

have any letter, number, or record thereon to show or indicate how such voters may have voted.'"

The CHAIRMAN: The reason given by the Assembly for not agreeing to this amendment is that the procedure of approaching the Court should be made as simple as possible.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: I move—

That the amendment be not insisted on.

Question negatived; the Council's amendment insisted on.

No. 35. Clause 56.—Delete the words "from time to time" in first line of subsection (1) of proposed new section 100, and insert "once in each year." After "State" in line five of same subsection, insert "and such determination shall have force and effect during the ensuing twelve months. The basic wage so determined shall operate and have force and effect from the first day of July in each year, and shall from time to time be substituted for the wage fixed by every industrial agreement or award made before or after the commencement of this Act, notwithstanding that any such industrial agreement or award may prescribe a lesser or a greater wage."

The CHAIRMAN: The reason given by the Assembly for not agreeing to this amendment is that the time should be left to the discretion of the court and that it is highly probable a fixed period would operate unfairly.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: I move—

That the amendment be not insisted on.

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: I hope the Committee will insist on this amendment. We make the basic wage certain from year to year, whilst the clause as it stood left the position in a state of chaos and capable of being changed from time to time, when no one would know what the position was.

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

Ayes	4
Noes	14

Majority against .. 10

AYES.

Hon. J. M. Drew
Hon. E. H. Gray

Hon. J. W. Hickey
Hon. W. H. Kitson
(Teller.)

NOES.

Hon. A. Burvill
Hon. J. Cornell
Hon. J. Duffell
Hon. J. Ewing
Hon. J. A. Greig
Hon. V. Hamersley
Hon. E. H. Harris

Hon. A. Lovekin
Hon. G. W. Miles
Hon. J. Nicholson
Hon. G. Potter
Hon. H. A. Stephenson
Hon. H. Stewart
Hon. R. J. Yelland
(Teller.)

PAIRS.

AYES.	NOES.
Hon. J. R. Brown	Hon. C. F. Baxter
Hon. T. Moore	Hon. J. J. Holmes

Question thus negatived; the Council's amendment insisted on.

Progress reported.

ADJOURNMENT—CLOSE OF SESSION.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: I move—

That the House at its rising adjourn till 11 a.m. this day.

Question passed.

House adjourned at 3 a.m.

Legislative Assembly.

Monday, 22nd December, 1924.

	PAGE
Questions: Railways, coal supplies	2592
Young Australia League	2593
Kendrup Estate and C. J. de Gids	2593
Bills: Licensing Act Amendment, to introduce, &c	2593
Workers' Compensation Act Amendment,	
Council's Amendments	2597
Land Tax and Income Tax, Council's pressed requests	2603
Closer Settlement, discharged	2604
Licensing Act Amendment, &c., etc.	2608
Land Tax and Income Tax, request for conference	2635
Treasury Bonds Deficiency, returned	2635
Adjournment, Close of Session	2635

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

QUESTION—RAILWAYS, COAL SUPPLIES.

Mr. WILSON asked the Minister for Railways: 1, Have instructions been given that Newcastle coal must be used exclusively on the Northern Railway lines, and if so, by whom? 2, Are all locomotives operating there fully and efficiently equipped with the latest spark arresters? 3, Is Mr. Muir aware that the cutting down of local coal orders prejudicially affects the coal miners at Colliet?

The MINISTER FOR RAILWAYS replied: 1, As a temporary measure, during the heat of the summer and whilst standing crops are awaiting harvest, instructions have been issued by the Commissioner to use Newcastle coal only, on the western portion of the Northern system, i.e., within the agricultural areas. These instructions were issued on urgent representations being made as to the extreme danger of fire being caused by sparks from Collie coal. 2, All engines are equipped with efficient arresters, viz., eight with standard wire mesh, nine with standard wire mesh and deflector plates. 3, Yes; but it is also known that the use of Collie coal in the conditions mentioned would prejudicially affect the farming industry.

QUESTION—YOUNG AUSTRALIA LEAGUE.

Mr. HUGHES asked the Minister for Justice: 1, Is it a fact that the Young Australia League, an incorporated association, has not, as provided by its constitution and regulations, held an annual meeting of members or issued an annual report and balance sheet for a number of years past, or filed such documents with the Registrar? 2, If so, will the requirements of the law be enforced?

The MINISTER FOR JUSTICE replied: 1, There is no provision in the Associations Incorporation Act, 1895, requiring an institution to file annual reports or balance sheets. 2, If the association's officers neglect to comply with the rules the remedy rests with the members.

QUESTION—KENDENUP ESTATE AND C. J. DE GARIS.

Mr. HUGHES asked the Minister for Justice: 1, Is it a fact that C. J. de Garis has obtained from certain of his Western Australian creditors further sums of money by means of what is apparently a confidence trick, and that to induce the creditors to furnish the money "uttering" of cheques was resorted to? 2, If so, will he take immediate action to enforce the Criminal Code?

The MINISTER FOR JUSTICE replied: 1, The department has no knowledge of the financial transactions between Mr. de Garis and his creditors. 2, Any person who alleges that he has been defrauded can lay a complaint if he thinks fit.

Mr. Thomson: These questions seem to amount to a sort of vendetta.

Mr. Taylor: They seem?

Mr. Thomson: They are.

Mr. Hughes: Evidently there was none of your money in it.

BILL—LICENSING ACT AMENDMENT.

As to Leave to Introduce.

The MINISTER FOR JUSTICE (Hon. J. C. Willcock—Geraldton) [4.35]: I move—

For leave to introduce a Bill for an Act to amend Section 100 in part vi. of the Licensing Act, 1911.

Point of Order.

Mr. Taylor: I rise to a point of order. I do not think the Minister is in order in moving, without notice, for leave to introduce this Bill.

The Minister for Justice: I am moving for leave to introduce it.

Mr. Taylor: On Tuesday, the 16th December, according to the Votes and Proceedings, No. 58, the following motion was passed at the instance of the Premier:—

That during the present sitting the Standing Orders be suspended so far as to enable Bills to be introduced without notice and to be passed through their remaining stages on this day, and messages from the Legislative Council to be taken into consideration forthwith.

On the following day, according to the Votes and Proceedings, No. 59, the following motion was carried:—

That for the remainder of the session the Standing Orders be suspended so far as to enable Bills to pass through all their stages in one day, and messages from the Legislative Council to be taken into consideration on the day on which they are received.

The first motion gave power to introduce without leave on that day, and that motion ceased to function after that day. The second motion did not give leave to introduce without notice.

The Premier: Of course it did. It gave leave to pass Bills through all stages, and one of those stages is leave to introduce.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: No.

The Minister for Mines: That is absurd. Of course it is.

Mr. Taylor: No. Leave to introduce has nothing to do with that motion. Why make a point of it in the first motion but not in the second?

The Premier: Leave to introduce is one of the very necessary stages.

Mr. Taylor: Standing Order 257 says—

Every public Bill (unless sent from the Legislative Council) shall be initiated either by a motion for leave to bring in the Bill, specifying its intended title, or by a motion for a Committee of not less than two members to prepare and bring it in, or by an Order of the House.

The Minister for Lands: The Standing Orders are suspended.

Mr. Taylor: Not so far as they relate to leave to introduce.

Mr. Speaker: It has been the practice of the House regularly at the end of the session to suspend the Standing Orders to enable Bills to pass through all stages at the one sitting, etc. Notwithstanding this, I find from the Votes and Proceedings on the 13th December, 1923, page 281, that after suspension of the Standing Orders the Premier, without notice, moved—

That so much of the Standing Orders be suspended as is necessary to enable the Vermin Rate Bill to be introduced and passed through all its stages on this day.

Mr. Speaker having counted the House, and an absolute majority of the whole number of members being present, and there being no dissentient voice, declared the question to be passed. If that procedure is to be followed it will be necessary for the Minister to move that so much of the Standing Orders be suspended as is necessary to enable the Licensing Act Amendment Bill to be introduced and passed through all its stages.

The Minister for Lands: Was that done after the Standing Orders were suspended?

Mr. Speaker: Yes. The Standing Orders were suspended on the 29th November, 1923, but notwithstanding this, on the 13th December the motion I have read was passed. In order to meet the difficulty it will be necessary for the Minister to move, without notice, in the direction I have indicated.

The Premier: Do I understand you have ruled that the Minister is not in order in asking for leave to introduce this Bill?

Mr. Speaker: I am inclined to follow precedent, especially as the difficulty can be got over in the way I have outlined.

The Premier: I propose to dissent from your decision if you rule that way.

Mr. Speaker: It is in the hands of the House. I would also draw attention to Standing Order 257, which reads:—

Every public Bill (unless sent from the Legislative Council) shall be initiated either by a motion for leave to bring in the Bill, specifying its intended title, or by a motion for a committee of not less than two members to prepare and bring it in, or by an Order of the House.

If the House orders, then the Bill can be brought in.

Bill introduced.

The PREMIER: I move—

That the House order that leave be given to introduce the Bill.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: Does the Premier intend to put the Bill through all stages to-day? Can we not have notice given to-day so that we can deal with the Bill itself to-morrow?

The PREMIER: No.

Question put and passed.

Point of Order.

Mr. Taylor: On a point of order, the question is whether it is the pleasure of the House to order the introduction of the Bill.

Mr. Speaker: The Minister can move that the Bill be read a first time.

The Minister for Agriculture: The Standing Orders are suspended.

Mr. Taylor: Not in respect of the introduction of Bills. On a question such as this, which is one relating to the pleasure of the House, one voice is sufficient to stop the necessary leave.

Mr. Speaker: A motion of the House has been carried making the introduction of the Bill an Order of the Day.

Mr. E. B. Johnston: It requires 26 votes to pass such a motion.

Mr. Taylor: If you accept the position, Mr. Speaker, you do away with the safeguard regarding the necessity for 26 votes in favour of the suspension of the Standing Orders. If your ruling be correct this procedure can be adopted when there is a bare quorum present. The safeguard we have is that the Standing Orders cannot be suspended except by the will of a majority of the House. The House may order anything to be done, but if one voice is raised against it the proposed action cannot be undertaken.

The Minister for Agriculture: On the 17th December the Premier gave notice that for the remainder of the session the Standing Orders should be suspended—not one but all the Standing Orders—so that Bills might be passed through all stages in the one day.

Mr. Taylor: But leave to introduce is not one of the stages of a Bill.

The Minister for Agriculture: When that motion was passed the Standing Orders were suspended so that Bills might be passed through all their stages. Since all these Standing Orders are suspended, the House has the right to proceed with the business.

Mr. Speaker: I rule that the House has given permission for the introduction of the measure.

First Reading.

The MINISTER FOR JUSTICE: I move—

That the Bill be now read a first time.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: Some members who are absent did not know that we would be even meeting to-day; certainly they did not know that it was proposed to introduce the Bill here to-day.

The Premier: Members knew that the Bill would have to be dealt with in this

Chamber whether it was introduced here or came to us from the Council.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: No one knew until the last moment whether we would be meeting to-day or not. Two or three members are absent who would have been here.

The Premier: That is their responsibility.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: That is so, but at the same time it is most unusual for us to sit on Monday, and members did not know we would meet to-day.

The Minister for Lands: On a point of order, is the Leader of the Opposition in order in discussing the motion for the first reading of the Bill?

Mr. SPEAKER: He is in order, but it is not usual.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a first time.

Second Reading.

The MINISTER FOR JUSTICE (Hon. J. C. Willcock—Geraldton) [4.53] in moving the second reading said: Generally when a Bill is introduced there is some curiosity as to the provisions of the measure. Ordinarily the provisions of the Bill are not known prior to the second reading stage. It appears, however, that the provisions of this Bill are fairly well known.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: No one on this side of the House knows what the provisions are.

Mr. Thomson: This is the first I have seen of them.

The MINISTER FOR JUSTICE: I have heard the Bill talked about outside and I have had several letters from my electorate concerning the contents of the Bill.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: The Minister must have told his constituents about it.

The MINISTER FOR JUSTICE: No, I have been wondering where they got their information. The Bill seems to have been discussed fairly freely throughout the State.

The Premier: References to the Bill have been made in the newspapers for weeks past.

The MINISTER FOR JUSTICE: Yes. The contents of the Bill have been public property for the last three or four weeks. The Bill does not deal with many portions of the Licensing Act. It really deals with one section. Its object is to amend the provision for a three-fifths majority being necessary in connection with the vote on prohibition, and substitutes in lieu of the three-fifths, a simple majority. Under the present Act a poll is to be taken every five years. A poll will be taken in 1925, and the Act as it stands prescribes that the majority in connection with that poll shall be one of three-fifths. There is also a proviso setting out that the poll shall not be carried unless 30 per cent. or more of the electors throughout the State vote for the proposal. The Bill does away with that proviso altogether and inserts a provision

making it compulsory for every elector to vote. Penalties are provided in order to assure that the electors exercise the franchise. The Bill is introduced this session because, unless its provisions be agreed to, next year's poll will be taken under the provisions of the existing Act. Prior to the elections the members of the Labour Party stated on every platform that it was their policy to introduce a Bill providing for a simple majority in connection with the prohibition poll. They also agreed that on such an important question there should be compulsory voting. Being democratic, the Labour Party—

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: That is very funny. This is not democratic.

The MINISTER FOR JUSTICE: It is not?

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: No.

Mr. George: It is autocratic.

The MINISTER FOR JUSTICE: It is democratic to provide for a simple majority determining the issue.

Mr. J. H. Smith: The Bill does not provide for that.

Mr. Davy: A simple majority will not determine the question.

The MINISTER FOR JUSTICE: The Bill provides that the whole of the people will have an opportunity of deciding the issue so far as is humanly possible to make such a provision. Anyone who does not exercise the franchise will run the risk of suffering a penalty up to £10.

The Minister for Agriculture: We are not dealing with the matter on the Legislative Council franchise.

The MINISTER FOR JUSTICE: No, we are endeavouring to get the majority of the people throughout the State to decide this great question. We provide that the people as a whole shall accept the responsibilities of their citizenship by deciding a question that will have such far-reaching effects. For that reason we provide for compulsory voting in connection with this poll. In other parts of Australia the compulsory voting provisions have secured as high a result as 98 per cent. That was obtained in Queensland. We consider it democratic to introduce this provision in the Bill to enable the whole of the people to have their voice heard on this most important question. The Bill is before members and gives effect to the pledges we gave the people on the occasion of the general elections. The Government disagree with the present provisions, which prevent a majority of the people obtaining what they desire. On other matters sometimes the wishes of the majority are thwarted, but that is not the fault of the Government. It can safely be said that the provisions of other measures introduced here during this session have had the sanction of popular will, and would have been passed into law had the people been able to give a verdict upon them. Nobody can accuse this party of having, at the elections, dodged the issue in respect of leg-

isolation we have endeavoured to pass during this session.

Mr. George: You could not explain your measures on the hustings.

The MINISTER FOR JUSTICE: No, but the general principle underlying measures we have introduced this session have been well-known by the people. We put up 40 candidates at the elections, and almost every one of them dealt fully with the Bills it was proposed we should bring in.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: You did not know yourselves what would be in them until you came to draft them.

The MINISTER FOR JUSTICE: Yes, the provisions of those Bills have been sought by the Labour Party for the last ten years. Generally the effect of our legislation has met with the approval of the electors. The introduction of this Bill does not necessarily imply that the Government or their supporters are in favour of prohibition. Everybody knows that considerable divergence of opinion in regard to prohibition exists amongst members of the Labour Party; but we are at one in our support of the principle of majority rule, and that is the issue in the Bill. Prohibition is not a political question. No political party has pronounced either in favour of or against it. Prohibition is a social question, and we consider that the people should have the decision in respect of it. On this question there can be no argument against people having equality at the ballot box.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: Surely you must know whether or not you are in favour of prohibition.

The MINISTER FOR JUSTICE: Yes, I do, but I also know that every piece of legislation brought into the House by this Government has had the backing of a majority of the people and that I, as a unit of the community, am prepared to accept the verdict of the people.

Mr. George: Under this Bill a majority of one could say whether or not we are to have prohibition.

The MINISTER FOR JUSTICE: That is right. The 1921 poll furnished an example of the injustice of the provisions in the existing Act. Of a poll of 80,550, no less than 45 per cent. of those enrolled would have been required to carry prohibition. In other words, 53,700 would have had to vote for it. And with the principle of 30 per cent. also, in the proviso, those in favour would have had to be 4,370 in excess of a three-fifths majority.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: How do you make that out?

The MINISTER FOR JUSTICE: In order to get 30 per cent. of the people in favour of prohibition at the last poll 4,370 more than a three-fifths majority would have been required to carry the question. We provide compulsory voting to ensure that all the people shall vote on the question. We recognise that the existing law is un-

democratic, inequitable and even unjust. A law that has the effect of restricting personal liberty should have the substantial backing of the people. So we consider it advisable to safeguard the principle of majority rule by compulsory voting, in order that a large majority of the people shall exercise their votes before so important a change is made in the social life of the community. Of course, vested interests will say they have acquired their claims in a legal manner. But the position has been well known since 1911; it has been known that the people would have an opportunity to take away rights and privileges granted by the licensing bench. Also it has been known that a strong section of the community have persistently demanded the right to exercise their vote and give a decision in this matter. So investors who have put considerable capital into the business have understood ever since 1911 that there is always a possibility of the people wiping out the traffic altogether.

Mr. E. B. Johnston: But it has been understood that that could be done only by a three-fifths majority.

The MINISTER FOR JUSTICE: And it has been understood that a strong section of the community was demanding that the question should be decided by a simple majority, and that at any time Parliament might alter the provisions of the Act to provide for the question being so decided. The Labour Party has been strong in opposition to the suggestion of plural voting or to giving any set of individuals greater power at the ballot box than other sections have. We are against plural voting at Legislative Council, municipal council and road board elections, and against the restrictive franchise for the Legislative Council. Even on the question of conscription, which was likely to have a tremendous influence on the people of Australia, affecting their personal liberty and even their lives—

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: It would have sent them to fight—where the young fellows ought to have been.

The MINISTER FOR JUSTICE: — even on that important question the Government of the day decided that it should not be determined without an expression of opinion from a majority of the people. It was considered democratic and equitable at that critical stage of our history, and the Government and the people acquiesced in leaving the question to a simple majority. If so stupendous an issue could be determined by a simple majority, surely this prohibition question should be decided in the same way! Under the liquor traffic many industries have been established, much employment created and maintained, and considerable capital invested. Vineyards have been planted and other activities entered upon in good faith and with the full knowledge that, possibly, there would be reached

in this matter a decision that would have the effect of ruining people who had invested money in the trade. We consider that such a question should not be lightly entered upon or decided on a catch vote, and so we say that a simple majority shall be based on compulsory voting so that everybody shall express his opinion. As against all that we have a considerable body of people who say the drink traffic is responsible for much evil in the community, and that if it were abolished the social and general welfare of the people would be greatly improved.

Mr. George: Surely you are aware there is more temperance to-day than there has been for many years, not only in this State, but all over the world.

The MINISTER FOR JUSTICE: I suppose we can say that, but I am not discussing the question of temperance, or whether I favour prohibition or not. The Government and the adherents of the Labour Party do not say that because this Bill is brought down, they are for or against prohibition. They say that they, as a democratic party, are prepared to abide by the result of a poll. The issue is one to be faced by the whole of the community and is such that the whole of the community should accept their responsibility in this great and far-reaching matter, so that the verdict obtained shall have the respect and compliance of the whole of the people. I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: I move—

That the debate be adjourned.

The Minister for Justice: Till a later stage of the sitting?

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: Until the trains have had time to get in from the country districts; not before. After eight o'clock this evening, I shall be perfectly willing to go on.

Motion (adjournment) put and passed.

Continued on Page 2603.

BILL—WORKERS' COMPENSATION ACT AMENDMENT.

Council's Amendments.

Consideration resumed from the 19th December of the schedule of 33 amendments made by the Council.

In Committee.

Mr. Lutey in the Chair: the Minister for Works in charge of the Bill.

No. 17. Clause 14, Subclause (1).—After "paragraph (2)," in line one, delete all the words down to "and" inclusive, in line seven, and insert in lieu thereof "in the sixth line of the sub-paragraph." In

line eight delete "seven" and insert "six," and in the same line delete the words "and fifty":

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: This amendment deals with two principles. First of all it strikes out the reference to the widow and children under the age of 16 being classed as dependants, and secondly it reduces the amount of money payable for death from £750 to £600. The first portion must be disagreed to consequentially on a previous decision. The second portion has been discussed at great length and there is no need to further debate the matter. I move—

That the amendment be not agreed to.

Question passed; the Council's amendment not agreed to.

No. 18. Clause 14.—Delete Subclause 2:

On motion by the Minister for Works, the foregoing amendment was not agreed to.

No. 19. Clause 14.—Insert at the beginning of Subclause (6) "by the insertion after the word 'payable,' in line two of paragraph (d) of the proviso, the words 'to those persons or institutions by whom the services hereinafter mentioned were rendered,' and":

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: This amendment seeks to set up an entirely new principle. It provides that the money to be paid for first aid, medical expenses, funeral allowance, hospital, ambulance, etc., shall be paid direct to the persons or institutions by whom the services are rendered, instead of to the injured worker.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: That does not matter, does it?

