Murchison that nothing should be done to delay the passage of this Bill, in order that it may receive consideration from another place, and in order, too, that they shall not be able to urge as the reason, if they throw out the Bill, that it was sent up to them at the fag end of the session. This House has already considered this Bill and passed it through Committee. The Bill is exactly the same as the Bill that left the Committee on a previous occasion. I may inform the member for East Fremantle that he was present both during the second reading debate and during the passage of the Bill through Committee on a former occasion. I have compared this Bill with the Bill as it was amended in Committee previously, which I obtained from a messenger of the House, and I found it was an exact copy, and for that reason I do not know why the measure should be delayed. I admit there is the possibility that some of the municipalities or governing bodies may object to the Bill being rushed through, because they have urged previously when the Bill was before the House, that at least the contributions to the board should be altered and in a way I am sure members of the House who know something about fire brigade work, will not listen to. That is the direction of striking out the representation of volunteer fire brigades. In that connection I would say that I have no sympathy with those municipalities who will work men without payment and then refuse to give them representation. They urge that as volunteer brigades contribute nothing towards the upkeep of the brigades they should receive no representation. I have always contended that the volunteer firemen contribute more towards fire brigades than even the municipalities

have in the past, and they have contributed a fair amount; because if they had actually been paid for the services rendered, it would have amounted to four times as much as the municipalities have paid in the past. I have known instances where men have had their best suits ruined in attending fires for the purpose of saving life and property, and have been successful in saving valuable property, and when an application has been made to the insurance companies who have benefited by the firemen being promptly on the spot, they have been met with a refusal, and outside a small contribution of perhaps £1 ls. per annum, they will not contribute towards the upkeep of the brigade. Though all the other details of the Bill are not as I desire them, for that reason I shall not raise my voice against the passage of the Bill. I am glad the insurance companies will have to contribute their quota. As they reap the advantage from efficient fire services, they should contribute a fair quota. I hope the Premier will put this Bill through the Committee stage this evening, and I am sure the member for East Fremantle will not raise particularly strong objection to the clauses, as he has already agreed to them in Committee. He was present, and spoke on one or two occasions when the Bill was formerly before the House, and he raised no serious objection to the Bill as it is at present before the House; therefore, I hope the Bill will pass this evening.

The PREMIER (in reply): I am glad to hear the remarks made on this measure. I would point out to the member for East Fremantle that in addition to being subject to close scrutiny in the Committee stage, prior to that the previous Bill was before a select committee, and it contains the suggestions made by that select committee. In regard to the constitution of the board, I would again point out to the hon. member that there are to be nine members: the municipal councils will have two members, the fire insurance companies two members, and the Government three members. In view of these facts, I hope the hon. member

will not press his objection to the Bill going through the Committee stage to-night. The Bill is exactly as it left the Committee previously. It was not rushed through on that occasion, but close scrutiny was given to the different clauses, and I hope no objection will be taken to the Committee stage being proceeded with to-night.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Mr. Daglish in the Chair; the Premier in charge of the Bill.

Clauses 1 to 5—agreed to.

Clause 6—Constitution of board:

Mr. FOULKES: Would the Minister inform the Committee as to the representation of local bodies in each fire district? What would be the representation of a district like Cottosloe, where there are three local bodies? Would each separate municipality or roads board be entitled to one member?

The PREMIER: The boundaries of the districts were set forth in the First Schedule. The various local bodies in each district would elect a representative for their district, just as the members of the fire brigades in each district would combine to elect a representative to the board for the district. Each local authority in the district would have a vote. Clause 11 made provision for regulations to be framed in this regard.

Mr. HOLMAN: Many local authorities had requested the passage of this or a similar measure. The appointment of members to the board would be made by regulation, giving fair and equitable representation to the various local authorities. There was power to establish local committees; there was a similar power in the Victorian Act; but it was not availed of in Victoria, so much satisfaction having been given by the administration by the Country Fire Brigades Board.

Mr. OSBORN: The point that puzzled members was, what would be the method of voting by local authorities in the election of a member to represent them on the board.

The PREMIER: In the definition clause, "local authority," was described as a municipality and the council thereof,

or the roads board of a road district. Clause 7 gave power to the Governor to constitute sub-districts, and Clause 8 gave the constitution of local committees. Each local committee would consist of three persons, one representing the local authority or authorities, one representing the fire brigade or fire brigades, and one representing the insurance companies insuring property within the sub-district. Provision was made also for the chief officer of the board to report as to the advisability of establishing boards in these various sub-districts.

Mr. BATH: Would the election by the local authorities mean a majority of the councils or roads boards, or a majority of the members of those bodies?

The PREMIER: It would be a majority of the councils and roads boards.

Mr. FOULKES: Clause 38 gave power to make regulations, and the only subclause regulating elections was Subclause (r) which solely related to the election of a representative from the fire brigades. Further provision should therefore be made to deal with the election of a member to represent local authorities so that there would be no future misunderstanding. He would also like to be satisfied that the various roads boards had the power to contribute towards the expenses of a fire brigade.

Mr. BOLTON: The probability was that the same system would be adopted as was adopted in choosing a representative on the Arbitration Court. The person receiving the greatest number of nominations would be elected. The difficulty might arise where each local authority nominated one of its own members.

Mr. KEENAN: Each district would be a large area containing many municipalities and road districts, and a single representative would be elected to the board for the whole district. In order to bring about the election, the different local authorities would have each one vote and the vote would be exercised by nomination. If each body chose to nominate one of its own members, there would be a failure to elect. In that case there was provision made in Clause 15 by which the Governor could make the appointment; but it was more than likely

that the local authorities would combine and elect some suitable person to represent them.

Mr. SCADDAN: It was provided in Clause 6 that only the contributing local authorities should have a vote in the election of a representative. It was also provided in Clause 41—

“Towards the annual expenditure so estimated a sum equal to the whole of such estimated expenditure in each district shall be contributed annually in the portions hereinafter set out and be paid to the board as follows, namely by (a) The Colonial Treasurer, out of the consolidated revenue, which is hereby appropriated for that purpose accordingly; (b) The municipalities whose districts are within or partly within the district, out of the municipal fund of such municipalities respectively.”

So that if a municipality or local authority existed in the district set out by the Governor-in-Council, they would be entitled to have a vote as a body and not as individual members. In Victoria the procedure was that nominations were called by *Gazette*, notice and various authorities nominated some persons and they requested other authorities to support their nominee. The procedure then followed was similar to that adopted in connection with the Arbitration Court election.

Mr. FOULKES: Would the Premier state whether any provision had been made to use half of the roads board moneys for the purposes of fire brigades?

The CHAIRMAN: That question could not be allowed on the clause under discussion.

Mr. FOULKES: Provision was made that one member should be elected by the local authorities. If it turned out that the roads board had no power to devote any funds out of their road rates towards their fire brigade, they would not have the opportunity of taking part in that election.

Mr. HOLMAN: The clause the Committee were dealing with was similar to that in the Victorian Act. With regard

to the question of the roads board being allowed to contribute, only those who contributed would have a voice in the selection of the members of the board.

Mr. Foulkes: Was it the intention of the Government to introduce a Roads Board Bill this session?

The CHAIRMAN: The hon. member could not discuss that question.

The PREMIER: The information might be given, but in view of the Chairman's ruling it could not.

Clause passed.

Clauses 7, 8, 9—agreed to.

Clause 10—Governor may remove members:

Mr. BATH: If the Bill gave the power for the different local authorities to elect members, it seemed to him a rather drastic reservation that the Governor may remove them if he thought fit.

Mr. Scaddan: Supposing one of the members of the board became insane there should be power to remove him.

Mr. HOLMAN: This authority was very necessary. The same provision existed in the Victorian Act although it had never been used.

The PREMIER: Practically the same provision went through without any objection in the Licensed Surveyors Bill.

Clause passed.

Clauses 11 to 25—agreed to.

Clause 26—Vesting of property:

Mr. OSBORN: It was provided in this clause that the property of any municipality on the election of the fire brigades board immediately became the property of that board. The municipality may have maintained a fire brigade for some considerable time and it may have accumulated a fair amount of property of a certain value. Under the clause a fire brigade would be able to participate equally in the property of the municipality and thus become possessed of it in equal partnership. Would the Premier give the Committee some assurance that any municipality that had accumulated property should be in some way recompensed by the other municipalities or roads board adjoining, who might participate in that property when it became vested in the fire brigades

board after its election? It was only fair where such an occasion arose that the municipality which had accumulated this property (and he had in mind one particularly, Midland Junction) should be recompensed in some way.