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: It may matter a lot.

Mr. George: Should not they be paid?

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: Yes, but this is not the way to do it.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: Why not?

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: A man who meets with an injury is entitled to settle his own accounts. These are expenses that the worker must incur, and even if he failed to get compensation he would be liable. These institutions and people have their legal remedy, and I do not see why security should be given them under the Workers' Compensation Act, or why someone else should collect their money for them.

Mr. George: Surely if a medical officer does the work, he should be paid!

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: I am not contending that any claims should not be paid, but a doctor has no more right to look for his money direct when a man meets with an accident, than when he falls sick. I do not know of any law setting up such a principle. I move—

That the amendment be not agreed to.

Mr. GEORGE: An employer has to pay this money and the injured man may or may not pay those who have rendered the services.

Mr. Panton: That does not affect the employer.

Mr. GEORGE: No.

Mr. Hughes: It is a sort of general garnishee, is it not?

Mr. GEORGE: Those who have done the work should be guaranteed the money.

Mr. Panton: What right have we to anticipate that men will not pay?

Mr. GEORGE: We have no right to anticipate it, but we know what human nature is. While I have no doubt the great majority of people would be only too willing to pay straight away, there are some who would see the doctors, nurses, and hospitals in Jericho before they would pay. Such people are to be found in all walks of life. This amendment casts no insult on the person injured, but guarantees that those who do the work will get their money, and therefore we should agree to it.

Mr. DAVY: This is a reasonable proposition not entirely without precedent. Under the Master and Servant Act a worker may serve a notice on the principal telling him to hold money due by the principal to the contractor, who is the employer of the worker, whereon the principal is bound to hold the money. That is a kind of protection analogous to what is proposed by the amendment. No one desires that an injured worker should make money out of the provision for medical expenses. He is merely to be indemnified against any expense to which he is put. I understand that frequently when a man is treated in one of our semi-Government hospitals, the amount charged is not rigidly fixed, but depends largely upon the capacity of the man to pay.

Mr. Panton: If he can pay, he is made to pay.

Mr. Taylor: But he is not unduly harassed.

Mr. DAVY: We all hope he is not. At the same time, the arrangement is elastic. I understand, however, that many of the workers coming under this measure would be in some benefit scheme whereby they get free, or partly free, services from the doctor. It would be well to simplify matters by letting the employer settle direct for medical expenses.

Mr. Panton: There would be nothing to pay if the medical services were free.

Mr. DAVY: But there is a possibility of some sort of a joke being put up. I do not say it is common for jokes to be put up, but it has happened; and if we can make provision to prevent it, we should do so.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: What does frequently happen is that the injured person's compensation is insufficient to pay his doctor's bill. I regard this provision

as one of the most beneficial in the Bill for the worker. In the case of slight accidents the medical expenses might easily exceed the amount of compensation, and it is very hard luck for the injured man, who has lost half his wages, to have a doctor's bill hanging round his neck. The Minister should accept this amendment. All it does is to put on the employer the responsibility for paying the doctor. I fail to see any objection whatever to the amendment; it merely saves the worker trouble. I certainly do not wish to suggest that the worker would not pay. I hope the Minister will not risk the loss of the Bill by opposing this amendment.

Mr. PANTON: I consider Parliament has no right to anticipate that an injured worker will not pay for medical attendance. By this amendment someone in another place has said, "We will not trust the injured worker with the £100 for medical expenses, but will make the insurance company or the employer pay those expenses." As a member of a hospital board I can assure the Committee that the boards know all about every patient's financial circumstances, and they will see that they get their money. Thousands of workers are in friendly societies, and thus entitled to free medical attendance. In that case the insurance company or the employer would not have to pay anything. The amendment distinctly suggests that the worker is not to be trusted with the amount allowed for medical expenses.

Mr. George: Some men don't pay their union fees.

Mr. PANTON: I know of a lot of other people who do not pay other things, and they are not workers; but we do not pass an Act of Parliament saying that such people must have money withheld from them; on that account. The ordinary machinery of the law can be put into operation against the worker, if necessary. The present amendment is in the nature of what was legislated against many years ago in the Truck Act.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: This amendment says to the worker, "We will see that you get your worker's compensation, and in addition we will insist on the employer's paying your doctor's bill."

Mr. Panton: Why not go a step further and provide that the employer shall decide which doctor the worker is to have?

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: This amendment comes from another place. It was not suggested here. I know jolly well men will be glad to know that up to £100 they will not be responsible for medical expenses. I do not understand why the slightest objection should be taken to the payment of these charges direct by the insurance company to the hospital authorities.

Mr. Panton: The insertion of this amendment will place a stigma on the worker, practically saying he is not to be trusted.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: I do not see that at all. Let us put this amendment into the Bill because it will save the worker trouble. What benefit can it be to the worker to be handed this money in order that he may pass it on? He will not get any of it. The arrangement will be similar to that under which the insurance company pays the injured worker direct, instead of the employer paying him.

Mr. Panton: That is only a matter of convenience between the employer and the insurance company.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: If it could be pretended that any part of this money would go to the worker, it would be another matter. But the money does not go to the worker at all; it goes to pay his account.

Mr. Heron: It would go to the worker if he were already provided for with regard to medical expenses.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: No. It may be that in such circumstances the money would go to the friendly society. I do not know. But Parliament has to see that the medical expenses are paid for the worker, and that he will have no responsibility for them. We want this clause in the Bill if we do not get another clause.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: I object to the principle underlying the proposal contained in the amendment. No one wants to support a man who incurs a debt and then refuses to pay it, but if we say that this money must be paid direct, where is it going to stop? How about extending the principle to wages earned? Why should we not say "We will pay for you your house rent, your butcher, your baker."

Members: Oh, no.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: Yes; it is just the same, and the principle is vicious.

Mr. Panton: Ninety-five per cent. of the patients would give an order on the insurance company.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: It is the vicious principle that the proposal seeks to embody in our industrial laws to which I take exception.

Mr. MARSHALL: One can detect something subtle in the amendment. There is a desire on the part of certain insurance companies to force injured people to undergo treatment by the insurance companies' doctors and not by the doctors of the injured people's own choosing. It is an old saying that he who pays the piper calls the tune.

Mr. George: Not now.

Mr. MARSHALL: I have a case in mind where an injured worker from a lead mine came to Perth for treatment. The insurance company affected declared after a time that in their opinion this man was all right

and that he should return to work. He went to his own doctor and obtained a certificate to the effect that he was not fit for work. The insurance manager said "You must go to our doctor." The individual agreed and the manager said to him, "But you cannot go until I accompany you." The man, however, went to the insurance company's doctor without the manager, and asked the doctor whether the presence of the manager would have made any difference. The doctor replied "Not in the least." What I want to know is whether one practitioner is not as good as another. I see no objection to paying direct so long as those who are legitimately entitled to the payment get it.

Mr. George: In 90 per cent. of the cases payment will be made.

Mr. MARSHALL: The hon. member walks in a circle that is different from mine. My experience is that insurance companies' doctors compel injured people to go back to work a little quicker than do the others. Why is the amendment sought by another place? Surely members there would not send it to us unless there was something behind it? I believe that the desire is to force injured people to seek the advice of medical men employed by the companies, so that the men may be obliged to return to work quickly. Of course the member for Murray-Wellington knows better, because if we reckon up the years of his experience in many directions, we will find that he has lived 150 years. Perhaps he can tell us why members of another place are so keen on having this amendment.

Mr. GEORGE: It is quite certain that some members would like to make out that I am as old as Methuselah. What I have in mind is an accident that may occur where there are no doctors, or where there may be only one some distance away. My experience is that 90 per cent. of the people who are injured are desirous of paying their debts, but of course there are always some who will not pay. The Minister for Railways must know of claims that are made against the Railway Department, and which have to be thoroughly investigated. There are also instances where people malingere. I remember one case where an individual had to be assisted up the stairs to the office of the Commissioner of Railways, and it was agreed that he should be paid £75 as compensation for an injury to his leg. Soon after he left the building the Chief Traffic Manager and I saw him twirling his stick in the air as happy as possible and striding along as though nothing had ever happened. There was another case, too, in which compensation was involved, and in respect of which the doctor afterwards came to me and apologised, because he discovered too late that the man was a malingerer. I am convinced that if the guarantee remains in the Bill it will be better for the working man.

Mr. THOMSON: The clause should be amended, as the provision in the Act is absurd. I regret that the Minister should have seen ulterior motives in this.

The Minister for Works: I suggested nothing of the sort.

Mr. THOMSON: If an employer has to guarantee medical expenses, such as when an accident occurs to a worker some distance from a town, the employer should be protected in the matter of his guarantee. I hope the Minister will give way on this point, for the amendment made by the Council will simplify matters for all concerned.

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

Ayes	21
Noes	15

Majority for .. 6

AYES.

Mr. Angwin	Mr. Marshall
Mr. Chesson	Mr. McCallum
Mr. Clydesdale	Mr. Millington
Mr. Corboy	Mr. Munro
Mr. Coverley	Mr. Pantou
Mr. Cunningham	Mr. Sleeman
Mr. Heron	Mr. Troy
Mr. Holman	Mr. A. Wansbrough
Mr. W. D. Johnson	Mr. Willcock
Mr. Kennedy	Mr. Wilson
Mr. Lamond	(Teller.)

NOES.

Mr. Barnard	Sir James Mitchell
Mr. Brown	Mr. North
Mr. Davy	Mr. Sampson
Mr. George	Mr. J. H. Smith
Mr. E. B. Johnston	Mr. Teesdale
Mr. Lindsay	Mr. Thomson
Mr. Maley	Mr. Richardson
Mr. Mann	(Teller.)

Question thus passed; the Council's amendment not agreed to.

No. 20. Clause 14, Subclause (7).—Insert at the end of paragraph (b) the following: "but such board or board and lodging shall not be assessed at a sum exceeding thirty shillings per week":

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: This deals with workers who receive board and lodging as part of their wages. I move—

That the amendment be agreed to.

Question passed; the Council's amendment agreed to.

No. 21. Clause 15.—Delete.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: This clause sets out a simple calculation for ascertaining the weekly earning for workers. It sought to establish the well-recognised system that now applies to waterside labour and other casual employment, and has been adopted by insurance companies. However,

this is not worth arguing about, and I move—

That the amendment be agreed to.

Question passed; the Council's amendment agreed to.

No. 22. Clause 16.—After the word "by" in the first line, insert "deleting the word 'both' in line eight of paragraph (a) and substituting therefor the word 'either' and by":

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: This deals with appeals to the medical referee. The Act says that both parties may appear before him, but the amendment says that either party may appear. I move—

That the amendment be agreed to.

Question passed; the Council's amendment agreed to.

Sitting suspended from 6.15 to 7.30 p.m.

No. 23. Clause 16.—Delete the words "the Court of Arbitration" in lines three and four, and insert in lieu thereof "a medical board consisting of three members":

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: This amendment deals with the principle of an appeal in connection with compensation allowed. That appeal has been to the Arbitration Court and that is what the Government desire. The amendment proposes that the appeal shall be to a medical board consisting of three members. I move—

That the amendment be not agreed to.

Question passed; the Council's amendment not agreed to.

No. 24. Clause 17.—Delete:

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: The clause relates to one method suggested for arriving at a lump sum payment for compensation. It sets out that the basis shall be sufficient to permit of the immediate purchase of a life annuity according to the weekly payments authorised. Under the existing system many contradictory decisions have been arrived at and the clause would make for uniformity.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: It will not make any difference to the amount paid to the individual, but will merely indicate how it may be invested for him.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: The clause will act as a guide to assist parties to arrive at settlement. I move—

That the amendment be not agreed to.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: I do not see that the position will be more beneficial to the worker if the clause be retained in the Bill, because the amount to be invested would not be greater than the worker would be entitled to in cash. I am afraid the clause will cloud rather than clear the issue.

The Minister for Works: It will provide the basis for a settlement. We have a number of very erratic settlements now.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: I do not know about that. I can see, however, that the clause may induce the employer to agree to an amount to be invested in an annuity in preference to providing the lump sum payment.

Question passed; the Council's amendment not agreed to.

No. 25. Clause 18.—Delete Subclauses 2 and 3:

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: The subclauses permit a secretary or an officer of a trades union to object to the registration of a memorandum of settlement for a lump sum. In desiring the deletion of these provisions, the Council argue that there should be no outside interference. I have already pointed out that settlements are quoted as precedents, so that a union secretary becomes vitally interested in the settlements. As a matter of fact, this "interference" is permitted now and union secretaries have been heard, apart altogether from the parties concerned.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: But nothing could happen if they objected now.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: Magistrates have frequently declined to register agreements for settlements after the union secretary has pointed out how unfairly they would operate. In such instances the agreements have been referred to court for argument. I have dealt with a case this week and it will lend point to my argument. A mother whose son had sustained an accident, was approached by an insurance company with an offer of £30 in full settlement. I have completed that case and I got £373 for the mother.

Mr. Taylor: The chances are she would have accepted the £30!

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: She was at her wits' end to know how to settle her doctors' bills and other debts. Her husband was out of work and the £30 meant a lot to her. She was referred to me and I advised her not to touch the proposal. Within the last few days I was able to secure that settlement.

Mr. Taylor: There have been some scandalous cases to my knowledge.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: In that particular instance, if the outsider had not been allowed to have something to do with it and the settlement had been between the company and the mother, look what the result would have been! It is not reasonable to expect every individual to know the law and to hold his own in argument, particularly in connection with such an intricate law as that relating to workers' compensation. I have already instanced the case of the migrant who was employed in a workshop. The grindstone exploded and split his right arm. He gave me a written authority to act for him. I considered he was

entitled to £200. Immediately the insurance company found that I was acting for him, they got this poor, unsophisticated immigrant aside, talked to him, frightened him, until he cancelled my warrant to act for him, and then they settled with him for £20. He finished with a permanently stiff wrist. I move—

That the amendment be not agreed to.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: I am surprised and sorry to hear the cases quoted by the Minister.

Mr. A. Wansborough: Then you wonder why we are dissatisfied!

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: You are not any more dissatisfied with it than am I. I have not come across any such cases. If the employer pays the necessary cover, the injured man should get the amount to which his injury entitles him.

Mr. Taylor: The insurance companies fight every inch of the way.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: I can understand that members of a trade union when in trouble, should go to their secretary for advice, but I do not know that it is good law to allow the secretary to actually intervene in these cases. My objection is to giving the union official authority to act for an injured man without first being requested to act. I do not see how a mutually agreed upon settlement can have any influence on future claims before the court. I am sure there must be a better and more effective way of dealing with these cases, if only the Minister would give the matter his thought.

Question passed; the Council's amendment not agreed to.

No. 26. Clause 20, Second Schedule.—Opposite "Complete deafness of one ear" delete the figures "£300" and insert in lieu "£200":

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: I move—

That the amendment be agreed to.

It is the only amendment the Council have made in this schedule and I will accept it.

Question passed; the Council's amendment agreed to.

No. 27. Clause 21, Third Schedule.—Delete "Septic poisoning" and "any industrial process" in the opposite column:

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: I move:

That the Council's amendment be not agreed to.

Septic poisoning was inserted in accordance with the findings of the medical conference held in Melbourne to deal with industrial hygiene. It was attended by the chief health officers from each of the States and by the Commonwealth medical officials. All present at that conference had studied this question. The amendments made by the Council in this schedule practically

bring it back to what I had it in my first draft. I amended that draft to be in keeping with the conference of medical experts. The Council's amendments to the schedule have been made largely on the advice of a medical man in the Council. But it is a question of his opinion against those of the 11 experts who were at the conference. We are the first Parliament called upon to deal with this list of diseases since the conference met, and we ought to stick to the findings of the conference.

Mr. Heron: Septic poisoning is very prevalent in the mines.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: But there it is classed as an accident, and compensation is payable.

Question passed; the Council's amendment not agreed to.

No. 28. Clause 21.—Opposite "Zymotic diseases" delete "any industrial process," and insert in lieu thereof of the words "medical officer, nurse, orderly, or other person employed in a hospital or quarantine station or in an ambulance brigade":

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: The same thing applies to this amendment. I move—

That the amendment be not agreed to.

Question passed; the Council's amendment not agreed to.

Clause 29. Clause 21.—Delete "Dermatitis" and insert in lieu thereof: "Eczematous ulceration of the skin produced by dust or caustic or corrosive liquid, or ulceration of the mucous membrane of the nose or mouth produced by dust":

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: Here, too, the same thing applies. I move—

That the amendment be not agreed to.

Question passed; the Council's amendment not agreed to.

No. 30. Clause 21.—Delete "cancer" and insert in lieu thereof: "Epitheliomatous cancer or ulceration of skin or of the corneal surface of the eye due to mineral oils, pitch, tar, or tarry compounds," and insert in the opposite column "handling of mineral oils, pitch, tar, or tarry compounds":

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: This deals with cancer. Dr. Atkinson advises that there are definite industries to which cancer is traceable, particularly industries in which tar is used. The provision in the schedule was laid down by the conference. I move—

That the amendment be not agreed to.

Mr. SAMPSON: The schedule provides for "cancer," which, of course, includes every variety of cancer; and the description of process included as giving rise to cancer

is "any industrial process." The term is altogether too wide. On the second reading I quoted an authority stating that the cause of cancer could not be defined. The Council's amendment limits the cause of disease to industries in which tar and similar compounds are used. We ought to accept the amendment.

Question passed; the Council's amendment not agreed to.

No. 31. Clause 21.—Insert after "epitheliomatous cancer, etc.," the words "scrotoal epithelioma (chimney sweep's cancer)," and in the opposite column insert "chimney-sweeping,"

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: I am going to stand by the conference at which we were represented, and according to which the Eastern States will be framing their legislation. We do not want to be 12 months behind them. The Commonwealth Government sent their medical man around the world, and the conference was called to meet him and discuss the position in other countries. The decisions were reached after careful consideration, and it is necessary that we should adopt them to make our law up-to-date.

Mr. SAMPSON: It is a sweeping statement to say that any industrial process will bring about the varying types of cancer. Thousand of people die from cancer who have never been engaged in any industrial process. Cancer is one of the great scourges of the race, and we should not define it in such general terms.

Mr. GEORGE: I agree with the member for Swan. I have seen a great many cases of cancer, both in Australia and in the Old Country, and from my observations I have concluded that cancer is generally prevalent where there is cold, clayey damp soil. To prescribe any industrial process is too wide.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: The member for Murray-Wellington overlooks the ground work necessary to establish a claim.

Mr. Thomson: What is the meaning of "any industrial process"?

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: Any industry. The first step is that the worker must secure a certificate from the medical man stating that in his opinion the disease has arisen from the worker's calling.

Mr. Davy: He has to prove it in court.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: It does not follow that every man contracting cancer will come under this provision. Unless he can get a certificate, the basis of his claim will be gone. If he gets a certificate, the company have a right to call in their medical man, and if there is a difference of opinion, the case goes to a medical referee and to the Court of Arbitration. Medical men are pretty conservative, and unless they can substantiate their opinions in court, they will not give certificates. I am afraid there

will not be so many certificates given as will be warranted.

Question passed; the Council's amendment not agreed to.

No. 32. Clause 23.—Insert at the end "and the short title shall be 'The Workers' Compensation Act, 1912-1924.'"

On motion by the Minister for Works, the foregoing amendment was agreed to.

No. 33. Insert a new clause to stand as Clause 10, as follows:—"Section 13 of the principal Act is amended by inserting after the word 'referees,' in line two, the words 'or members of a medical board.'"

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: This deals with the question of medical referees. I move—

That the amendment be not agreed to.

Question passed; the Council's amendment not agreed to.

Resolutions reported and the report adopted. The Minister for Works, Hon. W. D. Johnson and Mr. North drew up reasons for disagreeing to certain amendments, and for agreeing to one amendment with a modification.

Reasons adopted, and a message accordingly returned to the Council.

BILL—LAND TAX AND INCOME TAX.

Council's Pressed Requests.

Message from the Council pressing its requested amendments now considered.

In Committee.

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

The PREMIER: It is within the knowledge of members that the Council is pressing its requests for amendments in this Bill. I move—

That the pressed requests be not made.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: Does the Premier still object to the deletion of Clause 8? I think that clause is against the Standing Orders.

The Premier: It is the same as last year's clause.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: But it was wrong last year.

The Premier: There is no harm in its being wrong two years running.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: I hope the Premier will agree to the amendments requested by the Council, particularly as regards Clause 8. That provision should not have been in last year's measure. It can be included in the assessment Bill, which is now before Parliament. Last year we were not dealing with an assessment Bill, and for that

reason included Clause 8 in the Land Tax and Income Tax Bill.

The PREMIER: I understand the clause is exactly similar to the corresponding clause in last year's measure; and I think it is quite in order, even constitutionally, for it does deal with the imposition of a tax. My reason for desiring to retain the clause in this Bill is that the assessment Bill now in another place may be lost.

Mr. Taylor: Is that the only reason you have?

The PREMIER: Yes. If I were assured that the assessment Bill would pass, I should have no objection to the deletion of Clause 8 from this Bill; but I am not very optimistic regarding the fate of the assessment Bill, and, therefore, think it necessary, in order to give effect to the will of the House, that Clause 8 should be retained in this Bill. The clause, of course, deals with exemptions and deductions.

Mr. Davy: If the assessment Bill goes through, the deduction for each child will be £72 instead of £62?

The PREMIER: I do not think so. I am advised that it will not affect the position with regard to the exemption. I do not suppose there will be any departure from the attitude adopted by the Taxation Department last year.

Mr. THOMSON: I am not much worried about Clause 8, but I had hoped that the Premier would see his way to agree to some modification of the land tax, and possibly of the other tax as well. Those matters concern the people whom I represent more particularly. However, as mentioned by the Leader of the Opposition, the Premier has a majority behind him; and while we have protested, our protests have been characterised by much futility. It is no use protesting further. I trust the Premier will not display a spirit of uncompromising hostility, but will exhibit a certain amount of give and take.

Question passed; the Council's pressed requests not made.

Resolution reported, and the report adopted.

The PREMIER: I move—

That the following message be transmitted to the Legislative Council:—"With reference to message No. 39 from the Legislative Council, the Legislative Assembly acquaints the Legislative Council that it has again considered the request of the Legislative Council for amendments in the Land Tax and Income Tax Bill, and has decided again to decline to make them. The Legislative Assembly, therefore, again requests the concurrence of the Legislative Council in a Bill for an Act to impose a land tax and an income tax."

Question put and passed.

BILL—CLOSER SETTLEMENT.

Council's Message—Bill Discharged.

Message from the Council notifying that it insisted on its amendments Nos. 1, 2, 3, and 5 and had agreed to the Assembly's amendment to amendment No. 20, now considered.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS (Hon. W. C. Angwin—North-East Fremantle) [8.30]: I move—

That the Order of the Day be discharged from the Notice Paper.

In submitting this motion I desire to state that three attempts have now been made to pass the Closer Settlement Bill through Parliament. On the first occasion after the Bill left this Chamber, a select committee was appointed by another place and a report was presented. In the following year the then Premier, now the Leader of the Opposition, again submitted the Bill to this House. It was again passed by members here and sent to the Council. It failed to go through again. Then there was a general election, and I think I am safe in saying that it was the opinion of the majority of those who were returned to this Chamber that the people of the country were in favour of this legislation. The question was referred to on almost every platform and it was almost unanimously endorsed. The measure was again passed by this House at the beginning of the present session and it contained two slight alterations, but for which it was almost a fac simile of its predecessors. One of those two alterations was in accord with the recommendation made by the select committee of the Legislative Council, bringing in conditional purchase lands as well as freehold. The other was a taxation proposal which it was thought was not in accord with the title of the Bill. I do not think any member in this House would agree to a measure having for its object closer settlement that imposed on those persons buying land, after it had been subdivided, an increased value of 12 per cent. In other words, the purchasers would have to pay 12 per cent. more for the land than the land was actually valued at. Again, I do not think any member of this House will agree that all mortgages should be paid in full. That is to say, if a person had mortgaged his property and received more money than the value of the land, members would not agree that the mortgage should be paid in full, as it was obvious that there was a possibility in such cases that mortgages would be arranged for the purpose of claiming additional money from the State. There are other matters to which I could refer, but there is no need to deal with them now. There is no doubt that the country has been crying out for legislation of this description. People realise that we have too much vacant land adjoining our railways, and because of

that, when the Leader of the Opposition introduced his Bill, I thought that such legislation was on the right lines and would make for the progress and prosperity of the State. Believing in this legislation, I adopted the Bill that was previously presented by the present Leader of the Opposition almost in its entirety, except for the two amendments to which I have referred. Now I consider it is not worth while wasting any further time over the Bill and for that reason I submit the motion.

Mr. THOMSON (Katanning) [8.35]: Without in any way being offensive I wish to say that we doubt the sincerity of the Government in their desire to acquire for closer settlement land adjacent to our railways. The amendments that have been submitted by another place are to my mind fairly reasonable, and surely, if the Government are sincere in their desire to acquire land for closer settlement—

The Premier: If the Government are sincere!

Mr. THOMSON: It should have been possible even at this late stage to arrive at a compromise. We have been dealing to an extent with conciliation, and it seems to me that it ought to have been possible in connection with this Bill to arrive at a settlement with another place. We agree that people should be able to get land for closer settlement, but at the same time we have a duty to perform to those who hold that land, and whilst I desire to see that those who are placed on the land are not asked to pay more than is a reasonable and just charge, I strongly object to anything in the shape of land held by a private individual being confiscated. Therefore I regret that the Minister has seen fit to move that the Bill be discharged from the Notice Paper. The two amendments to which the Minister referred are not very serious.

The Minister for Lands: What about the appeal board to begin with?

Mr. THOMSON: That is only what some of us in this House have advocated. Surely all efforts to come to an agreement have not been exhausted. There are members here who are just as sincere with regard to the Bill as any member opposite, and I wish to stress the point that another place is entitled to have its wishes dealt with in some way, if not actually carried out.

Hon. W. D. JOHNSON (Guildford) [8.38]: Whilst I agree that the Minister for Lands in the circumstances cannot do other than to move for the discharge of the Bill from the Notice Paper, I wish to say briefly that I look upon this as the most disastrous happening experienced by the State for a considerable time. We have to recognise that we are settling people to-day under impossible conditions. The financial

outlook will not permit of us giving the consideration that should be accorded to those that are going on the land remote from railway communication, the consideration that will enable them to farm at a profit.

Mr. Thomson: There have been thousands of acres offered to the Government.

Hon. W. D. JOHNSON: Under conditions no Government could accept.

Mr. Thomson: And some that could have been accepted.

Hon. W. D. JOHNSON: We are settling people to-day on 160 acres of land 17 miles from an existing railway, and even further, and we are expecting those people to farm successfully! What is more, we are settling them on land that is not superior—I question if it is equal—to land that is close to the Bunbury line and monopolised by people who are not using it as it should be used up to its unimproved capacity, let alone what it would be capable of producing with improvement. For wheat growing we are sending people out as far as Parker's Range. I am prepared to admit that the Government were justified in experimenting with wheat growing in those areas, and I subscribe to that policy, but I claim that the State can experiment no longer when we realise that hundreds of thousands of acres of proved wheat lands are held up by people who are not using them to the extent that they should be doing and to the extent that the country is justified in demanding. Cannot hon. members see that disaster is staring us in the face? We are farming to-day it is true to a limited extent under profitable conditions, but we know well that we are farming huge areas that are showing a direct loss to those engaged in the operation. Why? Because facilities are not there to enable them to farm in circumstances that will give them a reasonable chance of success. Yet, alongside our existing railway lines we have land that would give these people now working under impossible conditions, an opportunity to become successful settlers. One cannot disguise the fact that the Agricultural Bank and the Industries Assistance Board have failed to make successful farmers, because money alone will not do it. Farmers must market their products at a price that will give them a profitable return. It is no use emptying money from the coffers of the State into our agricultural areas unless the farmers can successfully market whatever they produce. We are trying to do what is impossible. We have members in another place who control the lands of this country. I am prepared to admit they are doing their job. We recognise that they are representing vested interests, but greater than vested interests is the land monopoly in this country. There are huge areas that I know of within reasonable distance of existing railways that are not turned to useful account. One has only to travel by rail in this country to see the

enormous territory that is not being utilised to the extent that should be the case. We cannot go on under these conditions. What is the use of the Premier going to London and talking of increased settlement when we have not the land to offer? It is no use talking of increasing the group settlements when already existing settlers are 17 miles from constructed railways. How on earth can people succeed under those conditions? What is the use of sending the Premier to London to talk about increased land settlement when we have to admit that we are forced into the position that I have described. There is only one hope and that is to unlock the monopolised land in this country. We can only make our position right by increasing our population. We have no secondary industries to absorb that population and therefore there is only one way by which we can absorb it and it is by means of land settlement. But land is not available, though we have hundreds of thousands of acres monopolised by individuals that want to exact from the State conditions that are not fair, and that one can say are not honest. If the Government were to buy the land at their own price, these land monopolisers would take their money to Victoria and invest it there in order to escape taxation here. The whole financial position of the country requires to be reviewed. We can review the position as much as we like, but until we overcome the difficulty of landed monopoly we shall never put the finances right. I regret exceedingly the loss of this Bill. It would have given the Premier an opportunity to do some good in London. Without it he will have a difficult task. I look upon the defeat of the Bill as the most disastrous thing that could have happened to the State. Year after year we have given it to another place and asked them to consider it. We now find we cannot supply land to our own people.

Mr. Thomson: You have not exhausted every means of overcoming the difficulty.

Hon. W. D. JOHNSON: Exhausted, your grandmother! Year after year we have sent the Bill up to another place. The hon. member ought to be there himself. He is totally out of place here, where we represent the people, and where we are responsible for the financial administration of the country. He cannot take an irresponsible view of another place in regard to finances. He will have to accept the full responsibility with us for the financial administration of the country. He ought to take a more serious view of the situation than he has done by his speech and attitude to-night. I look upon this as a serious matter. I regret exceedingly that the Minister for Lands has been forced into this position, but can see no other alternative for him. Wherever my voice will reach, I intend to make another place responsible for the disastrous position into which they are forcing this State.

Mr. E. B. JOHNSTON (Williams-Narrogia) [8.48]: I am amazed that the Government should decline to have a conference with the Upper House.

Hon. S. W. Munsie: Why, when we have wasted four years already?

Mr. E. B. JOHNSTON: We have never got into closer agreement over this Bill than we have on this occasion.

Hon. S. W. Munsie: Never further away.

Mr. E. B. JOHNSTON: There are only 11 amendments in dispute, and some of these are consequential. The main principle, the question of compensation to the landowner whose property would be resumed, is there, and the Minister accepted an amendment that went a long way further than has been gone before towards arriving at unanimity between the two Houses.

Hon. S. W. Munsie: But another place made impossible suggestions there.

Mr. E. B. JOHNSTON: We have the opportunity of appointing three managers to meet three from the other House, and I think they would probably come to an agreement.

The Minister for Lands: Impossible.

Mr. E. B. JOHNSTON: It will take a good deal of money to finance the Bill, and unfortunately money is tight. Perhaps that explains the Government's attitude. If we do not appoint managers, whilst I am anxious at all times to maintain the rights, traditions, and privileges of this House against another place, I feel that we shall not be doing our duty in not trying to arrive at a settlement. I cannot see why we should suddenly decide not to appoint managers, not to go any further, and not to endeavour to effect a compromise. Especially am I amazed that so reasonable-minded a man as the Minister for Lands should take up this attitude. Never has he brought down a Bill and refused to let us cross a 't' and dot an 'i.' He has at all times been open to reason. If this Chamber is serious in the matter of closer settlement, it is its duty to exhaust every constitutional means we have of trying to get the Bill through. What harm, or delay, would occur by appointing managers to-night?

The Premier: It would be waste of time.

Mr. E. B. JOHNSTON: I cannot see why this should not be done, particularly as on the principal question, that of compensation, we have nearly arrived at complete agreement.

Mr. Pantou: You want three Guy Fawkes.

Mr. E. B. JOHNSTON: Land has repeatedly been offered to the Government for closer settlement at reasonable prices, and often at one-third of its present value. To me it is a matter for regret that the Government of the day did not buy more land in that fertile and well-watered part that I have in mind along the Great Southern Railway when it was offered to them. The present Government are not to blame for this, but on that occasion the land in ques-

tion was offered at one-third of what it is now worth on the open market.

Mr. Lutey: A lot of it was offered at unreasonable prices.

Mr. E. B. JOHNSTON: One of the best properties ever offered to the Government was put before them by a patriotic gentleman who had lost two brothers at the war.

Mr. Wilson: Some land that was bought was not too good.

Mr. E. B. JOHNSTON: That may be so. I am speaking of a property in the Wagin district. I regret the Government did not embrace the opportunity of purchasing a large area of land that was eminently suitable for closer settlement and viticulture. It could have been purchased at very reasonable prices. The member for Guildford (Hon. W. D. Johnson) referred to the question of the purchase of land for closer settlement.

Hon. W. D. Johnson: Group settlers are being put on Crown land 17 miles from a railway, on lots of 160 acres in extent.

Mr. E. B. JOHNSTON: I regret that under the existing agreement we cannot use Imperial funds for the purchase of land for group settlement. That is due to the bad agreement. I ask the Premier to reconsider the matter, and to show a spirit of reasonableness. Let this House exhaust every avenue for coming to an agreement. Let us appoint managers to meet those from another place. There are only 11 points in dispute, and some of these are consequential.

Hon. S. W. Munsie: There are 13 on the Notice Paper.

Mr. E. B. JOHNSTON: No. If we appoint managers we may easily come to a compromise and get this legislation through. We shall at all events have done our best.

Mr. Thomson: That is a reasonable suggestion.

Mr. E. B. JOHNSTON: I cannot see why this House should take up such an attitude, and should refuse to meet the managers from another place or endeavour to effect a compromise. Instead of that members say they want the Bill—the whole Bill and nothing but the Bill.

Mr. SAMPSON (Swan) [8.53]: I support the remarks of the last speaker. Every member will regret it if the Bill is laid aside. I also appeal to the Minister to look at the matter in a different light.

The Minister for Lands: My officers inform me that the Bill is useless.

Mr. Sleeman: When he says no, he means no.

Mr. SAMPSON: I know the Minister is extremely anxious to push on with closer settlement. If by a compromise it is possible for him to do so, I hope he will endeavour to effect that compromise.

The Minister for Lands: I accepted 14 amendments out of 33.

Mr. Lutey: And still they are not satisfied.

Mr. SAMPSON: It is a matter of deep regret that this Bill should not be gone on with. Perhaps even yet the Minister will make another attempt to save some of the principal clauses. I remember how early in the session it was when he brought down Bill.

Mr. Panton: Let us give it a decent burial.

The Minister for Lands: It was in the Council for three months.

Mr. SAMPSON: If the Minister feels that the amendments that have been made are too vital, there is nothing more to be said. We know, however, his powers of argument.

Hon. S. W. Munsie: And the power and stubbornness of another place.

Mr. SAMPSON: He would also have the assistance of two managers if he would permit himself to meet another place. Even now it may be possible to overcome the difficulty. An hour or two is neither here nor there when we are considering a matter of such vital importance.

Mr. Thomson: Considering the time that has been occupied on the Bill, the time spent on the conference would not be wasted.

Mr. SAMPSON: The measure is undoubtedly essential for the proper development and opening up of the country.

Mr. TAYLOR (Mt. Margaret) [8.55]: I feel it is idle for members to discuss the necessity for a conference. The points in dispute between the two Houses are so important that it is impossible for a conference to get over the difficulty. The Bill has passed this Chamber on three different occasions, and has always met with hostility in another place. It is idle for this House to suggest a conference, and I support the Minister in the attitude he has adopted.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS (Hon. W. C. Angwin—North-East Fremantle—in reply) [8.56]: I would not have replied but for the suggestion of the member for Katanning (Mr. Thomson) that I have been insincere.

Mr. Thomson: I did not mean that.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: Fancy any member pointing to the urgent necessity for the Bill, when on the second reading speech he said, "I do not see the need for the Bill."

Mr. Thomson: That is quite correct.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: Fancy a member talking about insincerity when he can say a thing like that!

Mr. Thomson: That is all right.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: The Leader of the Opposition for many years has seen the necessity for the Bill. He introduced it and I introduced another almost word for word with this. One of the great

est opponents to the Bill from the start was the member for Katanning.

Mr. Thomson: And I am proud of it.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: Then why should he accuse other people of insincerity?

Mr. Thomson: Because you have not yet exhausted every means for overcoming the difficulty.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: He is insincere himself. I have not discussed this Bill with anyone on this side of the House.

Mr. Thomson: And I have not discussed it with anyone either.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: But I have discussed it with officers of the department, who say that the Bill is now useless.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: The questions before us are too wide to discuss at a conference. We would have no hope of settling the difficulties, more especially when one man alone from another place has full power at conference. I could have given different reasons but I used only two. If members will read the amendments that have been sent back from the Council they will find that the whole 11 of them require scrutiny. I am not allowed, however, to break new ground. The member for Williams-Narrogin (Mr. E. B. Johnston) also opposed the Bill. Fancy that hon. member telling us now what we should do. Has he just recently discovered that the farmers are crying out that the land should be occupied, in order to bring about a reduction in railway freights? All members on the cross-benches are not similarly situated. Some members there realise the necessity for the Bill. When it was brought down we only dealt with the man who is not doing his duty by the country. We are not dealing with those who use the land. There was never any intention on the part of the Leader of the Opposition or myself, or the officers of the department, to confiscate any land. We intended to pay full value for it. A judge of the Supreme Court would have been chairman of the board which would have arbitrated in the matter of fixing the value of the land, if an agreement between the board and those who owned the land had not been possible. There was no question of confiscation. We were to give full value for the land. Both members on the Opposition side and on the Government side agreed that the man who owned land adjoining railways, and who did not utilise it, should have his land brought within the scope of the Bill. He should be paid full value for his land and there would be no confiscation.

Mr. Teesdale: Hear, hear! If he did not use his land he should get out.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: Under the Council's proposal there was a board to report on the matter and after the report went to the Governor the Council wanted a second board for a further inquiry and then a third board to fix the price. Three

boards! What would be the cost of the land to the man who wanted it for closer settlement purposes? It would have been impossible for him to make a success of it under such conditions. My officers advise me that the Bill is now absolutely useless and I believe them. For that purpose I have moved that the Order of the Day relating to this Bill be discharged.

Question put and passed; the Bill discharged.

BILL—LICENSING ACT AMENDMENT.

Second Reading.

Debate resumed from an earlier stage of the sitting. (Page 2597.)

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL (Northam) [9.3]: It is hardly fair to prohibitionists to submit a Bill of this description on such a hot day. I am surprised that Ministers have brought the Bill before Parliament at the eleventh hour of the session. It is an important Bill and it could have been presented earlier in the session.

Hon. S. W. Munsie: We could not bring everything down at once. We have kept the House pretty busy.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: We adjourned for a few days a little while ago, and we could have dealt with the Bill before now, when the House is about to adjourn. Everyone knows that we could hardly expect to pass the Bill, or give it ample consideration in the time at our disposal.

The Premier: There will be ample time for that. If we cannot deal with the Bill before Christmas we will come back afterwards and deal with it then.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: If that is the intention there is no need to go on with the consideration of the Bill this evening. While members generally on this side of the House have not had an opportunity of seeing the Bill, I did get a copy of it a few days ago. Most hon. members have seen the Bill for the first time to-day.

Member: Prohibition is not a new topic.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: That is so, but the Bill contains other clauses besides that relating to prohibition.

The Minister for Justice: Do you know that the provisions of this Bill were published in the Sydney "Bulletin" three weeks ago.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: Then I am surprised at the Minister allowing the paper to have that information.

The Minister for Justice: I did not let them have it.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: At any rate I am not concerned about the Sydney "Bulletin." I did not get the information three weeks ago.

The Premier: It was published in the newspapers here three weeks ago.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: What, the provisions of the Bill?

The Premier: Yes. There is only one principle contained in the Bill.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: There is the question of the simple majority, plus that wonderful clause dealing with compulsory voting.

The Premier: Those are the two points in the Bill, and particulars of those were published in the newspapers weeks ago.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: Not at all.

The Premier: They were.

The Minister for Agriculture: What difficulty have you in discussing those principles?

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: We knew it was suggested that prohibition should be carried by a simple majority, but we did not know what form the compulsory voting clauses would take.

The Premier: There is only one form of compulsory voting.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: There is a most obliging and convenient compulsory voting clause that anyone could draft.

Hon. S. W. Munsie: Then you should be satisfied.

Mr. George: They should send round and collect the votes.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: Parliament decreed that prohibition would have to be carried by a three-fifths majority and that 30 per cent. of the electors on the roll must vote in favour of it. The Bill, however, says that it can be carried by a bare majority with compulsory voting. I should like hon. members to ask themselves why Parliament provided that the prohibition poll should be agreed to by a substantial majority. Parliament enacted that provision only after mature consideration.

The Premier: That was another Parliament.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: And a better Parliament than this one.

The Premier: The electors did not think so.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: I am afraid that was because they were deceived, particularly regarding this measure. This question played a very important part at the last general elections.

The Premier: You are right. It did.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: Yes, and some members received the support of both parties. I admit that was rather clever.

The Premier: Which members were they?

Mr. A. Wansbrough: Name them!

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: I can tell the Premier who one particular member was! No one will claim that to drink is a crime. I do not feel that because I take a glass of whisky now and again that I am any worse than the mau who does not do so. The meanest possible things are done by men who have not taken drink.

The Minister for Justice: I did not say I was a prohibitionist.

Mr. Mann: We know your sympathies are not in your job.

Hon. S. W. Munsie: In his job, but not with prohibition.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: This is a question that has to be decided by the public. If there is to be any change, it should be by a substantial majority. If the Bill be agreed to, there can be a change by virtue of a bare majority, and in three or four years' time a bare majority can decide otherwise.

Mr. Panton: You tell that to the public regarding a change of Government.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: The people know they made a mistake.