Mr. Scaddan: The board would not take that property away.

Mr. OSBORN: But the adjoining local authorities were going to participate in the property of the municipality which had found the money to pay for it.

The PREMIER: If the hon. member turned up the marginal note he would see that the clause had been taken from 62 Vic., No. 8, which provided for the property of the Perth brigade being taken over. That section read—

“On notification of the acceptance of the services of any fire brigade the Governor shall forthwith by proclamation in the *Government Gazette* declare the provisions of this Act to be in force in the municipality in which such fire brigade has been so constituted, whereupon all the plant, fire engines, reels, fire escapes, and appliances, the property of and in use by the municipality for the service of such fire brigade, shall vest in and become the property of the board constituted by this Act.”

It should be pointed out that the municipality would be relieved of the expenditure and not the local roads board. At the same time the Government had contributed very liberally to the expenditure in connection with these country fire brigades, the amount last year having been £3,500. No practical suggestion could be made to meet the objection raised by the hon. member, inasmuch as at the present time the municipality was being relieved of the expenditure. The clause was practically on the same lines as the clause in the old Act, and the same course was taken when the Metropolitan Fire Brigade Board was constituted.

Mr. ANGWIN: The only objection to the clause was that there should be a date stated before the passing of the Bill in regard to the property. What was to hinder a local council or body disbanding the fire brigade, taking the prop-

erty and then after the formation of the board, agitating for the re-starting of a new fire brigade, and lease their property to that board with a view of obtaining revenue. There was a weak spot there.

(Sitting suspended from 6.15 to 7.30 p.m.)

Mr. ANGWIN: When the sitting was suspended he had been saying that in his opinion, instead of giving any more power to municipalities, it would be far better to tie their hands a little. However, seeing that he had an assurance from the Premier when introducing the Bill that the measure was exactly similar to that which had previously passed, he would not offer any further objections to it.

Clause put and passed.

Clauses 27 to 40 agreed to.

Clause 41—Contributions towards expenditure:

Mr. SCADDAN; Under Subclause (b) it was provided that the municipalities should furnish their quota out of the municipal funds. Ought it not to be read “local authorities?”

The PREMIER: It should read “local authorities,” and he proposed to have it so amended in another place.

Clause put and passed.

Clauses 42 to 77—agreed to.

Schedules, Title—agreed to.

Bill reported without amendment: the report adopted.

BILL—LICENSING.

Second Reading.

Debate resumed from 7th September.

Mr. BATH (Brown Hill): In addressing myself to the second reading of this very important measure, I think it would not be fitting were I not to compliment the Attorney General on the very lucid and eloquent way in which he introduced the measure to our notice. That hon. gentleman, in fact, in the argument which preceded his explanation of the details of the Bill, advanced views which, in my opinion, demand a much more comprehensive measure than even that which he introduced. His sentiment in regard to the necessity for a deference to public opinion on this

question is one with which I cordially agree: and I would very much have liked to remain under the delusion which I laboured under until last night, namely, that these were the ideals of that hon. gentleman, not only so far as this measure is concerned, but also in regard to other and perhaps more important proposals with which we expect to deal. But, after listening to the speech delivered by the hon. gentleman last night, I am rather afraid that those remarks were intended strictly to be limited to the occasion upon which he was speaking. Instead of being those jewels of sentiment which I had thought they were, they were rather of the nature of those paste diamonds which actors and actresses use upon the stage for the purposes of their calling; they were, as a matter of fact, in the nature of stage effects. At the same time I wish to say that so far as the Bill is concerned, in many of its details it is more than we were led to expect from the speeches and replies which have been given by the Premier in regard to this question of licensing legislation; and whatever opinions we may have as to the defects, as to the need for amendment when the Bill goes into Committee, I think we will all be agreed that it presents a very good foundation upon which we can apply ourselves with earnest attention to the drafting of a Bill which will represent a great measure of reform. There is not likely to be a great deal of dispute in the minds either of hon. members, or of the public generally, as to the need for reform. I am not prepared, of course, to accept the dictum of a great many temperance advocates, who say that the drink evil is the greatest evil, that it is the foundation of moral and social wrongs, and of great injustices under which we suffer. But I will go so far as to agree, and I think there can be little dispute about it, that the drink traffic itself is responsible for injurious effects. That is proved by our daily experience. It is proved by the daily chronicle of passing events which is presented to us in the newspapers. It is proved by that most impartial of authorities, the statistician. And were it not

that in this—as in other interests that buttress great evils with which we have to contend, there is a powerful force with immense resources at its disposal fighting against measures of reform I am certain that reform measures would have been passed long ago. We have only to remember that the liquor trade presents, if not one of the readiest means for the acquirement of wealth at least one of the readiest means for the acquiring of a competency without any very great call either upon mental effort or physical energy. We have only to remember that the liquor institutions here and elsewhere have provided the key even to the very fount of honour. It has been enabled by this influence to buy its way into the peerage, it has been enabled to purchase its entrance into the front rank of society, it has been enabled to win to its side the voice of newspapers through the generous amount of advertising which it can dispense. It possesses the golden consolation by which conscience is stilled, and its sensitiveness to human pain and suffering entirely obliterated. And it is not without the means here and elsewhere to hire able advocates to plead its cause. I say this because hon. members, in fact all the members of the House, have been presented with a pamphlet which, while it presents the views of an individual, purports to be a dissertation upon the liquor problem, or upon “no license” from the standpoint of Labour. On behalf of the Labour party here and, I think, on behalf of the Labour party in Queensland, I can repudiate that pamphlet. I have had an opportunity of reading the reply of the *Queensland Worker*, which can claim to be the official organ of the Labour party, both politically and industrially, in Queensland, and that paper in the most scathing indictment criticised the publication, not as the impartial opinion of the individual who wrote it, but as the opinion formed by a man who went to New Zealand to investigate the subject on behalf of the liquor interests of Queensland. Therefore members, knowing that fact, will know what value to place upon the pamphlet. This influence, which is

exerted in so many directions even affects those who cannot by any stretch of imagination be claimed to be friends of the liquor interests; because we find many of them asking for special or preferential treatment for the liquor interests which they are not prepared to accord to other interests. They are prepared to advocate special hours of opening and closing, prepared to accord to this particular traffic privileges and opportunities which they will not accord to others. Although they are sincere in their advocacy, still it shows how potent this interest is on our national and political life. If it could be claimed for one moment that the drink traffic presented any very great advantages to the community, advantages contributing to the national well-being, we might be prepared to hesitate before we introduced legislation in order to obviate what may be termed the counterbalancing disadvantages and evils we know exist; but none will admit that there is anything in this interest which contributes to the national well-being, or the well-being of the community. I will admit that in this and in other communities there are thousands of men who indulge in drink, who are not teetotallers, and who can indulge in it without injury to themselves or to any other members of the community; but when we remember that in so many instances the drink deprives the worker of his manhood, his self-respect and independence, and when we remember the cases of so many men of genius and brilliant attainments whose lives have been ruined and brought to an untimely end by drink, we must be prepared to believe there is need for interference on the part of the Legislature; that there is justification for it, and that the justification can be urged on behalf of these men. The moderate drinkers, who can exercise self-control and restraint and who can partake of intoxicating liquors probably with no more disadvantage to themselves than there is to those who indulge habitually in strong tea, or in many of those chemically prepared soft drinks which the temperance advocates urge as a substitute for intoxicating