Hon. S. W. Munsie: We will make it a three-fifths majority that will be required to effect a change of Government.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: You will need that provision, too, if you want to stick to the Treasury bench. I am not anxious to get there so long as the Government treat the country fairly and govern wisely.

Mr. Teesdale: Hear, hear. There is generosity for you.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: It is only right that we should criticise the Government when they bring in measures that we do not consider are right.

Hon. S. W. Munsie: You are not too bad, but some of your colleagues are not so fair.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: To bring in such a Bill and ask Parliament to approve of it within 48 hours is not right, and if this is the sort of thing the Government are prepared to do we shall have to consider whether they shall be allowed to remain in occupation of the Treasury bench. If this question is to be decided by the people, it must be by means of a substantial majority. The Minister has talked about democracy. What things are done in the name of liberty and democracy! We have not given up the right to legislate. We have said that if prohibition is to become the law of the land then the people must indicate by a substantial vote in that direction before Parliament will be justified in legislating for prohibition. The Minister says in effect, "I do not want prohibition." I can look around the House and see other members. I do not know which Government member desires prohibition. I do not know of one who desires to close a single hotel in the State.

Hon. S. W. Munsie: I do not know that we want to do so, but we want to give the people an opportunity to declare for themselves.

Mr. Hughes: Liquor has been the greatest curse the workers have ever had.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: East Perth may be in favour of prohibition. It is not democratic to provide for a vote being taken in the way suggested. Democ-

racy has nothing whatever to do with this question.

Hon. S. W. Munsie: Perhaps not with prohibition, but it has to do with the simple majority.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: Of course it has not.

The Minister for Justice: Then tell us what democracy is?

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: The Minister suggests that this question shall be decided by a bare majority, and that the freedom and liberty of the people shall be interfered with by such a vote. I know that many excellent people believe in prohibition; they have been temperance people all their lives. They want prohibition because they consider liquor is bad. They also know that while they wish to secure that end they must go carefully about it. I am certain that notwithstanding that if the law is fashioned as is proposed by the Minister, it will not be obeyed unless there is a substantial majority behind it.

The Minister for Justice: They will have an opportunity of giving that majority under the Bill.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: The Britishers have a mania for law abiding. They like to have their liberties interfered with a bit, but try this law in a British community on a bare majority, and see how it gets on.

Mr. Hughes: You are not counselling people to disobey the law.

Member: That is your job.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: Quite apart from that point, it is not right that Parliament shall say to the people: "You can have prohibition if one-half of the electors plus one are in favour. By such a vote, your freedom shall be taken away from you. You shall not have the right, by a majority of one, to do something that is not a crime." It is no worse to have a glass of wine than it is to have a cup of tea so long as one does not abuse the liquor. In this State people are more moderate to-day than ever before. Prohibition would be bad for us. Many evils have followed it wherever it has been tried. No British country would obey such a law merely because one-half the people, plus one, told them to do so. In Canada five States have given up prohibition.

Mr. Hughes: Is the hon. member in order in discussing prohibition under the Bill?

Mr. SPEAKER: No, he is not in order in discussing the merits or demerits of prohibition. He can discuss only a simple majority to decide the question.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: If that be a ruling, I am going to disagree with it. What is the question but as to whether or not we should have prohibition by this means?

The Premier: The Bill has nothing to do with prohibition.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: It has not to do with anything else. These five Canadian States have gone back on prohibition.

Mr. Hughes: Is the hon. member in order in persisting in discussing prohibition in face of your ruling?

Mr. SPEAKER: I have definitely ruled that the hon. member is not in order in discussing the merits or demerits of prohibition. The subject before the House is the decision of the people by a simple majority.

Mr. Taylor: But what is the question?

Mr. SPEAKER: That the Bill be read a second time.

Mr. Taylor: But what is the purpose of the Bill?

Hon. S. W. Munsie: To give the people the right to carry it by a simple majority.

Mr. Taylor: To carry what?

Hon. S. W. Munsie: Prohibition.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: If you, Sir, have ruled that I can only read the Bill to the House, but cannot discuss it, except that I may say that a three-fifths majority is better than a bare majority—if I am to be restricted to those words, I cannot discuss the Bill.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member scarcely grasps my ruling. The question is the decision for or against prohibition by a simple majority. But the merits of prohibition do not enter into the debate, since the Bill equally provides for the acceptance or the rejection of prohibition by a simple majority. The Bill is to enable the people to decide by a simple majority whether they will or will not have prohibition.

Mr. Taylor: Oh, we had better let the Bill go.

Mr. E. B. Johnston: The Minister touched on prohibition.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: If I am not to discuss the merits or demerits of prohibition, I have nothing further to say. However, I do not agree with your ruling. I think we ought to discuss that question. The Minister has asked the House to approve of a Bill to make prohibition more easily achieved. If you rule that I am not to discuss the question of prohibition—

Mr. SPEAKER: Only so far as it is incidental to the Bill.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: However, I have nothing more to say about the Canadian States, for hon. members know what has happened there. Prohibition will not suppress drinking. It is not a question of whether the people should or should not have liquor; because even if prohibition be carried in this State it will be easy for private people to import from the other States all the liquor they require. So, after all, there is a good deal that ought to be considered before the House decides whether or not the question of prohibition should be determined by a simple majority. We have discussed the question at length on previous occasions. In 1911 the whole question was

dealt with, including the method of arriving at prohibition and the method of controlling it when we should have it. Later on we again discussed the question when we found that by local option hotels that ought to have been closed were not closed, while others were closed without any beneficial result. So in 1923 we amended the Licensing Act. We then provided for the closing of hotels, and at Boulder and other centres where the local option vote was against reduction many hotels have been closed with good results. Under the law we have appointed the Licenses Reduction Board, men of experience who have done excellent work. I am told there is no other licensing law in Australia that has achieved so much as has ours. Under that law, which prescribes that prohibition shall be carried only on a three-fifths majority and with a vote of 30 per cent., the board have ordered considerable expenditure of money on various hotels. But Ministers are not satisfied to give the Act a chance. They do not want prohibition; probably do not believe in it any more than I do. Yet they refuse to give the existing law a chance. I cannot understand why, merely because there has been some pressure from outside, Ministers have on the last day of the session brought down this Bill. Of course, if the Labour Party promised it at the elections I can understand the Bill being brought down; but I cannot understand its being brought down by the Government or its being brought down now. It would be much better if the Premier postponed consideration of the Bill until the next session. The vote on prohibition has to be taken next year, but there will still be time to deal with this measure when next we meet. I hope the House will not agree to the bare majority. Members sitting on this side are free to vote as they please; it is not a party question with us, and it should not be a party question with those opposite. We hear a good deal about the need of prohibition, but we hear it only from those who are themselves extremists. When we come to compulsory voting we shall find that the trade will submit their case to the public, and that the extremists at the other end of the question also will submit their views to the voters. We heard a good deal from them at the last election. Because I had attempted some very necessary reforms I was strenuously opposed. My crime was that I had endeavoured to clean up the trade, which those extremists hold cannot be too bad. They get their strength, not from any merits they themselves have but from the fact that many hotel licensees do their business badly. So those extremists do not want reform, preferring that the trade should be really bad, in order that voters might be influenced at the poll. It is these people that will exercise some influence when next the poll is taken. The electors are

to be compelled to participate in the deciding of this question about which many of them know precious little. I came down in the train with a charming lady this morning. She said, "Well, what about this prohibition? I am a prohibitionist." I said, "I am not. Why do you want prohibition?" She said, "I think we had better give it a trial." I said, "It has been tried in many places, but has not succeeded anywhere." She said, "Still, I think we will give it a trial." That is just about the reasoning of many people. I know no question so little suited to compulsory voting as this one of prohibition. With all due respect to those advocating prohibition, having nothing themselves to gain, there will be a great body of electors at fault. No one will bother to discuss the question from the point of view of the moderate drinker. It will be a big work to go around the country and ingorm the people. The young people who have achieved the vote, and a great many who have never heard anything about prohibition, will be told that they have to vote, failing which they will be fined. This question should be decided by well-informed public opinion, not by a chance vote. After all, it will be a chance vote if the question is decided by a bare majority under compulsory voting. Many people want the question decided by a simple majority because they want prohibition at any price. They are perfectly willing to force their views on the State. Evils have followed prohibition wherever it has been tried. Some people would even reduce the moral standard of the people so long as their wishes in this direction were gratified. In America there has been some cleaning up of the liquor trade which in some parts was in a horrible state. There was much that could be done in America, and it was a simple matter to clean it up. The position here is totally different. There are very few hotels that could be seriously objected to now, and there will be fewer such hotels when the licensing board has had an opportunity to do its work. The people here can be influenced. Drinking is not half so bad as it was years ago, and I do not think the time has come when our pastors and masters should admit failure. They have not failed by any means. In the name of liberty the Government party claim that this question should be decided by a simple majority. They call themselves democrats; they believe they are democrats. But they are autocrats; they want to dictate to everybody. As a matter of fact this question is not submitted to the House by the will of the centre party, but only by a very small majority of those who attended the caucus meeting.

Mr. A. Wansbrough: Where did you get your wireless?

Mr. Davy: There was a leak somewhere.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: The public seem to know just what happened as re-

gards the consideration of this question in caucus, but they do not know what happened on other questions.

Mr. Panton: Never mind caucus. The workers at a conference representing the trade unions of the State said they wanted the simple majority.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: This is the most obliging compulsory voting provision that ever was. I do not know who designed it. If it is meant to be non-effective, it is a very clever clause. The voter is politely requested to vote. I think the word is "required." If he does not vote the returning officer will write him a polite note asking him to explain why he failed to vote.

The Minister for Justice: It will not be very polite if he is fined £10.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: The returning officer will say, "You did not vote, what have you to say for yourself?" The reply may be forwarded within two months and if the voter says, "My wife was away and got me to mind the baby, and I could not go to the poll," that will be a sufficient reason. If it was two months after the poll the elector could say his ankle was sprained and he could not go to the poll, I cannot imagine that anyone will be at a loss to find an excuse that will be adequate to satisfy the returning officer.

Mr. Panton: It all depends how the Treasury is.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: If it is not convenient for the elector to fill in the form to the presiding officer, a friend can do it. Some friend will open the letter and, seeing it comes from a Government department, will know that he may be of some service to his friend. He may send along the excuse, and having sent it, nothing more will be heard of it. Unless a man is very stupid, the only one who may be fined is he who does not write the returning officer in reply to his letter asking why he failed to vote. If he has any sort of an excuse at all, it will apparently be accepted. I do not see how it can be otherwise. With 180,000 electors on the roll in this scattered country, probably 40,000 or 50,000 will refrain from voting.

Mr. A. Wansbrough: The Treasury will benefit from that.

The Premier: If I could get £10 from each of them, I would do very well.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: They will all make excuses. If the member for Albany fails to vote he will probably say, "I was fishing at the Kent River and could not walk up to Mr. Saw's house where the polling booth was, because it was three miles distant and the day was very wet." Any excuse at all will do.

Mr. Holman: It might be a dry day.

Mr. Davy: I thought you said there might be a strike on.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: If a strike occurred very few people would get

to the poll. There is nothing in this compulsory clause, and it should not scare anyone. It is the most obliging compulsory clause I have ever read. The Premier says he will get £10 from each elector who does not vote. I imagine myself being brought before the Premier for failure to vote.

The Premier: I should not accept your explanation that you were fishing. I would say, "No, prosecute this man."

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: I do not know why the Premier should do that. The court would say it was a reasonable excuse. If no excuse were forthcoming, the courts would do as they now do with people who fail to enrol—fine them a shilling or two. It is true the penalty set down in the Bill for failing to vote is £10, but that is the maximum. The fine imposed could be anything below that, as my learned friend, the member for East Perth knows.

Mr. Hughes: It would all depend who you were.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: I shall be very glad when this question is settled, because it is a pity that it should play such an important part in our elections. There are far more important things to be decided at our elections, but this question continues to crop up and will do so until the prohibitionists are satisfied—if they ever can be satisfied. I do not agree that the question can be settled by providing for a bare majority vote. The law at present is a fair one; further it should be given a chance; further still the people who have spent their money to provide for the convenience of the public should receive some consideration. I should like to know who is going to provide lodging accommodation for the travelling public unless money for it. People have invested their money for the convenience of the public, and they are entitled to some consideration. It is a pity that this question cannot be decided for a period, but it is a difficult one and it always crops up at election time. There are always some people who can face north by south and who do so. So I suppose the question will be kept alive. I know there are people truly anxious that there should be total abstinence, people who have not always been temperance advocates. The ones I know are those who have lived here and whom one meets, people who wish to be fair. They are not the ones who cause the trouble. They have always been fair, and they are entitled to demand that there shall be strict and firm control of the liquor traffic. They are entitled to say there shall be no drunkenness. The charges of drunkenness have been reduced by half since the Act was amended. Such people are entitled to demand decent behaviour from everybody. I should be glad to join anyone who could suggest any improvement to the existing Act, but believing as I do that prohibition will be followed by many evils here as elsewhere, that it will fail as it has failed elsewhere, and knowing that the law will not be

obeyed unless a substantial majority of the people decide that it should be altered, I cannot agree to the Bill.

Mr. Taylor: You are not a conscientious objector?

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: No, but we should endeavour to be fair. If Ministers were prohibitionists, I could understand their bringing down this Bill.

The Premier: This is not a prohibition Bill.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: Nothing short of it.

The Premier: Oh, no.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: If it is not a prohibition Bill, it is nothing. It is not a question of deciding that liquor shall be sold. That question has been decided. The only question that ever will be decided by the people again is whether liquor shall not be sold, and that is apparently what the Government wish us to believe they want. Yet there is nothing they want so little as that.

The Minister for Justice: Call it a Bill for the continuance of the drink traffic if the people are favourable to it.

Mr. Taylor: That would not fit the title.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: It is not the point at all.

The Minister for Justice: That would be the position.

The Premier: It could be a Bill to prevent prohibition.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: The Minister said that the people who invested their money for the convenience of the public knew full well that this measure would probably be submitted to Parliament and would probably become law. I do not think they did know that. I believe they thought Parliament would stand by the recent amendment of the Act, at any rate for a time. The Minister said he knew much money was involved and much employment also. I do not know that that is a question to be seriously considered. The real question is whether we are going to give up our freedom and our right to drink in moderation, and allow it to be decided for us by someone else. I shall not allow that to be done if I can help it, and I believe I represent the great majority of the people of this State. The Minister said that caucus had arrived at a democratic settlement of this undemocratic question, and that the House should pass the Bill. I hope the House will not pass it.

The Premier: I am afraid it will.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: I know the Premier has had a little meeting.

The Minister for Agriculture: It did not need a meeting.

The Premier: When was the meeting held?

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: I think it was about the 14th July last, and the Minister, instead of submitting the Bill as soon as the party decided it should be submitted, has brought it down only to-day. At that meeting a small majority decided

that they wanted the issue resolved on a simple majority.

Mr. Hughes: Would you have supported the Bill had it been brought down earlier?

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: Let us see whether members on the Government side will act as their consciences dictate on this occasion. It is not a party question. It ought not to be a party question. Certainly it is not a party question on this side of the Chamber.

The Minister for Mines. We'll soon see about that.

The Premier: You are not going to burst up the united party so soon, are you?

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: We allow our people to exercise the utmost freedom on questions of this sort, and so I consider should members sitting opposite. I hope that when a division is taken we shall have a majority voting for the retention of the present Act, which is a very fair, reasonable, and proper Act, recently passed. The House should stand by its recent decision. However, the Premier says the whip has been cracked and he has a majority. Well, all right. This Bill is nothing but prohibition. The only reason why the measure is submitted is that people anxious for prohibition have asked the Government to submit it. The only reason the Minister for Justice had for submitting the Bill is that he is a democrat, although this is an utterly undemocratic measure.

The Minister for Justice: I am willing to abide by the voice of the people fully expressed.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: The Minister knows that under this Bill he will not have the decision of a majority of the electors at all. The Bill provides for a simple majority decision, and the compulsory voting clause of the Bill will not be effective. The clause is not important to the Bill from the Minister's point of view. The vote will settle the question.

The Minister for Justice: The people will be committing an offence against the law if they do not vote.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: The clause is so worded that they can take the risk, and they will take the risk. The Bill does not tell them to vote; it politely requests them to vote.

The Minister for Justice: It fines them if they don't vote.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: The people will not be fined if they do not vote. If they have the slightest excuse to offer, that excuse will be accepted.

The Minister for Justice: No.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: Of course it will. It is a pity the Bill has been brought down and particularly do I object to its being brought down at this hour of the session. It is a pity, too, that notice was not given of the Bill a week ago, so that all members might have known that

the measure would have been considered to-night.

Mr. DAVY (West Perth) [9.50]: It appears to me, after listening to the interjections from the Government side of the House, that very clearly the majority of members of this House are opposed to prohibition. Of course I accept your ruling as being correct, Mr. Speaker—I think it is correct—that we may not in general terms discuss to-night the merits or demerits of prohibition, but, very clearly, the merits or demerits of prohibition must come in to a certain extent, because we are asked by this Bill to place in the hands of the people a decision as to whether or not a certain act which hitherto has been a legal act shall be an illegal act. In deciding on the merits of that, one cannot avoid certain references to prohibition. The attitude of members on the Government side appears to me to be due to a certain mental confusion. I do not want to say this with any air of superiority: one always tends to give that idea when one speaks of mental confusion on the part of other people. However, they seem to have got the idea that everything ought to be decided by simple majority. If that be so, let us consider just where it leads us to. It is said that we ought to decide by simple majority the question whether or not persons in Western Australia shall drink alcoholic beverages. Equally it follows that we shall decide the reverse question, if on this occasion we are forbidden to drink alcoholic beverages. It is possible to conceive that persons who do not take a strong view of the drinking of alcoholic beverages might be prepared to allow alcohol to be put back by a simple majority, since alcohol was forbidden by a simple majority. That is altogether apart from other absurd results flowing from such a view. But can it be imagined that the people at the back of the agitation for prohibition in Western Australia are prepared, in the event of prohibition being put on the statute-book by simple majority, to allow the use of alcoholic beverages to be re-established by a simple majority? Those gentlemen are in many cases honestly convinced of what they say. They have stated in the newspapers from day to day, as well as in a circular letter which has been sent to every member of both Houses of Parliament, that they regard alcohol as a foul and evil thing, and the drinking of alcoholic beverages as a wicked and damnable act. The gentleman who sent me the circular letter which reached me is, I understand, a minister of the Church. His function is to preach morality and to urge the people to conform to what is good and right, to urge the people to eschew what is wrong and wicked. Now that gentleman prepared to stand up in his church and say that he is in favour of bigamy, we will say, being permitted by a simple majority of the people? Is he pre-

pared to stand up in his church and tell his congregation that he is in favour of theft, murder, or suicide being decided by a simple majority?

The Minister for Justice: Would that be possible in a civilised community?

Mr. DAVY: At the present time the drinking of alcoholic beverages is regarded by large numbers of people, by a great majority of this House and of another place, as being a perfectly proper and decent thing for any self-respecting man or woman to do. If that be so, surely if the people have the right to take alcoholic beverages away from us by a simple majority, they have a right to restore them to us by a simple majority. But these people who advocate prohibition do not take that view. They hold that it is wicked and damnable for anyone to drink alcoholic beverages. They therefore place themselves in this dilemma, that when they have carried their project by a simple majority, they are not prepared subsequently to accept a simple majority decision in the opposite direction. The circular letter to which I have referred contains the following:—

Our movement exists solely to promote the best interests of the whole community, and we labour in the hope that the elected representatives of the people will permit their constituents to settle the question of the continuance or prohibition of the liquor traffic on the just and equitable basis of a simple majority decision.

The Minister who introduced the Bill says that he is not a prohibitionist; that is, he is not in favour of prohibiting the sale of alcoholic beverages and the drinking of them, not in favour of making it a criminal offence for a man to drink alcohol in moderation. What other reason can the Minister have for introducing this Bill except that he thinks all questions should be referred to the people to be decided on simple majority? Surely that is a position from which anybody who values the principles of logic should retire? I cannot avoid referring to the question of the use of alcohol at this juncture. Apparently the people who are backing this movement, the Western Australian Prohibition League, are fully convinced that the sale of alcohol is a wicked and damnable thing, and the cause of all the evils in the community. They have written to the Press recently stating that alcohol is a race poison, that its use fills the gaols and lunatic asylums, and that the abolition of it will empty the gaols and insane hospitals. If they could prove those things, if we in this House were satisfied of those things, it would be our duty to abolish the liquor traffic and the consumption of alcohol to-morrow, even to-day. It would be our duty to do that. We are here to make such laws for the people as we think are needed for the good of the community. We are not here to avoid our difficulties by re-

ferring them to the people themselves. That is not our function. If, as I say, alcohol is such a terrible evil in the community, its use should not be prohibited by a simple majority, or a three-fifths majority, or a 90 per cent. majority: it would be our duty to abolish the use of alcohol immediately. But, in point of fact, we do not think that alcohol is such an evil. The evidence has not convinced us that it is. We are told that the excessive consumption of this "race poison" that is now going on will result in a deteriorated stock in the next generation. But when we examine the facts so far as we can know them, we see that it is not so. We see the British races, which are the dominant races of the earth to-day, and have been heavy consumers of alcoholic beverages for hundreds of years, showing no signs of deterioration. Can anyone say that there has been marked deterioration in the British races? There is no more remarkable race in the world than the Jews. For two thousand years, as far as we can trace their history, they have maintained their vitality, both physical and mental, in a marked degree. There is no more vital race, mentally or physically, on earth to-day. Did any member of this House ever hear of a teetotal Jew? There never was such a being.

The Minister for Mines: One never hears of a drunken Jew.

Mr. DAVY: Quite true. I was told the other day that there used to be one in Perth, but that he has been got rid of.

The Premier: The Jews are a very temperate race.

Mr. DAVY: Yes. They have always used alcohol, and they use it to-day. We are told by the abolitionists that even the moderate use of alcohol proves ruinous. If they say that the excessive use of alcohol is all they aim at, we are all with them. Every one of us holds that the man who uses alcohol to the extent of becoming intoxicated ought to be punished, and that if he persists in doing so he ought to be put in a place where he cannot do it. We are all in agreement with that. We are all agreed that we should teach our young people by every possible means that alcohol should be used only in moderation. But to say that it is a race poison is not in accordance with the facts. I have an idea, Mr. Speaker, that perhaps you are about to tell me that I have wandered a little from the subject. I do not want to infringe on your ruling.

The Premier: I move that the Speaker be allowed to reply.

Mr. DAVY: You, Sir, and I perhaps on one or two occasions have discussed the subject in an amicable way and have agreed to differ. However, you are not in the discussion at this moment; and I repeat that I do not wish to infringe upon your ruling that prohibition is not the main issue in the argument. The idea that the issue should be decided by a simple majority is based on

the false belief of what democracy is. This House does not decide matters on the principle embodied in the Bill. Any matter of importance in this House is determined upon an absolute majority of every member—26.

Mr. Sleeman: Would you prefer a minority vote?

Mr. DAVY: I do not know that it could be worse than this. If the Bill becomes law it will be possible for prohibition to be carried on a minority vote of very much less than half the electors of Western Australia, and yet in this House we say that where matters of importance are to be dealt with an absolute majority is necessary. If you put a proposition of that sort to us and allow the people to decide and carry prohibition, and if one more than half the number of persons in Western Australia votes in favour of it, then I say that a certain amount of consideration may be given to the proposal. That would be a true majority of the people.

Hon. W. D. Johnson: You compel a given number to vote and then the majority will decide.

Mr. DAVY: My friend thinks that there is some analogy between the fact that members of this House are elected by a majority and a majority decision on the liquor question. The circular which has been sent to me contends that as members are elected to this House by a simple majority, so should the other question be decided. I would like the author of this circular to explain how you could have members of Parliament returned in any other way than by a simple majority.

Mr. Panton: We will alter it to two-thirds.

Mr. DAVY: Do so by all means, and the result will be that you will not have half the members here, and instead of 50 there will be about 20. There is no analogy whatever between an election of members to this House and a decision on any other question. You cannot possibly constitute a House on the principle of a simple majority, because you would run the risk of not having all your people returned. Reference has been made to the fact that conscription was submitted to the people on a simple majority.

Mr. Sleeman: That was an important question.

Mr. DAVY: Yes, and it should never have been submitted to the people. That referendum had no more legal significance than the speech I am making here to-night. It did not bind the Federal Government to either pass conscription or reject it. It was just a weak means of dodging the issue, a means of endeavouring to ascertain from the people what their views were, because the Government thought that if they adopted conscription they might have been beaten at the next election. Someone may say that this was done by a Nationalist Government and that I am a Nationalist. I do not hesitate to say that I viewed that action on the

part of the Federal Government with contempt. I say definitely that the matter ought to have been dealt with by the Government. It was their responsibility, and Parliament, as then constituted, should have dealt with the question. In the same manner do I say now that this is a subject that should be dealt with by Parliament, and, if it was dealt with by Parliament there is no doubt about it that prohibition would be made to look perfectly silly. Any measure submitted to this Parliament dealing with prohibition would be turned down by an enormous majority, and the position would be the same in another place. The only two analogies quoted by those two people who are pressing the question, have really nothing to do with the matter. One is the election of members to Parliament, and in that regard I say that members could not be chosen in any other way. With regard to the conscription issue, the referendum that was taken had no legal significance.

Mr. Sleeman: And it only required a simple majority to decide it.

Mr. DAVY: There was no decision on it. It was simply a reference to the people to find out what their views were, because the Government were not strong-minded enough to deal with the question themselves.

The Minister for Railways: They accepted the decision of the people.

Mr. DAVY: The conscription question was an issue submitted at a time of terrific emergency. How then can it be suggested that this question we are now discussing is analogous to that. One could talk on this question at great length and from different aspects. The circular that was sent to me refers all the time to two contending parties. Anyhow, what have we in this House to do with the liquor or the anti-liquor party? There is a tendency to consider the two contending factions in the community and to forget the man in the street. We here do not represent factions or organisations.

Mr. Sleeman: You are objecting to the rank and file and the man in the street deciding it.

Mr. DAVY: No, I am objecting to the possibility of less than half the people telling more than half the people what they are to do. The two main branches of the Christian religion in Western Australia, the Church of England and Roman Catholicism, are of opinion that it is a perfectly decent and proper thing for people to drink alcohol.

Mr. Sleeman: This is not a religious question.

Mr. DAVY: That is exactly what it is. Let me remind the hon. member that there was a time not so long ago when it was considered that if the majority did not like the religion of the minority they were entitled to persecute them.

Mr. Sleeman: Is the hon. member in order in bringing religion into the question?

Mr. DAVY: I am illustrating the question of a simple majority, and I say that the position here to-day is analogous to the religious persecution that went on for hundreds of years in the country from which we derive our origin, and was finally wiped out at the beginning of last century. It was the dissenting majority that persecuted the Roman Catholics and our forbears fought against them. They declared that a man's religion and his personal and private habits were his own and should not be dictated by anyone.

Mr. Sleeman: Bill Sykes says that, too.

Mr. DAVY: Does the hon. member wish to compare himself with Bill Sykes? The essence of the position is this, that two main branches of our religious organisations say that it is a perfectly proper and decent thing to do. I say that if the majority of the people in Western Australia, a bare majority, are to be permitted to decide that the majority of us in this House are going to be made criminals if we continue to do that proper and decent thing, it is exactly analogous to the religious persecution that went on for centuries in England and was finally wiped out at the beginning of last century. Let me mention one more aspect. This House adopted a proposal last session providing for a new system for dealing with licenses, wiping out old licenses and granting new licenses on the basis that the question of prohibition would be decided by a three-fifths majority. On the strength of that there has been a great deal of capital expended in the building of hotels as well as in other directions connected with the liquor trade.

Mr. Mann: And at the direction of the licensing bench.

Mr. DAVY: The licensing bench raised the standard of hotel premises enormously and to-day it is practically impossible to build a hotel at a cost of less than £7,000 or £8,000, even in a country town. Now, before the time for the taking of the poll arrives, if the Government have their way, the condition of things is to be altered by the three-fifths majority being wiped out, and a simple majority being introduced. I do not know that I have any particular sympathy for the liquor trade; I always feel that I am being crushed between two contending factions, vested interests on the one hand and the people who want prohibition for various reasons on the other. At the same time where one sees that serious harm may be done, not to the liquor trade, but to private individuals who decide to put their money into this form of investment, one is entitled to pause, and this is an aspect that should not be lost sight of. If I talked till Doomsday, or if I had the eloquence of a Burke or a Cicero, I would not have the slightest chance of convincing one hon. member on the opposite side of the House, but having put views before the

House, as I am bound to do, I leave it at that.

Mr. PANTON (Menzies) [10.15]: The member for West Perth (Mr. Davy) made an excellent attempt to put up a case on a bad subject. I was surprised that he started off as he did, by practically accusing members on this side of the House of suffering from mental confusion. After listening patiently to him I think he is suffering more from that disease than anyone on this side of the House. He did his best to camouflage the whole issue. For the moment I am not particularly concerned about prohibition. Most people know how I stand on that question. We want the people to decide what is, after all, their own business. I disagree with the member for West Perth when he says it is a question for members of this House to decide. This is a big social question and one that we ought to be prepared to entrust to the people. It is begging the question to state that people should decide only on the three-fifths majority as to what they want. I have been astounded that one section of business, namely, the liquor trade, should be singled out for preferential treatment. The Factories and Shops Act provides that the electors in any locality can take a poll on the question whether the shops should close on Saturday at 1 o'clock or at 6 o'clock on Friday instead of at 10 o'clock. I have never heard anyone argue that such a poll should be taken on a two-fifths majority basis.

Mr. J. H. Smith: It is not proposed to close up the shops.

Mr. PANTON: It is argued that people have invested their money in the liquor trade, but people have also invested their money in shops in order that they may trade for a certain number of hours. In different parts of the State by a simple majority 10 per cent. of the electors in a given locality have come to a decision on the question of closing shops. Between Midland Junction and South Fremantle there were fewer than 2,000 votes cast on this question, but no noise was made about the manner in which it was settled. The member for West Perth referred to the question of conscription. Had it been carried by a majority of one it would have been put into operation. I read a good many articles whilst overseas, and I do not remember reading that anyone wanted the question decided on any other than the simple majority. In that matter the lives of the men of Australia were concerned. If it was good enough to deal with human beings by the simple majority vote, it is good enough to deal with this social question on the same basis. The Leader of the Opposition twitted the Government by saying that it was only the small majority in Caucus that decided to bring down this Bill. I was not present, so I do not know what happened. The hon. member knows more about it than I do.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: The man in the street knows about it.

Mr. PANTON: It is not a question of what took place at a Caucus meeting. The trades union movement is responsible for the Government being in office to-day, and it is a question of the trades unionists having decided that this should be done. This is what the platform of the Labour Party says on the question of liquor law reform:—

There shall be a poll taken of the whole State on the question of prohibition, such question to be carried on the bare majority vote of the electors voting at a poll conducted on a system of compulsory voting.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: Then you do not stand for this Bill?

Mr. PANTON: It is not a question of a small majority of Caucus, but of the majority of the trades unionists of the State.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: That is worse.

Mr. PANTON: They are the sufferers to-day, and they know what will be good for them. I will trust the workers to say what will be good, bad, or indifferent for them. The Leader of the Opposition tried to fasten prohibition on to this party. He can fasten it on as often as he likes. I will take my share of the responsibility. The question of prohibition can be settled when the poll is taken. Members can go upon any platform they like, or stay away. They are not asked to do one thing or the other. They can either record their votes, or make themselves heard on the mat. We are bound by the plank of our platform to give to the people the right to decide this question by a simple majority, and we are going to stand by that. It was not much use the Leader of the Opposition or the member for West Perth putting up any other argument so far as this party is concerned. You, Sir, have ruled that the merits or demerits of prohibition cannot be discussed, and I bow to your ruling. This matter should be dealt with from the point of view as to whether we are going to trust the people or not, and I hope that the Leader of the Opposition will see the error of his ways. If the hon. member will give the matter a moment's consideration I am sure he will realise that the people are intelligent enough and competent enough to say what they want and what they will have. The member for West Perth spoke about the writer of a circular, and the re-establishment of the trade by a simple majority. No doubt that gentleman can speak for himself when he gets the opportunity. I think that the people who are now supporting the simple majority will stand up for the same principle in either case. I assure the hon. member that we stand for the simple majority and for trusting the people at all times.

Mr. J. H. SMITH (Nelson) [10.23]: I protest against the late hour in the session at which this Bill has been introduced. It is of a very contentious nature.

Hon. S. W. Munsie: It was only about a fortnight ago that you asked for it.

Mr. J. H. SMITH: It was three or four months ago when I asked for information on the subject. Certain news had leaked out and I wanted to know about it. I asked the Premier a legitimate question as to whether he intended to introduce the Bill this session, or next session, and I received a very evasive reply.

Mr. Hughes: You have got it now.

Mr. J. H. SMITH: Yes, in the death throes of a hard session, and in weather like this.

The Premier: Would you not have opposed it just the same if it had been introduced at the beginning of the session?

Mr. J. H. SMITH: I do not see any reason why I should be opposed to it, except on the question of the liberty of the subject. We have no right to pass legislation for a simple majority vote to take away the liberty of the subject. It amounts to saying I am not to do something that has been legalised for years and which has never done me any injury, and on which I have thrived in many directions, just as some of my friends have thrived. I see around the Chamber some of the most robust, some of the brainiest and most able men, who realise the bright side of the movement, and who have at different periods bent their elbows, not to drink water or tea, but something stronger. The Minister made out a very poor case, and did not produce one argument why this House should support the simple majority. I cannot understand why the Premier has broken faith with the community. Is it because during the election one section or another of the people has pandered to him in the way of giving political support? Surely we are above that sort of thing. The Minister spoke about a plank in the Labour platform. I defy the Minister and half of the members sitting opposite to tell me that this was one of the leading planks of their platform at the last election. The only time they ever advocated the simple majority was when some person in the audience asked the direct question, "Do you favour the simple majority?" This cannot be denied. The Minister did not say how the compulsory vote was to be taken, whether the rolls were to be purified, and whether police or agents were to enrol the people. He did not say what would be done in the way of taking the votes of those who lived without the seven-mile radius. The compulsory voting could be nothing but a farce. I am not opposed to the people ruling. If 50½ per cent. of the people said they wanted prohibition

they would have it, but if as low a percentage as 35 or 40 per cent. secured it, there would be nothing but crime and law-breaking every day, and I should be inclined to resign my seat in Parliament and do a bit of bootlegging on my own account. Members will recollect the report which you, Sir, presented on the question of the liquor traffic. They will also remember the speeches that were made in Parliament concerning it. We were here till 4 o'clock in the morning discussing it.

Hon. S. W. Munsie: We may be here till that hour to-morrow.

Mr. J. H. SMITH: Even if we are, we shall be fighting for our liberties. In 1922 a vote of the people was taken on the liquor trade as a result of the amendments to the law. In many districts reduction was carried and in some increases were carried, but I do not think that "no license" was carried anywhere. The increases that were carried, however, went by the board. During that discussion we were promised a vote of the people. Here again the Government pandered to one section of the community. They promised that in 1925 another vote would be taken and that there would be a three-fifths majority again. This is how we keep faith with the people! The Government without consulting Parliament or their party members, decided that a board should be constituted and that the board were to travel from one end of the country to the other deciding where there should be decreases or increases in the licenses allowed. That board have been operating in the interests of the trade and of the community. I believe that those who do not agree with me, and even prohibitionists, will say that the board have been working in the best interests of the country. I believe that they will admit that the board have done wonderful work. If the simple majority is to govern the position and we get a 60 per cent. poll, 31 per cent. of the people deciding the issue, the work of that board will be futile. The member for Menzies (Mr. Panton) referred to another point when he said "why give preferential treatment?" I say that treatment should be extended to those connected with the trade because they have been lulled into a false sense of security by the hypocrisy of some members sitting on the Government side of the House. If a vote were taken on this question, I am sure some would be found voting on the right side. However, many of these people have been lulled into a false security by the work of the board and have, under the instructions and by the authority of that board, invested thousands of pounds in bringing their licensed premises up to date.

Mr. Hughes: Yes, with money they made out of the trade.

Mr. J. H. SMITH: Many of these men have invested their money in the trade and have been connected with it for years. If Parliament agrees to the proposal before us now, it will be barefaced robbery. I hope, even at this late hour, the Premier and his Ministers will listen to reason and withdraw the measure seeing that it cannot do any good. The board's work is satisfactory to-day. There is another phase that should not be lost sight of. I refer to the financial side, with which the Treasurer is always worrying. When hotels are closed down, provision has to be made for compensation. If the trade be closed down as a consequence of the Bill, the Treasurer must find the necessary funds to provide compensation. That is a trouble in store that must not be lost sight of. If the Minister will agree to a 50 per cent. poll and will meet us to that extent, it will save a lot of discussion and probably some stonewalling.

The Minister for Justice: The Speaker will look after that.

Mr. J. H. SMITH: Again, I would appeal to the Minister for Lands who is in control of soldier settlement. If the Bill be passed and a minority declare for prohibition, in what position will the country be? Thousands upon thousands of pounds have been invested in vineyards and in the wine making industry. Returned soldiers are interested in those propositions. Has the Minister given that matter consideration? I know where this agitation has come from. I do not believe it has come from the honest sections of the community. I do not refer to the promises made by the Government, but to the agitation that has gone on in favour of this move. I know the Government have had this question on their political platform. If they are such wonderful moralists, however, why do they not deal with our "white cities," where there is so much crime and vice going on? There will be found gambling and young fellows well under 20 years of age being led astray. Why do the Government not tackle that problem?

Hon. W. D. Johnson: One reform at a time.

Mr. J. H. SMITH: The attitude taken up is hypocrisy of the lowest water. The Government are pandering to one section of the community. A lot of the prohibition cry comes from the drapers in the city. There is more possibilities for crime by way of those beautiful silk "undies" and lovely fine drapery and silk stockings that the flappers of the town may be seen wearing about the streets, than come from the hotels. We can see girls whose fathers have big families—

Mr. Treasdale: Mind the step!

Mr. J. H. SMITH: I do not intend to speak apart from the question, Mr. Speaker, but I wish to deal with vice as I see it. I wish to connect it up with the question

of the simple majority. I am justified in raising my voice against this phase of the problem. The Government would be right if they took action along the lines I have indicated. These drapers think that money is spent on the liquor trade that should be going into their own pockets. Thus they say that drink is the cause of crime. Drink is not the cause of all the crime. Some people are led astray by the advertisements appearing in the papers regarding drapers' sales. When temperance people attribute all crime to drink, they are not fair. What will occur if Western Australia goes dry while the other States remain wet? How impossible it will be according to your own report, Mr. Speaker, which I have read carefully and marked in various parts. I trust to be able to read various portions of it before I have concluded my remarks. You have indicated the difficulty experienced in America and elsewhere in dealing with the runners and bootleggers. You have shown how an army of ships are engaged in an endeavour to keep them out. If Western Australia goes dry, and the other States remain wet, what sort of a position will our Treasurer be in in view of the expenditure necessary to keep Western Australia dry? How will he be in a position to guard our shores from Broome to the Leeuwin? It is an absolute impossibility; it is a dream that cannot come true. We have a lot of people in this country to-day who will have a drink. Some cannot think of drink without temptation arising before them. There are people who, so long as they can get a drink, will have one, and if people are to force prohibition upon those individuals, they will buy stocks and then we will hear something about liquor made from potatoes, blackboys, and so forth.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! I would remind the hon. member that the question before us is one relating to the simple majority.

Mr. J. H. SMITH: I am pointing out to the Government the error of their ways and the trouble that will be opened up if they proceed to amend the law as the Minister for Justice suggests. He talks about a penalty of £10 as though that will be some inducement for members to support him in his proposal. On the Opposition side of the House we are not united on this question. Every member has the right to vote as his conscience dictates. If the simple majority class is to be carried, I cannot say that I appreciate the action of the Government in not having the courage of their convictions to introduce the legislation in this Chamber at an earlier stage. Rather than do that, they endeavoured to introduce it in the Council. It reminds me of what happened to a previous Government regarding the State trading concerns. In that instance the legislation was introduced and on that occasion the Council had the courage to deal with the measure and did not send it down to us. I am more than

surprised at the Premier's action in introducing the Bill here at this stage. On our side of the House we are not compelled to vote one way or the other. Therefore why should it be made a party measure on the Government side of the House? If I start stamping the country in the near future in opposition to prohibition, I feel sure I will have the support of some hon. members sitting on the Government side of the House. As a matter of fact this is pure hypocrisy and pandering to one section of the community only. I will place before the House the views of Archbishop Riley showing that if I err in my views I err in good company. The newspaper report of the Archbishop's remarks shows that he is an opponent of prohibition. The report contains the following:—

The attitude of Archbishop Riley upon the question of prohibition and liquor reform was defined by him in forceful terms last night, when in St. George's Cathedral he delivered his charge to Diocesan Synod. His Grace spoke of the views he had held when he came to the State 30 years ago. "Then, as now," he said, "I believe that what we had to do as a church to promote temperance was to try to bring the power of the spirit of Christ to bear upon the lives of people and the thought of the world. I deprecated then, as I do now, the appeal to force—that is, the civil law—to compel men to be sober. If we could do it, the cost would be too great. To buy sobriety at the cost of freedom is not by any means a good bargain. . . . Prohibition for a free people is wrong in principle and so I will not do anything if I can avoid it to bring it about."

Those words of the Archbishop are forceful and they convey a great deal more to the Premier than I could if I continued my remarks. As to endeavouring to educate people to keep sober—

Mr. Taylor: It will take a long time to educate some people.