liquors, always urge that legislation of this character is an interference with the liberty of the subject. And they ask why should their liberty be restrained; why should any restrictions be imposed upon them on behalf of other members of the community. We are too apt in my mind to attach more than its due worth to this platitude about the liberty of the subject. I would remind hon. members that in the first step from savagery into the least vestige of civilisation there is a quality which is the natural complement of liberty, and that is restraint; the restraint exercised on behalf of the general welfare and good of the community. And in a case of this kind when we ask the men who are moderate drinkers, who have the power of restraint over their own inclinations and desires, also to exercise restraint on behalf of others who are not so well constituted, we are making an appeal that can very well be placed before them, an appeal on the more enlightened standard of modern days, that an injury to one is the concern of all. In that case there would be no call for for them to plead the liberty of the subject against such an appeal. It is not necessary that I should labour the argument as to the necessity for reform, but should rather discuss the question of how that reform is to be accomplished, for that is really the question upon which the temperance advocates, or rather reformers, to give them the more general term, are divided. I am reminded very forcibly of a quotation which an English writer, Mr. G. W. E. Russell, has used in regard to the general efforts for social reform. He said that the isolation and the detachment of all efforts for good make the chief strength of banded and cohesive evil. Yet to-day we have reformers advocating local option, no license, prohibition, the adoption of the Carolinian system, the Gothenberg system, or the nationalisation of the liquor traffic, and many other remedies. We find that the liquor interests are united in defying and destroying them all. It is because of the fact that reformers are divided, and that the defenders of vested interests are

united that reform has been so long in coming. As a matter of fact the Labour party in dealing with the question have suffered by this very conflict of opinion among reformers. At election time we always know on which side to find the liquor interests—the other side; whereas, on the other hand, we repeatedly find temperance reformers united with the liquor interests against us. It may be perhaps because their interest in temperance reform is not so strong as their interest in other vested interests; we will say in the continuance of sweating methods or land monopoly, or other evils greater than the liquor evil, interests which allow them to sink for the time being their interest in temperance reform in order to unite against the Labour party, who not only fight the liquor evil, but also greater evils whenever they have the opportunity. On this question we have adopted the attitude that, apart altogether from the question of any influence which the liquor interests may bring to bear, or apart from any influence which may be urged by temperance advocates, we will first make up our minds as to the evil, discuss and decide what is the best remedy, and then pursue that remedy so far as seeking reform, without having any regard whatever to one side or the other. That is the standpoint from which we approach the question. No member can accuse the Labour party of being influenced by vested interests on this question. One has only to turn to the return which the Attorney General read to us the other night, in which he named those constituencies wherein, basing his calculations on the Victorian quota, the number of hotels is in excess of what should be the established quota, and he will find that out of the 18 the Attorney General mentioned where the number was in excess of the quota, 12 were represented by members of the Labour party. Probably in those 12 the excess was the greatest. We cannot be accused of being influenced or deterred by vested interests in our attitude on this question. In our study of the question, not only by the members of this party, but the study by the rank and file of the party in

their organisations and at their congresses, we have arrived at the conclusion that the very foundation of reform must be the awakening of public opinion, which is first and foremost in regard to the matter. In seeking to secure public opinion, to arouse it, we say that one of the best methods which can be adopted is that of the referendum. By giving to the electors through the referendum or local option, whichever one may please to term it, the opportunity of exercising a vote on this question, we will take the first step to awaken responsibility. So long as the ordinary elector has no active participation in the question, so long as his interest is mixed up with his interests in a hundred other matters, there is no chance of educating public opinion in regard to the matter. But when a ballot paper is placed in his hand and he is asked to answer certain questions or to express his will in certain specified ways, then there is placed upon him the responsibility of exercising his vote and of deciding the issue according to his own intelligence and the opinion formed by that intelligence. The temperance party, or a great many members of it, are inclined to regard the principle of local option, or the referendum, as the end rather than the means by which to secure reform. As a matter of fact when we establish the principle of the referendum in this Bill, if it is established, we will only be at the beginning of the reform; all the work will then have to be accomplished. Temperance advocates neglect what is a very important factor in this question of temperance reform, they neglect what is, after all, the chief factor in all movements for reform, and that is the question of the profit which is derived. Until we take that into consideration, and until we devise some means, not only for the people to express their opinion, but also to get rid of the influence, the obstructive influence, aroused by the fact that people can make profit out of this or any other evil, so long will we stop short of practical reform on the question. Take for instance this very question; why is it that the evils are permitted to exist? Why is it that those

engaged in the trade should view the evils with equanimity, without heart-burning. I do not for one moment claim that persons engaged in the liquor trade, whether hotel-keeper, brewer, or employee, is one whit less sympathetic, or as a class are less sympathetic, than any other section of the community, less sympathetic say than the temperance reformer; but when the question of profit comes into the case, that is the factor that appeals to their sensibility, and commits them to acquiesce in these evils, and even to fight against those who seek to abolish them or minimise them. So long as it is possible for those engaged in the trade to relieve the drinker of the contents of his pockets, and then turn him out for the first policeman to take care of him; so long as it is possible to earn profit by turning a deaf ear to the troubles and miseries of women and children; so long as it is possible for them to earn profit by adulterating liquor, and in some instances driving men to suicide; so long as it is possible for them to earn profit by committing breaches of the law and palliating them; so long is the trade going to continue. I might apply this not only to the liquor trade but to other industries. Take the ordinary business men, so long as it is possible for them to earn profit by adulterating food, as nine out of every ten do to-day, so long as it is possible for them to earn profit by sweating employees; so long as it is possible to earn profit by maiming men and killing them in industrial life; so long it is impossible for us to deal with these evils. So it will be in regard to liquor reform, so long as we have men whose appetites are more powerful than their will, if we have local option, whatever legislation we pass, there will always be those who will be prepared to brave that illegality so long as they can make profits commensurate with the risk. That is the reason why the Labour party say that side by side with the principle of the referendum we should place the responsibility directly on the electors. We should also have something that will eliminate the factor of profit from the liquor traffic, that is why we advocate the ownership of the liquor traffic by the

people to-day. There are those who tell us this has been proved to be a failure; they have had it in Russia, and the Russian Government to-day make profits out of the liquor traffic. Western Australia is not Russia. Russia is governed by a bureaucracy. In Russia to-day we find there is a minority who are willing to draw the life-blood from the people for their own pleasure. So long as that continues, so long is the nationalisation of the liquor traffic going to be a failure. In Switzerland we have another example of the nationalisation of the liquor traffic, where it has been attended by beneficial results. When they see that the community can make some profit out of it they will let them continue to drink and be blind to the evils. That is not the case in Switzerland. When they found it necessary in the interests of their people to prohibit, not only the manufacture but also the importation and the sale of absinthe, the people responded to the call and gave the necessary authority by referendum for the total prohibition of the sale and importation of absinthe throughout the federation. The temperance advocates tell us it would be wrong for the State to take the responsibility, either in a wholesale or in a limited fashion of the liquor traffic, because it is attended with evils, and we cannot give the Government control of these evils. I tell those who argue that way that we have the responsibility at the present time and we cannot get rid of it. I tell all those, whom I would term human ostriches, that, although they bury their heads in the sand and blind themselves to the evils that are going on, it does not settle the evil, it does not prove that the evil does not exist. This is one of the questions upon which we cannot afford to play the Pharisee. If there are evils to be encountered we should be courageous in dealing with them; we should not only set out to provide a remedy but be prepared to investigate to the fullest possible extent, no matter what records of evil and crime may be unearthed, in order that we may first find out exactly how great the evil is before we attempt to apply the remedy. Sociology teaches us this

to-day. No matter how virtuous any individual may claim to be we cannot get rid of the responsibility for the social evils that exist to-day. Society is too complex and too far-reaching. Its influences do not go through one community alone, but from nation to nation, and we are feeling in Australia the perhaps injudicious effects of some action taken on the other side of the world. For instance, when Patten cornered the wheat market in Chicago, there were thousands of families in England faced with a serious position; they were already existing on what might be termed the margin of existence, and they were faced with serious possibilities. If we take to-day those who are content to carry on an industry, or take a part in it without regard to the interests of the workers, we find that the ordinary businesses carrying on the ordinary purchase of those articles which we require, may be responsible either for the death or the degradation of someone on the other side of the world. If we extend these questions beyond the liquor traffic, we find in all walks and industries, our interests are so much bound up in one another that none of us can escape our responsibility for the evils that exist. For those who imagine that by some act they can blind themselves, or put apart from them the outward appearance of evil that therefore they get rid of the evil, are probably the greatest opponents of reform with us to-day on this question. We have to accept things as they are. If tomorrow we were to exercise prohibition and declare the whole traffic to be illegal, there would still be those who by illegal methods, would be the purveyors, those who by the same methods would be supplied with liquor to consume. In New Zealand we find that after "no-license" was carried in some of the constituencies the New Zealand Government had to pass a special Act dealing with the manufacture and sale of methylated spirits in order to deal with one of the worst drinking evils which has cropped up there and in other parts of Australia. So the Labour party ask that the people should be courageous, and while placing the responsibility on the people should prepare for the gradual

abolition of the evil. In order, therefore, that this question may have an opportunity of being discussed it is my intention, when the Bill is in Committee, to add to those questions already contained in the local option provisions, two questions, one dealing with the right of the State, that is the people, to take over new licenses where demanded by the local option poll, and also another question, asking the people whether they are in favour of the nationalisation of licenses.