Mr. J. H. SMITH: The churches would be better advised if they went into the schools and started educating the coming generation, starting from the lower classes and working up. If this trade is such an immoral thing and has such a harmful effect upon the people of Western Australia, future generations will benefit if they are educated away from the use of alcohol. It would have been better if the temperance people, when they waited upon the Premier and got from him his famous promise to introduce the Bill, had sought permission from the Minister for Education, to go to the schools and start their education there. It is no use appealing to us, for we are hardened sinners and have gone too far. I do not see how any benefit can be derived from the legislation proposed by the Government. That is not the way to achieve their ends. It is not a fair proposition; it is pure hypocrisy. His Grace continued—

If we could do it, the cost would be too great.

MR. SPEAKER: I must ask the hon. member to confine himself to the Bill and not advocate either prohibition or non-prohibition.

MR. J. H. SMITH: I thought this was a liquor reform Bill.

MR. SPEAKER: It is only a voting reform measure.

MR. J. H. SMITH: Dealing with the abolition of liquor.

MR. SPEAKER: It is to put all voting on the same level.

MR. J. H. SMITH: Oh no, I must disagree with you there. It is voting reform dealing with the abolition of liquor. His Grace continued that the cost would be too great to buy sobriety at the cost of freedom.

MR. TAYLOR: That is the stuff to give the brutes!

MR. J. H. SMITH: And again—

The question of the accuracy or otherwise of reports from America as the result of prohibition does not affect me. Prohibition for free people is wrong in principle and so I will not do anything to assist it if I can avoid it. The improvement in the drinking habits of the people has been very pronounced.

Our Licensing Act has been carried out more strictly, and consequently we have had great improvements. His Grace continues—

There is, however, one very unfair way of bringing about prohibition.

MR. SPEAKER: I have repeatedly directed the hon. member to confine himself to the Bill.

MR. J. H. SMITH: I always endeavour to bow to your ruling, Sir, so I will drop His Grace. Here is a report on prohibition by the Hon. Thomas Walker, M.L.A. There is in this a few points I desire to make here, the reasons why we should go for local option and the reasons why we should refuse to have this question of prohibition settled by a simple majority.

MR. TAYLOR: You will require to read this report with circumspection and discretion.

MR. J. H. SMITH: This report reads as follows:—

About the middle of the nineteenth century the people in the various States commenced to apply the principles of local option. It was a right they believed conferred upon them by the Constitution of the United States. It is important to remember that prohibition came to America by a series of experimental tests.

That is what I am advocating. At least, for a beginning, we should make it a three-fifths instead of a simple majority. Moreover, I believe that that experiment should be continued. Then, if by education the people learn to understand the question, perhaps in 50 or 100 years' time we may

have prohibition in Western Australia. The report continues—

Through local option votes small districts, school districts, towns, then counties, and finally whole States adopted prohibition.

The Bill proposes to take the vote right through the whole State, instead of cutting the State into sections. If Kalgoorlie declares wet, while Perth declares dry, what will be the difference in bringing down liquor from Kalgoorlie to Perth and from bringing liquor from South Australia to Perth? It would be much easier to bring it from South Australia.

MR. SLEEMAN: What has this to do with voting?

MR. J. H. SMITH: The report continues—

Many States adopted prohibition laws, but in some instances these were repealed later.

It does not go on to say whether it was done by a simple majority or by a three-fifths majority, but apparently the people were not satisfied with prohibition. Let me point to this aspect: To-day we have many fine hotels. If we carry prohibition by a simple majority those hotels will change hands and be put to other uses. Then, perhaps, following history in America, in five years' time the vote will be reversed and those who want hotels will have to build new ones. Possibly at the end of the next five years we shall revert to prohibition once more. Of course that is an impossible state of affairs. However, this report continues—

South Dakota repealed the law in 1897; Vermont in 1902, and New Hampshire in 1903.

Then the author goes on to speak of the difficulties that have to be confronted under prohibition. He gives the views of the "wets" and of the "drys" and he shows that there was a good deal more home brewing in consequence of the law prohibiting the purchase of alcohol. More wine was made in the homes of the people. So it would seem that by prohibition we force the drink evil right into the homes of the people. It is shown in this report that the large States could not be coerced into voting for total abstinence. Nobody will refrain from having a drink if he wants it.

MR. SPEAKER: I again ask the hon. member to confine himself to the Bill. He cannot be allowed to defy the House and my ruling.

MR. J. H. SMITH: Very well, Sir. I ask whether I am entitled to read extracts.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member is entitled to read no extracts that are not pertinent to the measure under discussion. The hon. member must confine himself to the subject matter of the Bill.

MR. J. H. SMITH: Very well, on second considerations I will not attempt to go on. In conclusion, I ask the Minister to

reconsider the position and I remind the Premier of the enormous amount of money he will have to find for compensation alone.

Mr. Richardson: There will be no compensation.

Mr. J. H. SMITH: I draw the hon. member's attention to the hotels the Licenses Reduction Board have closed. I know that the unfair part of it is that there will be no compensation for the hotels to be closed under prohibition when the simple majority becomes law. As for compulsory voting, I remind the Minister that, while one can take a horse to water, it is impossible to make him drink. How is the returning officer to know who among recalcitrant voters have marked their ballot papers informally? Large numbers of people who will refuse to be forced to vote are not in a position to pay a £10 penalty. Many of them have never given the subject of prohibition the slightest consideration. When they are compelled to pay motor car hire and drive miles to the polling booth, probably they will merely mark their voting papers informally. If the Bill reaches the Committee stage, I shall endeavour to amend it by providing that 50½ per cent. of the people must record their votes in the affirmative or negative. I have no interest in the liquor trade to-day, so I am not speaking as an interested party. I am speaking as one who appreciates his liberty, and who claims to have the right to do as he pleases within reason. Is it not fair that if the issue can be carried by a 50½ per cent. vote, it should be possible to restore the original position by a similar majority? I hope the Minister will not tie the hands of his followers, but will permit a free vote on this clause. We do not desire to flout the wishes of the public, but we do object to one section of the community endeavouring to dominate the liberties of other people on this momentous question, and being able to decide it on a snatch vote. Thousands of pounds of capital have been invested in the trade, representing the life savings of many people, and they should receive some protection, especially as the licensing board has been operating and ordering them in some instances to make alterations and additions to the value of £3,000 to £4,000. Yet in one fell swoop, all that is to be brushed away. Under the compulsory voting provision, a penalty of £10 is to be imposed for failure to vote. This is another illustration of the Government's insincerity. The Minister knows it is impossible to collect such a fine. He will have half the people of the country in gaol, and the Government will have to maintain them. Thus the Government will be making more criminals.

Mr. A. Wansbrough: That is a poor argument.

Mr. J. H. SMITH: There are many electors in the Albany electorate who, if they were fined £10, could not pay it. The same

thing applies to any number in my district. I repeat, this is another illustration of the Government's insincerity. It is camouflage to hoodwink the people into voting. Let us provide that there must be a 50½ per cent. vote for or against prohibition. In Queensland I believe 82 per cent. of the people voted at the latest elections.

[The Deputy Speaker took the Chair.]

Mr. MANN (Perth) [11.5] I wish to show that the charges made regarding the consumption of liquor in this State are not so grave as has been alleged. The consumption of liquor is not having any ill-effects upon the people. If it is desired that the sale of liquor under existing conditions should cease, some consideration should be given to the people engaged in the trade. There are two points of view from which we may approach this question, namely, its effect industrially and its effect socially on the people.

Hon. W. D. Johnson: What! This vote? Mr. MANN: The liquor trade finds employment for some thousands of workers.

The Minister for Mines: This Bill does not say it shall not.

Mr. MANN: And it finds hundreds of thousands of pounds of revenue for the development of the State.

The Premier: This is not a prohibition Bill.

Mr. Griffiths: It is a Licensing Act amendment, and prohibition is bound up in it.

Mr. MANN: Are we going to say that by the vote of one individual, thousands of employees are to be thrown out of work, and all the capital invested is to be wasted?

Mr. Hughes: The employees do not get compensation now.

Mr. MANN: How will those thousands of employees, who will lose their livelihood, be absorbed?

The Minister for Lands: How will they be absorbed if prohibition is carried on the three-fifths majority?

Mr. MANN: Under the three-fifths provision greater consideration will be given to the position of these men than will be done by a simple majority.

The Minister for Lands: How will you provide for them? That is the question.

Mr. MANN: Under the simple majority provision, a catch vote taken in the stress of excitement may reveal only one vote in favour of prohibition, and the issue would be carried. If the three-fifths majority was required, the question would receive more consideration.

The Minister for Lands: That does not provide for those who will be out of employment.

Mr. Davy: It would give some stability.

Mr. MANN: The question requires more than a simple majority to decide it.

The Minister for Lands: But you asked what we were going to do to absorb the people thrown out of work.

Mr. MANN: I asked what suggestion have the prohibitionists to offer for the employment of the men who will be thrown out of work.

Mr. Marshall: They could all go into the pulpit.

Mr. MANN: I wish the member for Murchison would make a start.

Mr. Davy: If he did he would not preach prohibition.

Mr. MANN: One of the arguments advanced in favour of prohibition is the effect of drink on the people, and the extent of the crime of drunkenness. I have gone to a little trouble to ascertain the facts. During the years 1920 to 1922 the average of convictions was less than 1 per cent.; yet we were told that the position was serious, and that the trade must be suppressed even by a simple majority.

The Minister for Justice: Who told you that?

Mr. MANN: The Minister, in moving the second reading, said the question should be settled by a simple majority; yet less than one per cent. of convictions for drunkenness were recorded during those two years. Even that does not take into account the fact that some persons were convicted on numerous occasions, and so the number of individuals actually charged with drunkenness was very small.

The Premier: What has that to do with the Bill?

Mr. MANN: If it is not the important matter it is alleged to be, why should the Bill be rushed through in the dying hours of the session?

Hon. W. D. Johnson: It is a voting Bill.

The Premier: It is not a prohibition Bill.

Mr. MANN: If it is not, I do not know what it is.

The Premier: Of course it is not.

Mr. MANN: I have particulars of the quantity of liquor consumed in this State.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I am afraid you are going beyond the question. The question comprises the relative merits of the simple and three-fifths majority, and compulsory voting, and I should like the hon. member to keep within that.

Mr. Griffiths: I rise to a point of order. The short title says this Act may be cited as the Licensing Act Amendment Act 1924, and shall be read as one with the Licensing Act 1911. Is not the member for Perth in order in referring to those points?

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: We are not dealing with the whole of the ramifications of the Licensing Act. Members must stick to the questions dealt with in the Bill.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: We could amend the whole of the Bill.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: No, you could not.

Mr. MANN: I shall endeavour to keep within your ruling, but I feel I am entitled to point out what effect prohibition would have if it were passed.

Mr. Fanton: Do that on the platform.

The Minister for Justice: The same argument would apply to the three-fifths majority.

Mr. MANN: It has been alleged that a considerable quantity of liquor is being consumed to the detriment of the people.

Hon. W. D. Johnson: On a three-fifths majority vote?

Mr. MANN: And that a bare majority vote would have the effect of suppressing the large sale of liquor.

Hon. W. D. Johnson: Where does the Bill say that?

Mr. MANN: The large quantity of liquor consumed amounts to .39 of a gallon per head per year, and of wine the quantity is just half a gallon per head per year.

Hon. W. D. Johnson: Would the three-fifths majority increase it?

Mr. MANN: Do members think that with such a "great" consumption per head of the people, this Bill providing for prohibition on the simple majority should be rushed through at this hour? Should not this Bill receive mature consideration? It is alleged that liquor is filling the gaols and asylums.

The Premier: This Bill does not deal with that matter at all.

The Minister for Mines: On a point of order, the Bill does not provide for prohibition or anti-prohibition; it is merely an amendment of the Licensing Act.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: The Minister cannot make a speech.

The Minister for Mines: I am rising to a point of order.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: What is the point of order?

The Minister for Mines: How dare you get up and interrupt me?

The Premier: The Minister is entitled to state his point of order.

The Minister for Mines: I am entitled to state my point of order; and after I have stated it, the Deputy Speaker will state it if he thinks it of any value. The Bill is a Bill to amend the Licensing Act, and does not provide for prohibition or against prohibition. It provides that a poll shall be taken under certain conditions.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: Is this a point of order?

The Minister for Mines: The Bill further provides for a simple majority as against a three-fifths majority. I ought to know where I stand with regard to this matter better than the Leader of the Opposition.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: There is nothing you don't know.

The Minister for Mines: The point of order is that speeches must be confined to relevancy with regard to the discussion of the measure.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: That matter is left to the Speaker.

The Minister for Mines: The member for Perth is introducing arguments about the quantity of liquor consumed and the number of people who have been convicted—matters totally outside the question. I suggest that in view of the fact that the Bill deals only with certain specific items the discussion cannot go beyond those points.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I thought I had made the matter clear before. I pointed out that members were not relevant in speaking on prohibition or discussing its merits or demerits. The question before the House is the subject matter of the Bill. There are two points in the Bill—the question of the majority and the question of compulsory voting. I ask members to keep within the scope of the Bill and not to discuss the whole question of prohibition.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: What was the point of order, Sir?

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Minister for Mines asked whether the member for Perth was in order in referring to the consumption of alcoholic liquors and so on.

Mr. MANN: Would I be in order in drawing attention to the circumstances that a vote carried by a simple majority will have the effect of throwing out of work thousands of men who are in honest employment to-day, and also throwing out of employment thousands upon thousands of pounds of capital? I want to know whether those who are endeavouring to secure a bare majority vote have considered the number of industrialists who will thereby be thrown idle. Is not the position such as requires very mature consideration? We have to consider all the men who are employed in the growing of barley, hops and horse-feed, in transport work and so on, as well as barmen, barmaids, cellarmen, yardmen, glass blowers, painters, carpenters, paperhangers and manufacturers of every description. And then we have those employed in our vineyards and in the wine-making industry. How do the prohibitionists suggest that these people will be absorbed? Can they suggest any industry that will utilise their labour? And this great revolution of industry is to be allowed by the vote of one individual, probably influenced by excitement and who, in calmer moments, and with more consideration would have taken a different view of the position. It is absolute nonsense to compare our position with America.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I do not see anything in the Bill regarding those matters.

Mr. MANN: I contend that a matter of such vast importance should not be decided by a simple majority, but by a substantial majority, in order that the measure may have the people behind it. The Australian is not the man to be rushed into a position he does not desire to occupy.

The Minister for Mines: He won't be.

Mr. MANN: If prohibition is carried by a three-fifths majority there will be a reasonable prospect of its being put into operation, and of effect being given to the law; but if we endeavour to force upon the majority of the people a law carried by a minority we shall need to double the police force and to double their pay. If prohibition was carried by a simple majority I should like to be the proprietor of an hotel in Port Augusta, because we should see every train coming from Port Augusta loaded up with liquor to be consumed in this State.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! I ask the hon. member to get back to the question.

Mr. MANN: With a three-fifths majority the law will have the bulk of the people behind it, but if it is carried by a minority—

Hon. W. D. Johnson: Why three-fifths and not four-fifths?

Mr. MANN: The hon. member can move to make it four-fifths if he desires still greater security. The three-fifths majority has worked well up to now.

Hon. W. D. Johnson: But where has the three-fifths majority come from?

Mr. MANN: Taking all matters into consideration and knowing what the effect of this Bill will be and how difficult it will be to put into operation, I must oppose the second reading.

Mr. RICHARDSON (Subiaco) [11.21]: My views on the question of the simple majority or otherwise are so well known that I need not say much to-night. I have been struck, however, with the many side issues which have been introduced into this debate. To my way of thinking the argument has not been directed against the simple majority, nor yet against the three-fifths majority. The argument has been based on the fear in the minds of some members that we are going to get prohibition, just because the people will probably vote for it. I do not think it is reasonable for us to suppose that anything of the sort is going to happen. We know perfectly well that when this question goes to the country, either on simple majority or on three-fifths majority, both sides of it will be put plainly to the people. Thus it will become a matter for the people to decide. Many years ago this Parliament, before the majority of us had the honour to be members here, decided that the question should be referred to the people for their

decision. What we are debating to-night is not a question of prohibition or non-prohibition, but a question of how the vote shall be taken. That is the whole issue as regards the simple majority. If anyone here can show me that his vote is worth three-fifths of a unit whilst mine is worth only two-fifths, I shall be prepared to agree that the trend of my thoughts has been in a wrong direction.

Mr. Davy: The same thing applies to every question—say, smoking.

Mr. RICHARDSON: One man's vote is as good as another man's. On this particular question, however, because of the fear that prohibition may be introduced, one man's vote is to be considered worth three-fifths of a unit and the other man's vote only two-fifths. Like the member for Guildford (Hon. W. D. Johnson) I want to know on what basis that calculation has been arrived at. The privilege of the general elector is being taken away by his being asked to score three-fifths as against two-fifths. Working on the simple majority, however, one man is given the same voting power as another.

Mr. Davy: Why not put the thing to the people on the question of smoking, or of wearing collars and ties?

Mr. RICHARDSON: That is an argument against putting the question to the people at all.

Mr. Davy: I quite agree. It never ought to be put to the people.

Mr. RICHARDSON: Let me say to the member for West Perth (Mr. Davy) that it has already been decided that this question should go before the people. An honourable understanding to that effect was arrived at in 1911, and that honourable understanding is going to be carried out. The present question simply resolves itself into whether we shall send the issue to the people on the basis of a simple majority or a three-fifths majority. If an agitation arises against smoking or anything else of the kind and the agitation is sufficiently strong to influence members of this House to say that the issue is too large for them and must be sent to the people for their decision, then it should be sent to the people upon a simple majority basis.

Mr. Davy: You should alter the Standing Orders of the House, too, then.

Mr. RICHARDSON: It has been said here to-night that perhaps less than 50 per cent. of the electors of Western Australia may carry prohibition. It is inferred or insinuated that not the whole of the electors on the roll will vote. Why should we always pay so much attention to the people who refrain from voting, because they are not sufficiently interested to go to the poll? Is it right to assume that the people who refrain from going to the poll are people who would vote against prohibition? Probably those who remain away will be fifty-fifty, for and against prohibition.

Mr. Davy: No fear!

Mr. RICHARDSON: Thus the result from a full poll would be the same. Not one attempt has been made by those opposed to this Bill to prove that the simple majority is wrong or that there ever has been an instance of a referendum in connection with which the simple majority has not been enforced. Therefore, I claim it is right from a democratic standpoint that we should send this question to the electors for decision by simple majority. I have listened with great interest to the many side issues which have been introduced to cloud the main issue. Many men who believe in simple majority believe in prohibition. It is wrong to suppose that even with a simple majority decision we shall have prohibition. One might just as well say that with a three-fifths majority we are certain to get prohibition. I am not going into the probabilities of prohibition bringing with it bootlegging and liquor-running and the unemployment which the member for Perth (Mr. Mann) spoke about. This Bill is just a question of the value of votes, and that is the point we are discussing. I know of no case in Australian history where any question has been referred to the electors except to be decided by simple majority.

Mr. Davy: Nothing has ever been sent to the electors to be decided.

Mr. RICHARDSON: I beg to differ. There may be a distinction without a difference. In Australia we have had many referendums and they have all been decided on simple majority. Whether the referendums were to give the Government certain powers or only to give them certain instructions is a matter which does not concern me or any member of this House in the present connection. Such referendums as have been taken have been decided by simple majority. Let us not cloud this issue. I have made my position clear whenever I have spoken on this subject. Like the member for Menzies (Mr. Panton) I have no reason to be grateful to the opponents of prohibition. They have attempted the same thing with me as they have attempted with that hon. member. I want to see fair play given to both sides, and the only means by which we can do that is to submit the question to the people on the simple majority basis. If the Government had not included compulsory voting in the Bill I would still have voted for the simple majority, and so far as the members of the Government are concerned they are not going to let the simple majority go by the board without having a compulsory vote. I consider again that those who stay away from the polling booth should lose their vote and we should not give them a moment's consideration. If we have a compulsory vote the matter should be decided by the majority who take a sufficient interest in it for or against. Something has been said with regard to the financial side of the ques-

tion. I am speaking from memory, but I think that if we get prohibition the Treasurer will not lose any sleep over his loss. The revenue that the State draws from the liquor traffic amounts to between £50,000 and £60,000 as against over £600,000 obtained by the Commonwealth and for which we get no return whatever. Therefore it is folly to talk about the loss that the State is likely to suffer.

Mr. Mann: And who is to absorb the unemployed?

Mr. RICHARDSON: Great Scot! Here again the member for Perth is trotting along the supposititious problem of how to deal with the unemployed.

The Premier: Even if prohibition were carried with the three-fifths majority, there would be unemployed.

Mr. RICHARDSON: That question does not appeal to me. I hope that the Bill will be carried so that we may have the poll during the forthcoming year. Many members have criticised the Government for bringing the Bill in at this late hour. The Government certainly gave their promise that they would submit the measure at the earliest opportunity. The present may not be the earliest opportunity, but it is early enough and in sufficient time to meet the requirements of the poll that is to take place.

Mr. STUBBS (Wagin) [11.34]: But for the remarks of the previous speaker I should not have spoken. I should merely have recorded my vote in favour of the three-fifths majority. I was struck during the course of the previous speaker's remarks by the fact that he omitted one important point when he said that the people who did not go to the poll were not worthy of consideration. If the hon. member had travelled through the North-West in company with other members of Parliament a few years ago, from one end of the Kimberleys to the other, he might then have asked himself what community of interests there were between the people of Subiaco and the people in the North-West. No community of interests whatever. The people of Subiaco may think there is too much drinking going on in Perth, and that it was time a halt was made. Those people however know nothing about the conditions of the community who live in the far north, and some of those people are hundreds of miles from a polling booth. The member for Subiaco says they should not count. Is it because they happen to be so far away?

The Premier: Those people will have the same opportunity of voting as anyone else.

Mr. STUBBS: Every Parliament during the last 17 years—the period that I have been a member of this House—has endeavoured to tinker with the licensing laws and eventually it was decided that there should be a poll in 1925. That gave the hotel-

keepers an opportunity of knowing that when 1925 came round, prohibition might be carried and that there would be no compensation. During the last few years there have been altered circumstances in many of the electorates of the State. In my own electorate, for instance, a new district sprang up a few years ago and if any hon. member went to Lake Grace as I did on a score of occasions, and saw women and children sleeping in railway coaches and under trees because there was no accommodation, he would have sympathised with those people. I have no desire to be parochial, but I must mention that two young men were induced on account of the existing conditions to erect a hotel in that district at a cost of between £10,000 and £11,000. They undertook that work in the belief that the existing Act would not be altered. The member for Subiaco now defends the Bill before us. Most of the people in the State stand for the three-fifths majority and if a vote is taken on that majority I feel convinced that prohibition will not come into force. It is my intention to vote against the Bill before us.

Mr. NORTH (Claremont) [11.38]: When I was contesting the election for the Claremont seat I was asked a question that I have no doubt most hon. members were asked with reference to the views I held on the subject we are now dealing with, and I stated then, as I say now, that I believed in a State-wide poll, an absolute majority and compulsory voting. I notice in the Bill there is no satisfactory provision for insuring compulsory voting, and therefore I shall be bound to oppose it because it does not carry out the pledge that I made to my electors. The present law provides that a 30 per cent. majority can bring into effect the reform by a referendum. The Bill intends to go much further. Surely the Government are trying to make the position stronger and more advantageous for the liquor reform members of the community than is the position to-day, but that is not the only possibility. Admittedly there is a risk that some thousands, or perhaps tens of thousands may not vote, and I take it that many members have no desire that legislation should be passed on what might be called a sporting chance.

Hon. W. D. Johnson: And you have pledged yourself to it.

Mr. NORTH: Yes, on a State-wide poll, an absolute majority and compulsory voting. To-day only 30 per cent. of those on the roll need vote for prohibition to bring it about, whereas in my opinion, if the measure be passed and a vote be taken on a simple majority of the whole of the electors, there will be a likelihood of defeating prohibition. The pertinent question may be asked, how could one bring about compulsory voting to ensure an absolute majority.

It is difficult to answer that, but we are not here to answer questions of that description.

Hon. W. D. Johnson: Did you express an opinion on the elections?

Mr. NORTH: Yes. For many years I have thought that the method of voting as a whole in this community is cumbersome, costly, and causes needless trouble. If it is the intention of the Government to have compulsory voting, they might arrange a system on the turnstile principle and herd people in paddocks and then tick them off one by one. There would thus be no spoiling of ballot papers, no risk and no uncertainty. It is necessary to safeguard the community by taking more than usual precautions in a question of this nature. We here are attacking morals and customs and whenever anyone attacks morals or customs or anything that the community make a practice of indulging in, there is bound to be opposition. But when we pass laws, but possibly by representatives of hardly 30 per cent. of the electors, we are dealing with questions where the minority and not the majority are being reformed. In the case of ordinary legislation affecting only a few delinquents, the process is simple, but when we are attacking widespread fashion, morals or customs, we are on more dangerous ground. I say it is physically possible to have compulsory voting and prevent the spoiling of ballot papers in this particular question by doing away with the ballot. As the Bill is before us we are not supporting a measure in favour of an absolute majority at all. We are supporting a measure which might lead to greater abuses than is possible under the present law.

Mr. LINDSAY (Toodyay) [11.44]: It is necessary that one should not give a silent vote on a question such as this. I have no intention to go back on what I stated during the election campaign. I said that if the majority of the people on the roll voted in favour of prohibition I would be prepared to agree. I do not say this Bill will not give us that. I am surprised to hear the statements of Ministers as to what occurred in Queensland. The Honorary Minister, Mr. Munsie, stated that 97 per cent. of the people of that State voted, and the Minister for Mines said that 92 per cent. had done so.

The Minister for Mines: At one election.

Mr. LINDSAY: The Commonwealth "Year Book" states that at the elections held in May, 1915, the principle of compulsory voting was introduced for the first time in Australia. Of the total number of electors enrolled at the 1923 elections, over 82 per cent. went to the poll. Statistics regarding the five elections of which there is a record are also given. In 1912, without compulsory voting, the votes cast totalled 75.52 per cent. In 1915, with compulsory

voting, the votes cast totalled 88.14 per cent. In 1918, when the next elections were held, under compulsory voting the total dropped to 80.27, and in 1922 the total dropped to 79.93. At the last elections in 1923 the total rose to over 82 per cent. One can see that there is still a large number of people on the rolls who do not attempt to vote.

Mr. Chesson: But very often the rolls are inflated.

Mr. LINDSAY: I am replying to the statement of Ministers. They seem to take Queensland for their bible.

The Minister for Mines: That does not include unopposed returns in the case of non-contested elections.

Mr. LINDSAY: If there was no contest there would be no voting. The member for West Perth (Mr. Davy) said that when it came to a question of dealing with important problems this House must have an absolute majority of the House before a Bill could be dealt with. The member for Guildford (Hon. W. D. Johnson) stated that this is what the Bill means. There is nothing to say in the compulsory voting system in Queensland that the majority of the people must vote before a Bill can be dealt with. If the Bill were amended to provide that over 50 per cent. of the electors on the roll should vote in favour of it, I would agree, but it does not say that now. I think in the Labour organisations, if a change in the constitution is required, it must be effected by a two-thirds majority. That is the case in the organisation with which I am connected. That is done to avoid snatch votes being taken and in order to stabilise the constitution. Prohibition is one of the biggest things this House can possibly deal with. Why should we not have some stability? If we are going to have this decided on a simple majority, are we going to provide that a simple majority may restore licenses? If it is fair in one direction it is fair in another. I know of no organisation whose constitution does not contain some provision to make it safe, either that the voting shall be by a two-thirds majority or by an absolute majority of the votes, before the constitution can be changed.

Hon. W. D. Johnson: A two-thirds majority and a simple majority are two different things.

Mr. LINDSAY: How did they get prohibition in America, and how can they alter the system? I believe it is necessary to have a three-fifths majority there. If it is decided to alter things there, the people should be able to do so by the same means that the first alteration was effected. Prohibition was brought in at a critical period during the war, otherwise the people of America would not have had it. If this Bill were amended so that an absolute majority of those on the roll are compelled to vote in favour of or against prohibition, I would agree. We require some stability about our

laws, particularly when such an important alteration as this is under consideration.

[The Speaker resumed the Chair.]

Hon. W. D. JOHNSON (Guildford) [11.50]: I should like to reply to some of the arguments raised concerning this Bill. We have heard a lot about matters that could well be left until the people have an opportunity of deciding the question. The advocates of anti-prohibition or prohibition will then have their opportunity of delivering some of the speeches they have delivered to-night, and some that were not allowed to be delivered. In regard to matters raised by the member for West Perth (Mr. Davy) and endorsed by the member for Toodyay (Mr. Lindsay), I would say that we cannot amend anything affecting the constitution, of vital importance in this Chamber, unless we have an absolute majority of the members present. That is as it should be. We say exactly the same thing in this Bill. We say that this is a big question and that it should not be decided upon a catch vote. The reason why in our Standing Orders we provide that all matters affecting the constitution must be voted on by a majority of members is to prevent a catch vote upon an important question. After we have got a majority of members present, an absolute majority decides the issue. We do not want anything beyond that. All we say is there must be a representative gathering of members, a majority of the whole, and once that majority is present one vote or a simple majority of those voting decides the issue.

Mr. Lindsay: I think you are wrong.

Hon. W. D. JOHNSON: Yes. We must have one more than half of the members in the House, and that is a simple majority of the House.

Mr. E. B. Johnston: Of those entitled to vote.

Hon. W. D. JOHNSON: One vote would decide the issue. In order to prevent there being a catch vote, we say there must be an absolute majority present before a question can be decided. We say in the Bill that, in order that this shall not happen, compulsory voting shall be insisted upon and that every elector shall vote. We cannot enforce that to the extent possible in this Chamber because we have not the power.

Mr. E. B. Johnston: You can say that 50 per cent. of those on the roll must vote for prohibition.

Hon. W. D. JOHNSON: If it were provided in that way, people would be allowed deliberately to stay away in order to prevent the settlement of the issue. In this Chamber we can enforce a decision one way or the other, but when we leave it without any penalty the people will refuse to vote, and the whole thing will go by the board. What we want is to get the people to recognise that this is a question belonging to them, and that it shall not be

dealt with on a catch vote, but must be a representative vote of the people. The member for Claremont (Mr. North) takes up an extraordinary attitude. It would be interesting to find out how he can justify this before his constituents. He admits that he promised he would agree to a simple majority, and a State-wide poll with compulsory voting. When the question was submitted to him it was done in a fashion that had been advocated time after time in this Chamber, and advocated by different candidates in the various constituencies, and it was a definite plank of the political party which the hon. member was opposing. The candidate who stood against the hon. member was on the platform advocating the simple majority vote, a State-wide poll on the compulsory voting basis.

Mr. North: A simple majority only.

Hon. W. D. JOHNSON: No. I know the candidate and have heard him. He promised he would vote for and support a simple majority on this question on a State-wide poll on the compulsory voting basis. The hon. member said he was in favour of that. He used the same words as the man he defeated. While he pledged himself to his constituents, he is trying to get out of it by saying that the kind of compulsory voting in this Bill is not the kind he had in mind at the time. If the hon. gentleman had some special brand of compulsory voting, he was in honour bound to give it to his constituents so that they might understand what he meant. If the hon. member is going to carry out his pledge, he must stand for exactly the same as the man he successfully opposed stood for.

Mr. North: He did not frame this Bill.

Hon. W. D. JOHNSON: The Bill was framed by the party in whose interests the other candidate was contesting the election. That candidate was pledged to advocate the same thing as the member for Menzies, and other members and I advocate. If the member for Claremont pledged himself to the people to do this, then he should support this Bill. I leave it to him to decide whether or not that is so.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: This is not compulsory voting.

Hon. W. D. JOHNSON: The next point is this: it is said that people have invested their money in hotels, and did so on the understanding that a law existed providing for a three-fifths majority and that this would not be altered. They had no right to come to the conclusion that it would not be altered. The fact that the Assembly passed that measure and declared for a three-fifths majority is sufficient indication that it might declare for something else at any time.

The Minister for Lands: And we gave them 10 years previously.

Hon. W. D. JOHNSON: Undoubtedly. The fact that the three-fifths majority was carried by only four votes in this Chamber

was an indication that it was not likely to be accepted as final. The vote that declared for a three-fifths majority was carried by 19 to 15. It was not a representative vote of the Chamber. There was such a small majority that anyone who thought seriously of the question must come to the conclusion that there was a likelihood of the matter being reconsidered. Suppose that is not so, have we not on various occasions done things to alter the law in this House that have injured people to a greater extent than this Bill will injure people if the vote is cast as members say it will be cast? If these hotels in which capital has been invested are going to be closed, are they going to suffer any more than other people have suffered as the result of the action that took from the women and children that which they were enjoying? Take the miners on the Kalgoorlie goldfields. They had an award of the court giving them certain wages. A political opportunity presented itself to so constitute and pack the court that it deprived these men unjustly of what they had enjoyed.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: I rise to a point of order. No political opportunity came along. I object to the statement.

Mr. Marshall: Why should you object?

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: I do object. I know to what the hon. member is referring. He said that a political opportunity came along to pack the court for the purpose of dealing with wages on the goldfields. This amounts to contemptible meanness on the part of the hon. member. He has reflected upon members on this side.

Mr. SPEAKER: Is the point of order that the hon. member reflected upon the court or upon the Leader of the Opposition?

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: The point of order is that he reflected upon the Government of the day.

Mr. Thomson: On the court as well as on the judge.

Mr. SPEAKER: I ask the hon. member to endeavour to confine himself to the Bill.

Hon. W. D. JOHNSON: I am not reflecting upon the Leader of the Opposition. If he applies my remarks to himself, I do not wish him to do so. It is a matter for his own judgment.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: I say your statement is not true.

Hon. W. D. JOHNSON: I am merely stating facts.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: It is contemptible meanness on your part!

Hon. W. D. JOHNSON: I say that when the opportunity came along for the wages the men had been enjoying to be reduced considerably below what they had a right to expect, that opportunity was available of.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: That is different.

Hon. W. D. JOHNSON: When the standard of living was reduced, it meant that the women and children, as well as the

workers, were not able to enjoy a reasonable standard of comfort. In these circumstances we must realise the risk the men had to run. However, it is a risk we all have to take, and I see no reason why people should not accept the risk under the Bill. Greater injustices than those suggested have been experienced under other legislation. The people affected by the Bill will, it has been stated, have their security interfered with. If Parliament permitted that security to obtain, then that is no argument why people who allowed the benefits of these investments to accrue, should not have the right to be heard in deciding whether the trade should continue or not. These arguments will have some weight with the people when the poll is being taken, and that will be the time for these arguments to be advanced. There is no doubt that all these questions will be raised during the course of the prohibition campaign. We have had references to ministers of religion declaring their attitude in certain directions. Those facts will be taken into consideration by the people in due course. The question is whether there shall be an opportunity for an expression of opinion on the part of the people as a whole. There will be no catch vote. The poll will be taken under the best possible means of guaranteeing that there shall be a representative vote. The member for Claremont (Mr. North) suggested putting all his electors in a paddock.

Mr. North: I was speaking figuratively, of course.

Hon. W. D. JOHNSON: That may be all right for his constituency. He could have the people run in through the turnstile at the show grounds, and get his decision there, but that would not apply to my electorate, for instance, for the people would have to be driven from both ends and it might not be so effectively done. Then reference has been made to the position in the outer areas. As it is, we go as far as it is humanly possible to get a proper expression of opinion by the people. Wherever compulsory voting has been used, it has increased the number of people who have gone to the poll. Even if at the outset compulsory voting does not prove wholly successful, the position will improve as time goes on. We have compulsory enrolment now and we have had to face difficulties. Penalties have had to be imposed and people have been fined because they have not placed their names upon the rolls. They have been fined £2 or more.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: No one has ever been fined £2.

Hon. W. D. JOHNSON: The fines may have been 2s. or 5s. I was referring to the penalties provided in the Act. Whatever the fines may have been, they have had some effect. Nowadays people come to one's door and ask for assistance to fill

in the electoral claim cards so as to avoid prosecution. It is possible, therefore, that the first prohibition vote will not be as large as the second vote that will be taken. I believe that if fines are imposed upon those who do not vote, the subsequent vote will be much higher. I believe we shall have to do a lot of work before we get prohibition. If better arguments cannot be advanced in favour of the three-fifths majority, or against prohibition, than have been voiced to-night, then the way of the reformer will not be very difficult. We can claim that the Bill is a just one because we can produce arguments to demonstrate that the simple majority is the honest way to get an expression of public opinion, whereas the stipulation for a three-fifths majority benefits one section of the community at the expense of another. That is not democratic, and cannot be supported by argument. But the simple majority provision is in operation in many ways. It has been sufficiently demonstrated that it is the only way to get a true expression of opinion from the people. It has been established throughout the world that the liquor problem is one that should be decided by a vote of the people as a whole. The Leader of the Opposition has declared in favour of submitting this question to the people. The member for West Perth (Mr. Davy) was pleased that the question was to be decided by a vote of the people, because it enabled him to say that as it was to go before them by way of a referendum, he would accept the decision of the people. The only question at issue during the last election was whether the basis upon which the vote should be taken, should be the three-fifths majority or the simple majority. Those advocating the simple majority were successful at the polls, consequently the Bill has been introduced. The member for Claremont, on his own utterances, must support the Bill.

Mr. SAMPSON (Swan) [12.10]: When the Bill was before the House in 1922 I supported the taking of the poll on a three-fifths majority. I recognise this is a non-party measure, and I recognise the disinclination that the Government feel in bringing it forward. It has been delayed, but it has been brought down at last. I know it will be passed by this Chamber. We can, however, with all sincerity congratulate ourselves as citizens upon the standard of sobriety attained. That such great progress has been made during the past comparatively few months in connection with liquor reform, is largely due to the Licensing Act Amendment Act dealt with during the time the Mitchell Government were in power. That Act has been responsible for the improvement in the position. It is unusual nowadays to see anyone in the street the worse for

liquor; certainly it is much more unusual than it was a few years ago. Gradually by evolution, this has been brought about. It is the right way by which reforms must be achieved. The Government of the day did what was possible to amend the existing legislation and took important steps in that direction. Provisions were included in the Act that have materially assisted those who are imbued with a desire for temperance reform. I have no reason to alter the opinions I held when that legislation was brought in. When certain matters of grave importance are brought before Parliament, an absolute majority is required before it is possible to deal with such problems. This measure does not even require that 50 per cent. of the electors shall vote, but merely requires a simple majority of those voting. I do not think the final result will be good. Although it is claimed that voting will be compulsory, almost any excuse will suffice for abstaining from voting. An elector will be able to say that his horse cast a shoe, and the excuse will be accepted. We are already on the right path, and we shall be well advised to continue the progress we are making. In 1922 the House decided to take certain steps, yet already it is proposed to reverse that decision. I oppose the second reading.

Mr. SLEEMAN (Fremantle) [12.17]: The Government have been accused of political dishonesty in introducing the Bill in another place. I congratulate the Government on having done as they did. They had an idea that it was of no use wasting hours of discussion here, and then having the Bill rejected in a few moments in another place. And I am pleased that, leave having been refused to introduce the Bill in another place, the Government were strong enough to introduce it here. It has been said that this was not made a subject at the recent elections. Certainly I was asked many times for my attitude on it. The member for Nelson (Mr. J. H. Smith) said the movement had not come from the honest section of the community. I say it has come from the dinkum honest section, namely, the workers. It was discussed and agreed to at the annual congress, delegates having been previously instructed how to vote upon it.

Mr. Teesdale: How did the brewery employees vote?

Mr. SLEEMAN: They were there, and they had to abide by majority rule. Very likely some of them voted in favour of it.

Mr. Teesdale: If they wanted to lose their jobs, yes.

Mr. SLEEMAN: Other members have told us we are interfering with the liberty of the subject. If it comes to that, we interfere with the liberty of the subject every day in the week. Even the churches have been brought in, the member for West

Perth (Mr. Davy) referring to the Anglican Church. As a member of the Anglican community I am not prepared to allow the member for West Perth to speak for me and say that my church is against it.

Mr. Mann: The leader of the church is.

Mr. SLEEMAN: No, he has never made a public utterance on this Bill. He is opposed to prohibition, but that is not the Bill. I am not a prohibitionist, and when I vote in April next it will not be as a prohibitionist. But I am democratic, and therefore I vote for a simple majority with one vote, one value. The Bill represents the only fair way to deal with this business.

Mr. BROWN (Pingelly) [12.20]: Prohibition is a burning question throughout the State because the vote is to be taken next year. I am not a prohibitionist. I am like Timothy or Paul—I often take a drop of wine for my stomach's sake. But also I am a democrat. When on the hustings I was asked my opinion on the liquor question I said I was not a prohibitionist. When I was asked was I in favour of a simple majority I said "No, except with compulsory voting." Therefore, to be consistent with my statement on the hustings, I feel it my duty to vote for the second reading of the Bill. During my election I explained how compulsory voting could be brought into effect. I said that if we had a system of voting based on the census, scarcely a voter would escape. It would give a 90 to 95 per cent. vote. If on such a poll a simple majority said they wanted prohibition, I should agree to give it to them. We have heard a good deal from the member for Nelson (Mr. J. H. Smith). When we have this simple majority poll every man with the courage of his convictions can go forth and express them. If a majority of the people say they want prohibition, by all means let them have it. The Bill will ensure that a majority of the people on the rolls shall record their votes. However, I feel the Government are convinced that there is no chance of the Bill being passed.

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

Ayes	26
Noes	15
Majority for	11

AYES.

Mr. Angwin	Mr. Hughes
Mr. Chesson	Mr. W. D. Johnson
Mr. Clydesdale	Mr. Kennedy
Mr. Collier	Mr. Lamond
Mr. Corboy	Mr. Lindsay
Mr. Coverley	Mr. Lutey
Mr. Cunningham	Mr. Marshall
Mr. Heron	Mr. McCallum

AYES—continued.

Mr. Millington	Mr. Thomson
Mr. Munzie	Mr. Troy
Mr. Pantou	Mr. A. Van 'brough
Mr. Richardson	Mr. Willcock
Mr. Sleeman	Mr. Wilson

(Teller.)

NOES.