Mr. Brown: Would you be in favour of it?

Mr. BATH: What?

Mr. Brown: Nationalisation.

Mr. BATH: I have just been arguing in favour of it, and I claim, even although there may be local optionists who on principle are opposed to any proposal for the nationalisation of the liquor traffic, I still claim their support, because their argument is that we should trust the people on this question. The people have just as much right to be given an opportunity to express an opinion on this issue as they have on the issues contained in the Bill. To come to some of the details in the Bill, I wish to refer to those provisions dealing with the constitution of licensing courts, and it seems to me there can be no justification urged for, on the one hand, giving to the people the right to pronounce on the issues of licenses, increases, decreases, or no-license, and yet to deprive them of the opportunity of selecting those who will have to carry those ideas into effect. It is illogical. If we are to trust the people on the question of licenses, it is also logical to trust them on the choice of those who will have to carry their wishes into effect. I see nothing in favour of nominee licensing courts as contained in the Bill. Then there is too great a variety of licenses provided in the measure; some kinds of licenses may very well be dispensed with. I think we can very well dispense with what is known as the wine and beer licenses, more familiarly known on the goldfields as "shypoo" shops. Outside the mere trafficking in liquor over the counter there is no demand on those licensees for the accommodation which other licensees have to provide for before they can se-

cure a license. Then, again, there is the question of the gallon license. I am satisfied that this is one of the worst forms of licenses that we issue under our present legislation, and I for one would like to see it eliminated from the Bill. If these are retained the referendum should apply to them as well as to other licenses in the measure. Above all things I do not see why there should be any discrimination between the ordinary license issued to publicans and licenses issued to clubs. If there is any discrimination in regard to the evil effects that come from either, I think there is more evil from the indulgence in the clubs than in hotels. In existing circumstances the police can supervise hotels, they are open to all classes, there is an opportunity for supervision, but so far as the club is concerned the guardians of the peace have little opportunity indeed. The Minister claims that we have more supervision under the Bill, but that does not answer my argument that clubs have as much right to come under the provisions of this local option legislation as any other form of license that we issue. That is my opinion and it is my intention to make it so apply. I was just about to say that I know of one instance of a club not 100 miles from here that has been responsible for the ruin of a number of good business men, men who were getting along well and doing a good business, but who came under the influence of the club, which is, after all, nothing but a drinking den, and have been practically ruined as the result. We have heard from the Attorney General that, although we have an elaborate machinery by which the people are to express their opinion on the number of licenses to be issued, yet we depart from that and say that the licensing court, which under this Bill is a nominee court, shall have absolute discretion as to the granting of licenses. That seems to be a contradictory proposition. I think that not only should the board be elected but that their discretion should be taken away.

The Attorney General: The discretion they have is as to refusing; they cannot grant a license in opposition to local option.

Mr. BATH: They have discretion in regard to the granting of a license where the local option poll asks for a license, and that discretion is entirely contradictory to the principle on which the Bill is framed. It is entirely contradictory to the submitting of this question to the people. Then we have the proposal as to which day shall be selected for the taking of a local option poll, and on this question I am in accord with the Government in making the day other than an election day. I do not wish to see election day upon which all the questions dealing with the political and administrative affairs of the State are decided made the debating day between rival parties on the liquor question. We cannot have the important questions, political and administrative, dealing with the activities of the State subordinated, practically put out of sight in subordination to the question of the control of the liquor traffic. Therefore, I am entirely in accord with the proposal of the Ministry that it shall be on some other day than election day. As it is now these people have too many opportunities of exercising an undue influence on election day to make it advisable for them to be able to bring to bear all their influence, all the power which the expenditure of money gives them on the day on which other issues are to be decided; and therefore, I say the idea of the Government in leaving this question free from our ordinary political conflicts or decisions is one that, I think, can well be adopted by the House. I have already said in regard to questions to be submitted that it is my intention to move for the inclusion of two in regard to nationalisation, but I notice that the taking of a vote of no-license is postponed until the end of the ten years period. Of course that is entirely contingent on whether the House accepts or rejects the principle of compensation. I hope members will reject the provision made for compensation. I think there is no legal justification that can be urged by anyone which can support the proposal inserted by the Attorney General. It is true the hon. gentleman entered into a learned legal argument as to the vested rights which licensees have to a renewal of their

licenses, but when the very pertinent interjection of the member for Subiaco was interposed, the Attorney General quickly departed from that issue and based his claim upon the moral right. In regard to this question of the renewal of the license, I want to draw the hon. member's attention to the fact that in Section 24 of the Wines, Beer, and Spirit Sales Act of 1880 the licensee is entitled to a renewal of the license, but certain provisions are inserted by which objections can be lodged, and among these objections are the following:—That the licensee is of bad fame and character, or of drunken habits, and that the house has not reasonable accommodation. There are grounds upon which objections can be urged not only to the application but also to the renewal, and amongst these is one "that the licensing thereof is not required in the neighbourhood." Another is "that the quiet of the place in which such premises are situated will be disturbed if the license be granted." This provision in the Act on which the Attorney General bases his claim that licensees have a statutory right to renewal is precisely similar to the provision that appears in the New South Wales, and, I believe, the New Zealand Act.

The Attorney General: And the Victorian Act also.

Mr. BATH: Yes. The question was argued at great length by the advocates and opponents of compensation in the New South Wales Legislature. I am not going to appeal to any British precedent, but I am going to point out that although the question was argued, although legal gentlemen in both Houses of the New South Wales Parliament urged that licensees had a statutory right to renewal, the Bill was passed without any provision whatever for compensation for licenses in New South Wales; and notwithstanding that fact and notwithstanding the statutory legal right which was claimed no attempt whatever was made—

The Attorney General: A time limit was imposed.

Mr. BATH: I am going to deal with that later on, but notwithstanding it was claimed that they had this statutory

legal right, after the Bill was passed in New South Wales no attempt was made by the licensed victuallers or any of the advocates of the liquor interests to establish their claim; and if they had a claim, surely the fact that they have no difficulty in raising funds would have allowed them to use every means to establish their claim in the courts or to dispute that Bill which was passed. It is true that the Attorney General after passing from what he termed the statutory legal right based his claim upon the moral right. Even taking the claim while the statute is in existence or for the ten years period that will elapse before it is wiped out by this legislation, apart from that the Attorney General made a powerful, and I may say, pathetic appeal on behalf of the moral right of licensees for a renewal. How long since is it that the Government have become regardful of moral rights? Let me draw attention to the claim of an old and trusted servant of the State to a pension under the Superannuation Act. I refer to the late Commissioner of Titles. When he submitted his claim, not only a legal but a moral claim, I remember the virtuous indignation with which the late Attorney General got up and opposed the claim and dismissed from his mind altogether the moral claim, and based it on the legal claim or lack of legal claim.

The Premier: The State does not pay the compensation. The licensees compensate themselves.

Mr. BATH: Let us also turn to the action brought by the municipality of Fremantle for the return of certain money which the State had wrongfully withheld from it. The Government did not defend the action on the moral claim of the municipality, but they defended it on what they thought were their legal rights, and they used the law for all it was worth in their attempt to prevent the Fremantle municipal council from securing that money.

Mr. Walker: They actually pleaded that the Bill was passed without a Message from the Governor.

Mr. BATH: It is true that they pleaded that the Bill was passed without

the necessary Message from the Governor. The Premier interjected just now that the State was not asked to provide the money, but that the licensees were asked to provide it from a fund established by themselves. I am not opposing the idea of insurance among the licensed victuallers for the compensation of those whom a local option poll may affect, but I do object to the House, as a Parliament, as a legislative body, giving a statutory right by an Act of Parliament which does not exist. We have too many vested interests to fight at present; there are too many obstacles in the way of reform for members of Parliament deliberately by legislation to create a vested statutory right where it does not exist; and that is the objection I take. If the licensed victuallers, apart from this Bill, care to establish a sort of insurance fund, such as was proposed by the member for Swan in regard to another thing altogether, I have no objection; I would regard it as a very good idea; but I object to Parliament enacting this and recognising something that does not exist. Now let me point out how different is the treatment we are asked to mete out to those engaged in this industry from the treatment meted out in the past. As soon as the Goldfields Water Scheme was completed to Coolgardie and the water was made available to the residents in that area, dozens of condenser owners found themselves deprived of their means of existence; and when some of them urged the then Minister for Works that they should be granted compensation, they were laughed out of the Minister's office, they were ridiculed for their presumption for asking such a thing. Of course it will be said that we grant a license in the one case; but we only grant it for one year, and I am not asking the House to deprive the licensees of their rights for the year; but I would point out that we gave to these condenser owners what are known as water rights, not for one year, but for 21 years, and no claim for compensation on their behalf was entertained.

Mr. Brown: They could still stop there and practise their occupation.

Mr. BATH: I would like to see the member for Perth running a condenser in opposition to the water scheme. Certainly we did not deprive the condenser owner of his condenser, nor do we deprive the licensee of his building. If the condenser owner can apply his plant to some other purpose there would be no objection nor will there be if the licensee uses his building for another purpose. Then there is the action of the Government in constructing railways in Western Australia. Take for instance the railway from Mount Magnet to Black Range. As soon as that is completed the carriers, the teamsters, on that road, will have to find some other occupation, and will have to move to some other district in order to carry on their work. They certainly will have their teams, but they cannot act as carriers in opposition to the Government railways, and will have to go elsewhere. We do not apply for compensation for them, nor tell them they have the right to compensation. The claim provided for in the Bill has no justification whatever. It has been proved on legislative enactment in both New Zealand and New South Wales that the legal right for compensation does not exist. Therefore I strongly object to such a proposal being included in this Bill. Then again I would point out that even if we adopted the position we would merely be giving the right of local option to the people with one hand in order to take it back with the other. I do not think the Attorney General will contend for one moment that the fund proposed to be raised under the Bill, if carried, will be at all adequate, will be anything like sufficient, to compensate those who will be deprived of their licenses after a local option poll. By the provision inserted in the measure the local option poll can only be honored to the extent the funds will permit. As I say the Bill makes a pretence of granting local option with the one hand but takes it back with the other.

The Premier: With a license reduction board system, double as many hotels were closed in Victoria as were closed in New Zealand under the no-license system.

Mr. BATH: There is no parallel because, so far as our Bill is concerned, it will not be carried out in accordance with the result of a local option poll but in accordance with the deliberations and the conclusions of a nominee license reduction board.

The Premier: Whose operations are governed by the amount of funds in their possession.

Mr. BATH: And the Licenses Reduction Board are not to honour the result of the poll unless they have sufficient funds to pay the compensation. We are asking the board to honour something we have granted to the people. This provision is, I suppose, inserted by the Government in all sincerity.

The Attorney General: We honour the decision of the voters to the extent of £20,000 a year.

Mr. BATH: As I say, that is giving something with one hand and taking it back with the other. In view of the fact that it is done in order to give effect to an argument with no foundation, I fail to see the necessity for it. If in this Bill by the will of the Legislature we provide for a continuance of licenses for the term of the lease of the licensee, as distinct from the owner, with a maximum of five years, we shall be doing all that is required in the circumstances.

The Attorney General: The period is eight years in New South Wales.

Mr. BATH: And I am saying it should be five years. Again we have a number of proposals which may be termed machinery proposals of the Bill, one of which deals with adulteration. To my mind there is no worse crime in this world than that of adulteration, the crime of selling either impure liquor or impure food to the community. Yet by the Bill, if a licensee adulterates and the offence is proved once against him his license is not taken away, but he is allowed to adulterate and poison the public twice before losing his license. If a licensee is proved to have adulterated his liquor he should be deprived of his license.

The Premier: Not if he adulterates it with water.

Mr. BATH: I am talking now of adulterating with injurious compounds. On the authority of those who travel about the State and consume liquor I can say that the offence of adulteration is one that is altogether too frequent.

The Premier: Why not give your personal experience.

Mr. BATH: I have never been poisoned yet by adulterated liquor. Then again we find the Government, although I may say the Attorney General made no reference to it in his explanation of the Bill, providing for a later hour of closing than is in the existing Act. There can be no justification for this differential treatment. What is there in the trade of a licensed victualler which entitles him to preferential treatment over any ordinary business man, a grocer or ironmonger, who has to close his shop at six o'clock and to conform with the provisions of the Early Closing Act and the limitation of hours of his employees. What argument can be advanced for this special treatment. At any rate I fail to see any arguments in favour of the extension of the hours over those provided in the existing Act. There is one point I omitted in dealing with the details which I intended to touch on this occasion, that is I wish to impress on members that I am strongly in favour of the local option poll extending to State hotels as well as to any other hotels. I do not wish to differentiate between the Gwalia State hotel or the one at the Yallingup Caves, and those run by private individuals. We advocate State hotels not because they should have preferential treatment, because we want them to be placed on a different footing from others, but as we believe they form one of the practical remedies which can be provided in dealing with evils under the liquor traffic. Our only object is to provide a remedy. If the principle were applied and in practice we found it to be injurious or wrong, then the Labour party would be the first to retrace their steps; but we ask at least that this principle, which has been advocated and established with success in other parts of the world, should be given a trial here. I have dealt with

the main features of the Bill, and the other questions I propose to leave to the Committee stage. There is one other point, however, and that is in regard to the petition which must be presented before a local option poll can be taken in any district. Probably the Attorney General, who discoursed so eloquently on the initiative and referendum last night, will claim that this petition is something in the nature of an initiative. I will point out to him that we do not regard it as such; we accept the referendum as the verdict of the people and believe that the right to the referendum should be granted to them. In accepting that opinion we want to place no obstacle against the exercising of the right. I therefore object to this proposal making a referendum conditional upon the presentation of a petition. Even if we inserted the principle in the Bill the petition would come in every case just the same, and the expense the Attorney General spoke of will not be saved by the insertion of the provision. The proposal seems to me to have been put in in order to block in some way the referendum, and I will oppose it. In conclusion, I want to refer to the eloquent peroration with which the Attorney General concluded his speech. He referred to this Bill—I do not know whether it was a pious opinion or not—as one that was going to bring about national well-being and great social reform. I cannot quote his exact words, for the Standing Orders forbid me to read *Hansard*, but that is the purport of his remarks. While I welcome this provision of the referendum, while I regard it as the establishment in practice of what we have so long talked about, that is the right of the people to rule, I regard it as only being the very first step in reform. I want members who advocate this means of dealing with the liquor evil to apply the system also to other greater evils. I do not for one moment hold with those who say the liquor evil is the root of all the social injustices and inequalities under which we labour. I believe the liquor evil is only the outworks of the greater evils with which we contend. It is more the effect of the deeper lying

injustices and wrongs than it is the cause of them. It is true that indulgence in liquor sometimes accentuates them, but if we are to build up a great nation, to set ourselves earnestly to the task of doing what the Attorney General said, promote national well being, we must go beyond this question of dealing with the liquor evil. There are those who claim that, when we have established that, we have settled the whole of the ills the flesh is heir to, but I would point out that there are ardent temperance advocates here and elsewhere to-day who, while they are in favour of reform in that direction are themselves among the greatest upholders of evils in other directions. We have temperance reformers who are sweaters, and who sweat women and children in industries; we have temperance reformers who are advocates of monopolies, and as long as they continue to advocate those things, so long will this fail to remedy the injustices which I hope we all are seeking not only to alleviate, but to prevent. I want to appeal to the local optionists to give this question of the referendum more than limited application. I want them to apply the referendum in other directions, so that we may utilise the weapon of public conscience in order to deal with the defects and evils which confront us. If I were asked for some proof of my contention that the liquor evil has been greater than the social evil, I would quote first the opinion of Miss Frances Willard, the founder of the Women's Christian Temperance Union, who said that after 21 years' experience in the temperance movement, she had come to the opinion that rather than seek to promote the happiness of the people by promoting temperance, she thought they would have to devote their attention to promoting the temperance of the people by promoting their happiness. I want to point out that scientists who have investigated the question impartially, who have brought facts to bear, contend that intemperance is only the result of the greater social evil. I have only to refer hon. members to Charles Booth in the *Life and Labour of the London People*, and I have only

to refer to a report recently issued by a Commission appointed by ex-President Roosevelt, the United States Commission known as the Homes Commission, which was asked to investigate the conditions under which a great many people live in the larger cities of the United States, and a Commission which presented its report, a report which was so horrifying in its details that the Government which authorised them to make that report gave instructions that it should be suppressed. In the course of that report, I want to point out that the members of it, including scientists and medical men, gave expression to this opinion—