Mr. Barnard	Sir James Mitchell
Mr. Davy	Mr. North
Mr. Denton	Mr. Sampson
Mr. Griffiths	Mr. J. H. Smith
Mr. E. B. Johnston	Mr. Taylor
Mr. Lindsay	Mr. Teesdale
Mr. Maley	Mr. Stubbs
Mr. Mann	

(Teller.)

PAIRS.

AYES.	NOES.
Mr. Lambert	Mr. Angelo
Mr. Withers	Mr. Latham
Mr. Holman	Mr. George

Question thus passed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Mr. Lutey in the Chair; the Minister for Justice in charge of the Bill.

Clause 1—agreed to.

Clause 2—Amendment of Section 100:

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: I ask the Government to insert a compulsory voting clause that will be effective if they want compulsory voting. This clause cannot possibly be effective. Nothing will happen to a man who does not vote.

The Premier: I do not know how we can make it more effective.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: I do not see how it could have been made less effective. Make the penalty fit the offence.

The Premier: There is a penalty.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: It is provided that the returning officer shall write to the person who neglects to vote, and if the explanation is satisfactory, there will be no prosecution. Any excuse will do.

The Premier: Not any excuse.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: If we are to have compulsory voting, make it effective.

The Premier: I know of no other way of doing it.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: You could not have a worse way than this. I do not favour compulsory voting under this measure.

The Minister for Justice: It will be the duty of every elector to vote.

Mr. Mann: So it is now.

The Minister for Justice: No, it is not. Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: Of course it is.

The Premier: Not his legal duty.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: If it is to be compulsory voting, it should be made effective.

Mr. E. B. JOHNSTON: As soon as local option was brought in there was no compensation. But it has always been recognised that there should be a three-fifths majority, and the House, feeling there would then be sufficient weight of public opinion, agreed to the principle of no compensation. I agree that if a three-fifths majority were accepted, there should be no compensation, but if we alter entirely the conditions of the vote there should be compensation. Compensation has never been urged except when a bare majority vote is proposed. I do not mind if the Government close hotels without a referendum, so long as they give full and adequate compensation. I want compensation provided for the employees who lose their work as well as for the vignerons, lessees, licensees and owners. I suggest an amendment as follows:—

Add to paragraph (a) of Clause 2, the following words:—"and a new proviso is substituted therefor as follows:—'Provided that no such proposal shall take effect unless three-fifths of the votes given throughout the State have been cast in favour thereof, or provision has been made by Parliament for payment of adequate compensation to—(i) Every owner, lessee, and licensee of any licensed premises which shall become delicensed on a proposal that prohibition shall come into force being given effect to; (ii) Every grower of grapes for the manufacture of wine or brandy and every manufacturer of wine, brandy, or beer who shall be prejudicially affected by prohibition coming into force; and (iii) Any person employed by a grower of grapes or by an hotelkeeper, or by a manufacturer of wine, brandy, or beer who shall suffer pecuniary loss owing to being deprived of employment as the result of such a proposal being brought into operation.'"

If a three-fifths majority is cast for prohibition there would be no compensation at all. It is important that that should be understood. If the majority is less than three-fifths, then effect should not be given to the poll until provision had been made by Parliament for the payment of adequate compensation to the whole of those concerned in the liquor trade. This is entirely logical. We have said we would have prohibition on the three-fifths majority. That was put into the law in 1911 and renewed in the measure of two years ago. When subsequently the Government said that certain hotels should be closed by a board irrespective of the voting, compensation was provided payable by the trade. It is interesting to recall that on the Kalgoorlie goldfields a record for Australia was established in that 29 hotels were closed in one day by this excellent board.

The Premier: Why have you made no provision for compensation for the girls employed in hotels?

Mr. E. B. JOHNSTON: Any person employed is to receive compensation.

The Premier: I thought you had overlooked the girls.

Mr. E. B. JOHNSTON: No one has been overlooked. The whole of the people who have been robbed of their employment have been included. I admit that compensation should be provided by the trade. That is the ideal system, and if this Government would give sufficient time for the trade to provide compensation I should be quite satisfied. That is the principle now adopted in the closing of hotels by the licensing board.

Mr. Hughes: Why did not you try to include the employees in the compensation provisions on the last occasion?

Mr. E. B. JOHNSTON: They should have been included. I have always favoured complete compensation for those affected by arbitrary laws of this kind. This House has realised that if any departure is to be made from the three-fifths majority, there should be compensation. The board have been given the power to close hotels wherever considered desirable, even in districts where continuance has been carried. All of the 29 Kalgoorlie licensees whose hotels were closed have been fully compensated out of funds provided by the trade. If the Government depart from the law that has been recognised for so many years, the people who vote for this drastic alteration should be prepared to see that full and adequate compensation is paid.

The CHAIRMAN: The proposed amendment seems contradictory, and I think it imposes a charge on the revenue.

Mr. E. B. JOHNSTON: There is no charge.

The Minister for Justice: Who will pay compensation?

Mr. E. B. JOHNSTON: The Government.

The Premier: Then you will want a message.

The CHAIRMAN: I think the amendment is out of order.

Mr. E. B. JOHNSTON: If you intend to rule that way when I move the amendment, I shall have to dissent from your ruling.

Mr. J. H. SMITH: I trust the Premier and the Minister for Justice will be reasonable as regards the reduction of the majority. Two-thirds would be a fair thing. I move an amendment—

That in paragraph (a), line 1, "a majority" be struck out, and "two-thirds" inserted in lieu.

The MINISTER FOR JUSTICE: I shall not accept the amendment, because the Bill has been introduced for a certain purpose, from which the amendment departs.

Mr. J. H. Smith: Two-thirds would be meeting you half way.

The MINISTER FOR JUSTICE: I cannot accept the amendment.

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

Ayes	14
Noes	25

Majority against	..	11
------------------	----	----

AYES.

Mr. Barnard	Mr. James Mitchell
Mr. Davy	Mr. North
Mr. Denton	Mr. Sampson
Mr. Griffiths	Mr. J. H. Smith
Mr. E. B. Johnston	Mr. Taylor
Mr. Maley	Mr. Teesdale
Mr. Mann	Mr. Stubbs

(Teller.)

NOES.

Mr. Angwin	Mr. Lindsay
Mr. Brown	Mr. Marshall
Mr. Chesson	Mr. McCallum
Mr. Clydesdale	Mr. Millington
Mr. Collier	Mr. Munro
Mr. Corbey	Mr. Panton
Mr. Coverley	Mr. Richardson
Mr. Cunningham	Mr. Sleeman
Mr. Heron	Mr. Troy
Mr. Hughes	Mr. A. Wansbrough
Mr. W. D. Johnson	Mr. Willcock
Mr. Kennedy	Mr. Wilson
Mr. Lamond	

(Teller.)

PAIRS.

AYES.	NOES.
Mr. Angelo	Mr. Lambert
Mr. George	Mr. Holman
Mr. Latham	Mr. Withers

Amendment thus negatived.

Mr. DAVY: I understand the Government desire this question to be decided by a simple majority of the people of Western Australia, and accordingly I move an amendment—

That in paragraph (a) after "a majority," in line 1, there be inserted "of the total number of persons entitled to be enrolled for the Legislative Assembly."

If less than a majority, not of the people who happen to go to the poll, but of the people in the State—

The Minister for Lands: How can you find that out? The Commonwealth can't. Your leader has been at the Commonwealth authorities about that for years. Be a little bit sensible!

Mr. DAVY: Is it sensible to put on our statute-book a law under which fewer than a majority of the people who live here and pay taxes and have the right to vote will be enabled to dominate the private lives and personal habits of the whole community? The people on the roll do not necessarily re-

present the people who ought to be on the roll. Frequently the rolls are a screaming farce, and yet the Bill proposes that the question of prohibition shall be decided on those rolls! If we carry prohibition, unless there is an overwhelming majority we shall require a number of persons to enforce the law, such a number in fact that we shall not be able to afford. We may also expect to have a number of decent and reputable citizens against this particular law and their conscience will not prick them when they break it.

Hon. W. D. Johnson: You should not say that.

Mr. DAVY: I do say it.

Hon. W. D. Johnson: If I broke the law would you agree with my action?

Mr. DAVY: No, but there are certain limitations, and we cannot enforce a law that is not believed in by a majority of the people.

Mr. HUGHES: The hon. member practically says "If there are enough of you, disobey the law."

Mr. Davy: Did I say that?

The CHAIRMAN: I did not hear the hon. member say it.

Mr. HUGHES: Well, I heard it.

Mr. Davy: Nothing of the kind.

Mr. HUGHES: The hon. member said that unless there was a sufficient majority, there would be no chance of enforcing the law. The Leader of the Opposition also said that if the majority was not favourable to the Bill it would not be possible to enforce it. For hundreds of years minorities have been forcing their will on the majorities.

Mr. Davy: That is what is called tyranny.

Mr. HUGHES: That is what we find in our own State, and that the majorities submit to it. If the doctrine laid down by our ultra-radical friends opposite is adopted, unless we have an absolute majority at the poll, the people will not obey the law.

Mr. North: That is when you are attacking customs.

Mr. HUGHES: We are always attacking customs when we pass laws. If no Bill can be passed except by an absolute majority, Parliament will become a farce. A representative in Parliament can only represent those who record their votes at the poll.

Mr. Mann: Are you suggesting that the Government have not a majority of the people behind them?

Mr. HUGHES: They have behind them a big majority of the people who went to the poll, but I doubt whether they have an absolute majority of the people enrolled who voted for them at the last elections. Not more than 63 per cent., I think, of the people went to the poll. I do not think any Government can say they have had 51 per cent. of the total number of the electors enrolled voting for them. The amendment would nullify the clause. How can we find out who is entitled to be enrolled for the Legislative Assembly? The Opposition say,

"If you have a majority, do not obey the law."

Mr. Taylor: You, Mr. Chairman, have already told the hon. member that that statement was not made, but he is repeating it.

The CHAIRMAN: I said I did not hear the statement. The member for East Perth is, at all events, repeating himself.

Mr. HUGHES: The member for Northam said that if a majority is not in favour of the Bill it cannot be enforced. That is an open invitation meaning, "If you have a majority, do not obey the law." If that had come from this side of the House there would have been a scream of protest. The members opposite now have the cheek to say the Government are insincere.

Mr. NORTH: I support the amendment. The Government are always dependent upon a majority of the people.

Mr. J. H. SMITH: The amendment is fair, reasonable, and impartial. It only applies to those who are entitled to vote on the referendum. The onus is upon the Minister to see that those who are entitled to vote do so, if there is to be compulsion. There is a cry from one end of the State to the other as to the stuffing of the rolls and their impurity, and as to the number of dead men whose names appear upon them.

The Minister for Lands: There are not many of those now.

Mr. J. H. SMITH: The Minister for Lands once said he had put 1,200 names on the roll and taken a great many off. On a big question like this it is necessary that this amendment should be carried. We want a proper consensus of opinion on this subject, and every one in the State entitled to be on the roll must be enrolled.

Mr. Hughes: I think you have the wind up.

Mr. J. H. SMITH: I take all knocks as they come. We only want to be fair and reasonable.

The MINISTER FOR JUSTICE: I do not propose to accept the amendment, for it is impracticable. There is no method whereby we can ascertain those persons in the State who are entitled to be put on the roll.

Mr. Griffiths: What about enforcing the Compulsory Enrolment Act?

The MINISTER FOR JUSTICE: We pass a law and we expect people to live up to it. If they do not obey, in some instances we prosecute.

Mr. J. H. Smith: How many prosecutions have you had since the last elections?

Mr. Davy: None.

The MINISTER FOR JUSTICE: There have been some in regard to non-enrolment, and there may be others in the future.

Mr. DAVY: The Minister's arguments are against the whole Bill. He said it is impossible to carry a law into effect such as would be introduced by my amendment. All my amendment ensures is that prohibi-

tion shall not be carried unless there is a real majority of people entitled to vote in favour of it.

The Minister for Justice: We passed a law compelling people to enroll.

Mr. DAVY: Members opposite passed the law compelling people to get on the roll.

The Minister for Lands: Your crowd brought in compulsory enrolment.

Mr. DAVY: I have always been strongly opposed to compulsory voting, because I think it is a farcical and ridiculous thing. I was strongly opposed to the Bill for compulsory voting that was introduced in the Council.

The Minister for Lands: I referred to compulsory enrolment.

Mr. DAVY: I do not know anything about that. I know that, when one is seeking election one finds that the rolls are just as impure as before compulsory enrolment was enacted.

The Minister for Justice: That is not so at all.

Mr. DAVY: My agents put on 500 votes in the West Perth constituency and my opponents put on another 500. The member for Canning put on 1,100 in the short time available in his electorate. That shows the value of compulsory enrolment. I know of half a dozen persons whose names appear on the West Perth roll twice, once in their unmarried names, and the second time in their married names. If that happens in one electorate, how much greater will be the defect when the whole State is concerned?

The Minister for Justice: Therefore I say that your amendment is impracticable.

Mr. DAVY: Then it shows how utterly impracticable it is to suggest compulsory voting at all. We are told that this decision should be arrived at by a majority of the people. The reference was not to the people on the rolls, but to the men and women entitled to be enrolled. The Bill does not provide for that.

The Minister for Justice: It provides for the machinery where possible.

Mr. DAVY: And everyone knows it will not assure any such result.

The Minister for Lands: You know that everything is not perfect.

Mr. DAVY: When one half of the people endeavour to make criminal an offence which was not such before the vote, how can it be expected that the law will be enforced? If my amendment cannot be given effect to, then there is a grave and serious risk that the legislation may cause that which is quite proper to-day to be improper to-morrow.

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

Ayes	16
Noes	22
					—
Majority against	6
					—

AYES.	
Mr. Barnard	Mr. Mann
Mr. Brown	Sir James Mitchell
Mr. Davy	Mr. Sampson
Mr. Denton	Mr. J. H. Smith
Mr. Griffiths	Mr. Stubbs
Mr. E. B. Johnston	Mr. Taylor
Mr. Lindsay	Mr. Teesdale
Mr. Maley	Mr. North

(Teller.)

NOES.	
Mr. Angwin	Mr. Millington
Mr. Chesson	Mr. Munro
Mr. Collier	Mr. Panton
Mr. Coverley	Mr. Richardson
Mr. Cunningham	Mr. Sleeman
Mr. Heron	Mr. Troy
Mr. Hughes	Mr. A. Wansbrough
Mr. W. D. Johnson	Mr. Willcock
Mr. Kennedy	Mr. Wilson
Mr. Lamond	Mr. Corboy
Mr. Marshall	
Mr. McCallum	

(Teller.)

NOES.	
Mr. Angwin	Mr. Marshall
Mr. Chesson	Mr. McCallum
Mr. Collier	Mr. Millington
Mr. Corboy	Mr. Munro
Mr. Coverley	Mr. Panton
Mr. Cunningham	Mr. Richardson
Mr. Heron	Mr. Sleeman
Mr. Hughes	Mr. Troy
Mr. W. D. Johnson	Mr. A. Wansbrough
Mr. Kennedy	Mr. Willcock
Mr. Lamond	Mr. Wilson

(Teller.)

AYES.	NOES.
Mr. Angelo	Mr. Lambert
Mr. George	Mr. Holman
Mr. Latham	Mr. Withers

Amendment thus negatived.

Mr. MANN: I move an amendment—

That after "majority" in line 3, the following words be added, "of the persons entitled to vote by reason of their names being on the rolls at the date the poll is taken."

That is a reasonable proposition because it cannot be contended that it will not be possible to know who will have the right to vote. The names will appear on the roll. This amendment does not go so far as that of the member for West Perth, whose amendment referred to persons entitled to have their names on the rolls.

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

Ayes	16
Noes	22

Majority against .. 6

AYES.	
Mr. Barnard	Sir James Mitchell
Mr. Brown	Mr. Sampson
Mr. Davy	Mr. J. H. Smith
Mr. Denton	Mr. Stubbs
Mr. Griffiths	Mr. Taylor
Mr. E. B. Johnston	Mr. Teesdale
Mr. Lindsay	Mr. North
Mr. Maley	
Mr. Mann	

(Teller.)

AYES.	NOES.
Mr. Angelo	Mr. Lambert
Mr. George	Mr. Holman
Mr. Latham	Mr. Withers

Amendment thus negatived.

Mr. E. B. JOHNSTON: I gathered from your remarks that on a cursory glance at my proposed amendment you deemed it to be out of order. If you will look at it more carefully, I think you will find it is in order. It does not impose any charge at all. It only lays down conditions under which the proposed alteration shall take place, and other conditions under which, if the majority be smaller than three-fifths, it shall have no effect until compensation is provided. The Government would have to bring down a separate Bill, just as in respect of the taxation measures, one of which supplies the machinery while the other prescribes the tax. I move an amendment—

Add to paragraph (a) the words following: "and a new proviso is substituted therefor as follows: 'Provided that no such proposal shall take effect unless three-fifths of the votes given throughout the State have been cast in favour thereof or provision has been made by Parliament for payment of adequate compensation to (1) every owner, lessee and licensee of any licensed premises which shall become delicensed on a proposal that prohibition shall come into force being given effect to; (2) every grower of grapes for the manufacture of wine or brandy and every manufacturer of wine, brandy or beer who shall be prejudicially affected by prohibition coming into force; and (3) any person employed by a grower of grapes or by an hotelkeeper or by a manufacturer of wine, brandy or beer who shall suffer pecuniary loss owing to being deprived of employment as the result of such a proposal being brought into operation.'"

The CHAIRMAN: The amendment seems to me to make a charge on the people, and so I rule it out of order.

Dissent from Chairman's Ruling.

Mr. E. B. Johnston: I am sorry, Sir, but I move—

That your ruling be disagreed with.

The Premier: Why dissent? The amendment is clearly out of order.

[The Speaker resumed the Chair.]

The Chairman reported the dissent.

Mr. Speaker: Does the hon. member wish to say anything?

Mr. E. B. Johnston: This amendment does not impose any charge at all. It only lays down the conditions under which the poll to be taken shall be operative. It says that if a three-fifths majority for prohibition be achieved, then the existing law shall be maintained and there shall be no compensation at all. It says that if a smaller majority be achieved, adequate provision shall be made for compensation before the poll takes effect. If the taxing measure be not introduced as a separate Bill, the amendment simply means that the poll does not take effect. The amendment does not make it necessary for the Government to impose any charge on the people.

Mr. Speaker: The Bill amends the existing Licensing Act in certain particulars. Those particulars are the substitution of a simple majority for a three-fifths majority, and the institution of compulsory voting. It has no relation to compensation. Consequently the amendment is out of order in that respect. It is inconsistent. It provides eventualities upon the three-fifths majority which are not contemplated under any circumstances in the Act itself. The amendment furthermore makes it obligatory to pursue this legislation with a Bill for compensation to be provided out of the public funds. Therefore it places a burden on the public and so I uphold the Chairman's ruling.

Committee Resumed.

Clause put and passed.

Clause 3—agreed to.

Title—agreed to.

Bill reported without amendment and the report adopted.

Third Reading.

The MINISTER FOR RAILWAYS (Hon. J. C. Willcock—Geraldton) [2.0]: I move—

That the Bill be now read a third time.

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

Ayes	24
Noes	16

Majority for	8
--------------	----	----	---

Mr. Angwin
Mr. Chesson
Mr. Clydesdale
Mr. Collier
Mr. Corbooy
Mr. Coverley
Mr. Cunningham
Mr. Heron
Mr. Hughes
Mr. W. D. Johnson
Mr. Kennedy
Mr. Lamond
Mr. Lutey

AYES.

Mr. Marshall
Mr. McCallum
Mr. Millington
Mr. Munzie
Mr. Panton
Mr. Richardson
Mr. Sleeman
Mr. Troy
Mr. A. Wansbrough
Mr. Willcock
Mr. Wilson

(Teller.)

Mr. Barnard
Mr. Brown
Mr. Davy
Mr. Denton
Mr. Griffiths
Mr. E. B. Johnston
Mr. Lindsay
Mr. Maley

NOES.

Mr. Mann
Sir James Mitchell
Mr. North
Mr. Sampson
Mr. J. H. Smith
Mr. Taylor
Mr. Teesdale
Mr. Stubbs

(Teller.)

PAIRS.

AYES.
Mr. Lambert
Mr. Holman
Mr. Latham

NOES.
Mr. Angelo
Mr. George
Mr. Withers

Question thus passed.

Bill read a third time and transmitted to the Council.

BILL—LAND TAX AND INCOME TAX.

Council's Request for Conference.

Message from the Council received and read requesting a conference on the Land Tax and Income Tax Bill and intimating that if the request were agreed to, the managers for the Council would be the Colonial Secretary, Hon. J. Ewing, and Hon. A. Lovekin.

Mr. Taylor: No chance of getting that conference.

On motion by the Premier, consideration of the Message was made an Order of the Day for the next sitting of the House.

BILL—TREASURY BONDS DEFICIENCY.

Returned from the Council without amendment.

ADJOURNMENT—CLOSE OF SESSION.

The PREMIER (Hon. P. Collier—Boulder) [2.5]: I move—

That the House at its rising adjourn till 11 a.m. to-day.

Question put and passed.

House adjourned at 2.6 a.m. (Tuesday).