“Malnutrition, whether the result of insufficient or improperly prepared food, or the consumption of cold victuals is a very fruitful cause of intemperance. In our sociological study of 1,217 families it was found that 750 wage earners carried dinner pails and 205 were reported as being accustomed to consume alcoholic beverages with their meals. The number in each case was greater among the white than the coloured wage-earners. Everyone at all familiar with the subject knows that badly cooked food, especially when consumed from the “cold dinner pail,” produces derangements of the stomach and a craving for alcoholic stimulants, which in turn aggravate the original gastric disturbance and readily lead to the drink habit.”

I would like also to quote the opinion which is included in the report of this Homes Commission of Professor Justus von Liebig, a very eminent scientist, who declares—

“Alcoholism is not the cause, but the result of distress. It is the exception to the rule for a well-nourished individual to become a drunkard. When, on the other hand, a man's earnings are insufficient to provide the quantity and quality of food required for the restoration of his working capacity, sheer necessity compels him to have recourse to alcohol.

If I might add an authority to whom I attach even more weight than either of those I have quoted, I would refer to the

English writer, Dr. Sullivan, a medical officer in His Majesty's prison service in England. I know the Attorney General has read his book, and he will agree with me that the book is the result of impartial and careful investigation into the evils of alcohol in the old country. That gentleman points out that the worst form of alcoholism is the evil effects resulting from what he terms industrial drinking, and further, he proves in the course of his investigation—an investigation of the most careful character—that industrial legislation for the amelioration of the condition of the workers in England's industries, has had a most beneficial effect in minimising intemperance among the industrial classes. It is, then, because I regard the placing of direct responsibility on the people as the best means for removing these wrongs that I welcome it in its application to this question of licensing legislation. I welcome it, and I hope before many years are passed in Western Australia, with the assistance of opinions from outside, to welcome it in other forms in its application to other evils under which we labour. I believe if we do that we will be arousing in Western Australia a public feeling of sentiment, of social legislation, which, in a few years, will work wonderful effects. During the past few years we have had a surprising result from the fact that the genius, which had hitherto been flowing into the channels of art, science, literature, and invention, is being applied to the solution of social questions. We have medical men, scientists, and professional men who are giving great and increasing attention to the social injustices which mar the civilisation of the leading countries of the world to-day, and I believe there is no greater and no nobler work in life than that which is spent in trying to do something to promote the social conditions which are for the uplifting of humanity, and for the benefit of the great mass of the people.

Mr. KEENAN (Kalgoorlie): I have listened, as I feel sure every hon. member has listened, with a great deal of care to the eloquent remarks of the Leader of the Opposition, and I have tried to grasp what he has laid before us. He has cov-

ored very much beyond the scope of the Bill before the House, but, at the same time I might digest his arguments in a short space by saying with the hon. member that there is an evil in the liquor traffic which might be partly cured by nationalising that traffic, but that the real evil lies in the desire to make a profit, and so long as that continues, whether it be a desire by the State which is running a State hotel, or a private individual who is conducting a private hotel, so long will the evil continue. That is putting the case on very broad grounds, and even if we cannot accept that we can at least respect the opinion of the hon. member in entertaining it. It is, however, perhaps not quite pertinent to the consideration of the Bill before the House. I had not the advantage of being present when the Bill was introduced by the Attorney General, but I read his remarks in the public Press and I feel sure that the report was fairly accurate, and represented, to a considerable extent, the words he pronounced in this House.

Mr. Scaddan: They were not reported in the gallery.

Mr. KEENAN: I do not propose to ask the assistance of the hon. member for Ivanhoe in recollecting what the Attorney General said. I may turn at once to the consideration of the Bill. In my humble opinion, the Bill may be approached from two points of view. One is the point of view of those who do not see any evil that requires to be stamped out in the mere consumption of intoxicating liquor, but only in the abuse of the right to consume that liquor, and the other is that of those who do see an inherent evil in the mere consumption of liquor, and who honestly believe they are doing that which is right and proper, and will lead to the welfare of the community, if by legislative enactment they can bring about the complete extinction of that consumption. I can see no moral wrong in any man drinking intoxicating liquor if he preserves his self-control and if he stops before it has become an abuse, nor can I recognise any moral right on the part of any man, or number of men, to tell me, if I wish to exercise

under proper control and without any abuse, the right to drink, that I am not to exercise that right. I would have to be satisfied, before I acknowledged any such right, that the bounties of Providence, furnished to satisfy a natural and proper desire, were to be denied to us by the mere resolution of our fellow men.

Mr. Horan: Hear, hear.

Mr. KEENAN: I hope the levity displayed is only that form of levity which encourages one to proceed with one's argument. This is really a matter of great importance, and although it may be, and I am the last to object to it, we can introduce into a measure of this grave importance some light and jovial thoughts; still, I think we should turn to the consideration of the matter in a spirit of determination to do that which is consistent with the liberties of the individual, and do that which is right and proper with regard to the drink traffic. Let me say that we must recognise that human nature has many failings, and there are many in our midst who are not capable of protecting themselves against that, which, if they were so capable, would require no laws of this character. Therefore, it becomes necessary for us to step in as legislators, and attempt to extend that protection which their own weaknesses denies to them. In doing so what is it, in a country such as Western Australia, that should be the great governing principle of a measure of this kind? I submit that the essential feature of this measure should be its elasticity, that it should be capable of being adapted to the many different conditions existing in this great State, and we should not suppose that it is possible to frame a law, even with the assistance of all the wisdom of the two sides of the House, that would suit every part of the State and would fall in with all requirements. We should have to make provision in this Bill which, under proper local control, will allow these conditions to be so moulded that the requirements of all localities will be legitimately supplied. The Bill as presented to us, and properly presented too, is a

local option measure. As presented by the Attorney General the measure practically contemplates the governing of all liquor traffic, and of the right to sell intoxicating liquor, by popular control after the lapse of 10 years. It is true that for ten years the right of certain parties, those who had licenses before the passing of this Bill, are in some measure preserved. But after the expiration of that period all licenses will be under the control of the people of the State. And let me deal at this point with the legal right of renewal. The right of renewal as set out in the Bill is the same as that on our statute book in the Act of 1880; and there can be no question from the language of that section reproduced in the Bill that any person who has a license, and against whom no objection can be taken arising from a breach of the conditions of the Act, is entitled to renewal. The language is too precise to admit of any doubt; he shall be entitled to apply for, to demand, and to obtain. If any person could doubt that language it would only be because he was desirous of raising such a doubt. If you wished to give any man the right to obtain something, I know of no language which you could better adopt.

Mr. Bath: Subject to approval—

Member: What is the qualification?

Mr. KEENAN: Only this; he gets that right of renewal subject to the provisions of the Act; which means that if he has committed certain offences he can be deprived of his license. Amongst the suggested reasons why he should be deprived of his license is the circumstance that it is no longer required; and the Leader of the Opposition has already drawn attention to the fact that the Attorney General did not seem to be over-confident on that point and that he was inclined to think that the right of renewal could be denied on such grounds. But that is not so. The right to refuse because the license is not required is a right that only exists at the time of the application for such license; so, too, the right to refuse because the quiet of the place will be disturbed only exists at the time of the applica-

tion. Once the license has been granted it cannot be said that the quiet of the place was not properly and legally disturbed by the order of the bench; and similarly if it can be said that the license was not required, again the answer is that it was granted by a proper authority and it cannot be set aside for the purpose of depriving the party of his legal right.

Mr. George: But what if the conditions have changed?

Mr. KEENAN: Had the original application been received and granted under some statutory authority, giving the right of revision in the event of the conditions changing, then the right would be there. But that is not the case. I pass from this question of right of renewal, about which I say there is no legal doubt whatever, to the consideration of the composition and powers of the licensing court to be established under this Bill. Before doing so, I desire to say that I do not feel absolutely satisfied with the method of the appointment of that body. I should have preferred the body to be elected as to two-thirds, and nominated as to one-third. And, having a board so elected, I would have given them extended powers without requiring that any such powers should be submitted to a referendum of the people. I think it would be more satisfactory to get a good executive elected by the people, and then to allow that executive all those powers which it may be thought necessary to fully accomplish the intent of the Bill. But to always have a mere nominal authority sitting in nominal power and having to consult the people by referendum, which may or may not evoke sufficient interest to give a true answer, is not so conducive to real and true results as would be the alternative which I bring before the House. It will be within the knowledge of the House that as regards existing licenses, the duties of this licensing court for the next 10 years under the proposal of the Bill, will be almost nominal; unless the licensee has committed some offence which warrants them in determining his license their duties will be practically nominal. For there

is but little likelihood of any crop of new licenses; on the contrary I believe that for many years to come licenses will be granted at rare intervals. Therefore, this body, with its purely nominal duties, will become a body commanding but little respect, and few men of any standing will aspire to be members of such a body. The extended powers that I would give to a court elected as I suggest, would comprise the right to fix the hours for the consumption of liquor in the hotels in the district controlled by the court. Under the present measure and all our past law, there has been a statutory series of hours, from 6 o'clock in the morning until 11 o'clock, or half-past 11 o'clock at night, or 17½ hours in all. Now it so happens that these hours suit in the majority of places. It so happens that, taken in the capital city of the State, these hours are probably the best for the requirements of the public. But have we any reason to suppose it is so in every other part of the State, in parts of the State where industries require men to be employed not only during the ordinary hours of daylight, but during the night time? Is there any reason to suppose that these hours should fit their requirements? Because, after all, what we should do is this: we should only enable the liquor traffic to be carried on in order to meet the requirements of the public. And if, in different parts of the State, the local requirements demand that the hotels should remain open during the night, we are foolish and, more than foolish, we are tyrannical to require the local communities to assimilate their hours to the hours laid down in the Statute. Furthermore, I would favour—and I shall certainly take action to test the feeling of the House on this point—the giving to these licensing courts the right to allow houses to be open on Sundays during limited hours. Anyone with experience of the back country cannot deny for one moment that there is a necessity, in summer time at all events, for the sale of refreshments on Sunday.

Mr. Scaddan: Would you abolish the bona fide travellers clause?

Mr. KEENAN: No.

Mr. Scaddan: Then I will not support you.

Mr. KEENAN: The present state of affairs is simply disgraceful. One cannot possibly change human nature, and on the goldfields it is utterly impossible to imagine that on a hot day, especially if a considerable amount of dust be going about, that every man will observe a law foreign to the instinct of his nature. He has no possibility of resorting to a club, which is the happy condition of some of us, and he must do that which breaks the law; he must indulge either in misrepresentation by asserting that he is a bona fide traveller, or else, by crawling in by some back door become a quasi criminal merely in order to quench a natural thirst, and not with a view to indulging in any excess whatever. The member for Ivanhoe asked, would I abolish the bona fide traveller clause.

Mr. Scaddan: I said would you allow it to remain.

Mr. KEENAN: Then I misunderstood you, for I thought you said, would I abolish it. If we give accommodation on Sunday for those who, in the open air are enjoying themselves in a legitimate manner—if we do that, we can safely abolish these bona fide traveller clauses. It is a mere excuse for lying. I do not believe that those who avail themselves of the privileges created in the Bill for bona fide travellers—I do not believe that one in ten is genuine in his representation. Why then should we continue that which we know is a fruitful ground for teaching men to lie in order that they may have that which is not something criminal, but which is merely a natural enjoyment, within reasonable bounds, of the gifts of Providence! I propose to submit to the House a provision to be inserted in the Bill, allowing these district licensing courts to fix hours for the opening of hotels on Sundays, not exceeding five hours per day. I assume the court will consist of reasonable men with a knowledge of the wants of the locality; and they can fix hours which will give necessary accommodation, and will not allow public hotels to remain open

sufficiently long to interfere with divine service, or with the recreation of the people, or to allow men to have sufficient liquor to intoxicate them.

Mr. George: And allow them to buy bottles to take away?

Mr. KEENAN: The practice of to-day leads men to buy bottles to take away. It is the only way in which a man may observe the law and yet gratify his wishes. He can get as drunk as he likes in his camp, but not a glass shall he have in the hotel. There are other forms of licenses that I would like to see in the Bill. I think it is folly to shut our eyes to the fact that there are many places which enjoy general publicans' licenses, yet do not carry out the duties appertaining to a hotel. It would be better to recognise that, and to give a form of license for the sale of liquor for consumption on the premises, without insisting on the keeping of a number of bedrooms which are never opened, and of the worst form of dining-room, where everything served is indigestible. It would be better to open our eyes to this situation and to take steps to meet it. If they be necessary—and it seems that they are—let us have places which do not pretend to be hotels in any sense, but which shall merely have a bar and a bar trade, and no right to sell liquor for consumption off the premises. And in granting such licenses we could ask for a very much higher license fee than we ask from those who worthily accommodate travellers. To-day they are all put on the same plane; that is that genuine hotels which really suffer a considerable loss by affording to the general public the accommodation required by the public are called upon to pay exactly the same licensing fee to the State as hotels run purely for profit, run merely as saloon bars. There is another form of license that I would like to see included in the Bill, and that is a license for breweries and distilleries. We have to-day under our State law the two-gallon license, and under the Commonwealth Beer Excise Act every brewery licensed under that Act has to be the holder of one of those two-gallon li-

censes. What the intent was it is hard to discern. Although we have a license to that extent it is a mere nominal license. The profit in the liquor traffic is in the brewery. The brewer is a huge landlord, owning many hotels and having others tied, yet contributing to the State revenue the minimum amount from any profit the trade derives from carrying on this traffic. We should impose a license on those breweries, adding to that license a tidy sum for every hotel tied to the brewery, and for every hotel owned by the brewery; and by that means we would not only add considerably to our revenue but, if the compensation clauses be adopted and a compensation fund created for extinguishing licenses, the revenue from this source could well be diverted to that channel so as to augment it considerably and enable us to close hotels which would otherwise by the scheme proposed in the Bill remain long continuing in the land. It must be remembered that when in the British Parliament a proposal was made for a compensation fund for extinguishing licenses one of the main contributories to that fund was the breweries. The breweries were among those on whom the law placed a large burden of contribution for the purpose of realising the necessary contribution of moneys. These are two forms of new licenses I think may well be included in the Bill. Now I will say a few words on club licenses. There can be no doubt that there is an urgent necessity for dealing with the dangerous evil that has arisen from clubs. There is no place where a man is more readily seduced into losing his self-control and drinking excessively than in a club. In a public house there is always danger, at any moment when a man happens to pass the limit, of an offence being created by serving him with drink; but there is no offence in a club if a man is served with drink so long as he can stand up or even after he has passed that stage. If we have proper rules and regulations governing the conditions of clubs, there can be no objection to their continuance. I believe that by allowing an opportunity to different people in any society whatever to meet one another it must promote a

considerable amount of good, but one of the main abuses of club licenses is the "honorary member." It is common knowledge that in one of the principal clubs in Perth one can become an honorary member while one stands in the door. It is a matter of a moment and one is admitted to the club.

Member: What club is that?

Mr. KEENAN: It is a club in St. George's-terrace, but I regret mentioning the locality. It is unfair to single out a particular club for criticism, especially when it is only hearsay, but I have been told, and other members must have been told, of the occurrence, and it is impossible there cannot be some justification for saying it; but whether it be true or not, we should make provision in this Bill to prevent the possibility of its occurrence in the future. Therefore, when that part of the Bill comes under review I shall ask members to insert a provision which will entirely prevent this humbugging creation of honorary members who are really used to exploit the finances of the club to which they are admitted. There can be no difficulty in regard to genuine visitors. If a man is coming to Perth, for instance, if he is a genuine visitor and he is known to someone who is a member of a club, he can be posted for 24 hours—that is not an unreasonable period—and then he can go through the necessary form of subscribing his name in a book that can be produced to some proper authority enabling that authority to be satisfied as to the genuine character of the visitor. I do not attach much, if any, importance to the annual subscription. I cannot see why a man who is only in the position to contribute 5s. cannot be as genuine a member of a club as a member who pays £5. If we make conditions under which those who can properly and legally associate for the mutual enjoyment of each others' society with the right to have those comforts we have in our homes—because the true club is every member's home—it is immaterial altogether if he pays 5s. or any sum prescribed per annum, if indeed he is a genuine and honest member, and not a man merely going in to the club to use

it as a place for drinking. Now I wish to say a few words on the proposal made in the Bill for collecting license fees.

Mr. Scaddan: Would you not bring clubs under a local option vote?

Mr. KEENAN: No. My opinion is that a proper club is tantamount to a man's home, and I would no sooner propose to apply local option to a club than I would apply it, if it were possible to do so, to one's home. I was turning my attention to the proposals made in the Bill for the various fees paid for the various licenses and I regret that we have still retained the old and crude form of a fixed sum, dependent, it is true, to a certain extent on the rental, but still inflicting undue hardship on those conducting hotels and extending undue leniency to those conducting drinking bars. I think it would be far wiser and more remunerative to the State in the end to charge a percentage on the liquor consumed in a particular house.

Mr. Bolton: Would you fix a minimum?

Mr. KEENAN: A minimum consumption.

Mr. Bolton: No, I mean a minimum licensing fee.

Mr. KEENAN: I presume that is a matter of detail. One might have £2, £3, or £10; a reasonable amount might be fixed; but my object is to have a particular method of collecting the fee on the percentage of the liquor consumed, as it would be impossible to have a correct return of the profit made. The only means suggested to me of getting a return is on the invoiced prices of the liquor as purchased by the hotel.

Mr. Duglish: Why not a percentage on the rental value?

Mr. KEENAN: The reason why that is not satisfactory is that the rental value in a hotel proper includes not merely the bars, but also the bedrooms. I am desirous, and I think every member is desirous, of encouraging the true hotels in our midst, those places maintained for the accommodation of travellers, places where visitors to Perth can get accommodation, and good accommodation. I am informed, and I believe

it is true, that this part of the trade is absolutely a loss, that those who keep proper bedroom accommodation and give good dining-room accommodation make a loss in both respects.

Mr. Daglish: Then it cannot seriously affect the rental.

Mr. KEENAN: If we make any percentage on the rental we make a percentage on the benefits these people afford to the community, and they are real benefits, though a loss to the people who keep these places; and at the same time we give enormous advantage to those who merely maintain bars, and with which the hotel giving accommodation with proper provision for bedrooms and dining-rooms is not to be in any way classed. This latter class is worthy of every support we can give it, but we are not doing that if we call upon the occupant to pay a license fee which would be in proportion to the annual rental he pays for the building he occupies. I have pointed out it is possible to charge a percentage which will cover not merely the amount the State has the right to expect from the trade, but will leave a margin sufficient to establish a sinking fund for paying off the value of licenses that have been extinguished. Assuming that $3\frac{1}{2}$ or 4 per cent. on the amount of goods purchased by each hotel is necessary to return to the State the amount we receive to-day, and add to it what we think is a fair sum for sinking fund, the two together would constitute a charge which in one form could be collected as a license fee from the holders of these licenses. I pointed out that in my opinion the funds from which the licenses are to be extinguished can be derived from two sources, from the breweries as well as from the licensees. I see great difficulty in this part of the Bill. We live in a country where there are rapid fluctuations of population. A great town such as Kanowna once was has in a few years shrunk to proportions that are indeed insignificant.

Mr. Walker: No!

Mr. KEENAN: Then may I say, "with the appearance of being insignificant." We see on the other hand districts in the State with rapid increases of popu-

lation, and it may well happen that by some lucky turn of fortune the mining districts that have suffered such a relapse may regain prosperity. No one hopes for anything else who has the interests of the State at heart. Yundamindera, Menzies, Morgans, Laverton, and many other places I could mention are just like Kanowna. The mere fact of these rapid fluctuations must mean great difficulty in dealing with the question of compensation for licenses that have been extinguished because the quota has been exceeded. I see great difficulty in the administration of this part of the Bill. I do not see where, in the circumstances this State presents, they can get, as in Victoria or elsewhere, anything like a consistent quota.

The Premier: There is no quota in the Bill.

Mr. KEENAN: I was speaking of the observations I have read of the Attorney General's. I regret that I have addressed myself to the part in misunderstanding. But leaving apart the question of the quota, it is obvious that a licenses reduction board must approach the question in some way from that point of view. They will have to come to the conclusion that there are some hotels in excess that can be closed without any reasonable want being experienced of their services by the population. They receive instructions not for the particular number, but for a reduction, not for a particular house, for none would make such a proposal as that. Being instructed to make a reduction it is obvious they will have to approach the problem to some extent from a population basis. For that reason, although I do not wish to suggest that the House would be warranted in striking out these provisions, still I see such difficulty in the carrying out of them that I doubt whether they will achieve any good result. A few words as to local option. Local option is supposed to be something entirely new, but as a matter of fact local option, in regard to any application for a new license, has been on our statute book for years, in fact ever since the principal Act was passed. Under that if any person should

apply for a new license and a petition is presented from a majority of those in the neighbourhood against the license, the power of granting the license is absolutely taken from the bench.

Mr. Foulkes: A majority of the ratepayers.

Mr. KEENAN: Yes; that is so. The majority of ratepayers on the municipal or road board roll. Under this Bill we are merely extending the principle, first widening it by making it a majority on the electoral roll, and secondly providing that after the expiration of the term prescribed in the Bill we shall make the provision relate to existing licenses. I am of opinion that the polls which will be authorised to be taken for the purpose of determining whether there shall be a reduction or an abolition of licenses will be an absolute failure unless taken either on the same day that there is an election for the Assembly or on the day of election for municipal purposes, or even for the filling up of vacancies in some other local board. It is exceedingly difficult to evoke the interest of the public even in elections for this House. We all know that it is only by almost direct appeals that electors can be made to go to the poll to vote for Parliamentary elections, and we also know that the great majority of people look upon such elections as being much more important than any question of a local option poll. I see nothing but failure unless we can associate the taking of this poll with some other election. If it be objectionable to have the poll on the day of election for this Parliament let us associate it with an election for municipal purposes. The difficulty is not to procure the attendance of a few enthusiasts but to get those who are apathetic to record their votes. If we attempt to get them to vote on what to many will be an abstract question, the continuance or non-continuance of licenses, shall we get a full and proper expression of the popular will? I have nothing further to add in general remarks bearing upon the question, but there are many clauses which will admit of some amendment, and which can be referred to when the Bill reaches the Committee stage. I think that when these clauses are reached members will agree

so to amend them as to make them more workable. I only have to say this: every one will recognise that the Bill puts before us as its true intent the prevention of excessive drinking, the putting down of the evil. I sympathise heartily with that object, and I sympathise with those who have devoted their lives to preaching temperance, who have tried so hard to bring about legislation that will lead to the end they desire. To my mind, however, the true remedy for the evil lies in the education of our people. By teaching from day to day our young people to exercise habits of self-control we shall be doing more to achieve a sober and sedate nation than by any laws of a restrictive character. There is nothing in any law of restriction that has been successful in curing the failures of human nature. Education alone can achieve that result. Although measures of this character must be persevered in we must look for a true result in the promotion of a larger and wider school of education of our people, by teaching them self-control, and that the highest good can be achieved and the greatest pleasure can be enjoyed without abusing any of the privileges Providence has conferred on them.

On motion by Mr. Daglish, debate adjourned.

BILL—EMPLOYMENT BROKERS.

Received from the Legislative Council, and read a first time.

House adjourned at 9.39 p.m.