

ADJOURNMENT—CLOSE OF SESSION.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY (Hon. J. M. Drew): I move—

That the House at its rising adjourn to the 25th February, 1916.

Question passed.

*House adjourned at 12.7 a.m.
(Saturday).*

Legislative Assembly.

Friday, 26th November, 1915.

	PAGE
Paper Presented	2895
Bills: Prohibition of Treating on Licensed Premises, 2n., defeated	2895
Land Act Amendment, Council's message, Conference	2914, 2915, 2932
Sale of Liquor Regulation (No. 2), Conference	2914, 2916, 2917
Permanent Reserve (No. 2), Council's amendment	2915, 2932
Appropriation, returned	2932
Fremantle Municipal Tramways and Electric Lighting, returned	2932
Adjournment, Close of Session	2933

The SPEAKER took the Chair at 3 p.m., and read prayers.

PAPER PRESENTED.

By the Honorary Minister: Perth Public Hospital, report for the year ended 30th June, 1915.

BILL—PROHIBITION OF TREATING ON LICENSED PREMISES.

Second Reading—Defeated.

Hon. H. B. LEFROY (Moore) [3.5] in moving the second reading said: This is a Bill which was introduced in another place and passed there, and is now sent to us for consideration. The Bill, no

doubt, is novel in character; by some people it may even be considered ridiculous. However, we are living in difficult times, we are passing through a period in the history of the British Empire when we are called upon to do things which might not be done at other times. The provisions of the Bill have been adopted in Great Britain, where I believe they are the law of the land. This is what might shortly and vulgarly be termed an anti-shouting Bill. I do not quite know why I was selected to pilot the measure through this House, unless it be for the fact that I am well-known to be one who endeavours to practice temperance in all things. Although I am not an abstainer, still I believe in making proper use of the things that the gods send us, and hold that they are not sent to us for their abuse. The question here is not one of abstinence, but of the encouragement of abstinence. The Bill provides against shouting in the ordinary acceptance of the term, and I myself honestly believe that the system of shouting as it has been carried on for years past has not been in the best interests of the country. I honestly believe that, although at the same time I think that perhaps without the shouting system in a mild form there might not be the good comradeship and good fellowship which frequently we find existing. I consider that the time has come when we ought to husband our resources as much as we possibly can, when people should be encouraged not to spend their money in drinking excessively of intoxicating liquors. The measure provides—

No person shall . . . sell or supply liquor to any person on licensed premises, for consumption on the premises, unless the liquor is ordered and paid for by the person to whom it is supplied, and by whom it is consumed or intended to be consumed.

A penalty of £5 is provided for the offence, and a similar penalty for the person consuming the liquor. I know that this is a question which has been seriously thought over by many of us, and we recognise that considerable harm

may result from excessive shouting, which is detrimental to the community as a whole.

The Minister for Mines: Will you accept an amendment to make this Bill apply to the refreshment room here?

Hon. Frank Wilson: Yes.

Hon. H. B. LEFROY: It seems an unfortunate thing that when a man meets another for the purpose of doing business, the first thing he does is to say, "Come and have a drink." I myself do not think that is a practice which ought to be encouraged; in fact, I think it is one to be discouraged in every possible way. I practise what I preach on this occasion at any rate. I have been able to carry on my own business without that sort of thing, though, at the same time, I am charmed and delighted to be able to extend hospitality when the opportunity offers. It is a bad thing for the community if a man on meeting a friend is bound to demonstrate his friendship by an invitation to drink. Somehow or other, I have been in Parliament a good many years, but have not got into it by shouting. The leader of the Opposition reminds me that this Bill applies to soft drinks on licensed premises. That is a matter for consideration. The Bill is not incorporated with the Licensing Act. If it were so incorporated, there would be no difficulty and soft drinks would not be included, because "liquor" according to the Licensing Act is intoxicating liquor. Strange to say, while the Bill provides that "licensed premises" shall be licensed premises within the meaning of the Licensing Act, 1911, it does not provide that "liquor" shall be defined as in the Licensing Act. The same point struck me. I certainly do not see why a man should be prevented from giving his friend a lemon squash even on licensed premises. There is no need for me to thrash this matter to pieces.

Mr. Heitmann: But you want to give us some reason why we should vote for the Bill.

Hon. H. B. LEFROY: Hon. members will have their reasons as to voting for or against the Bill. It is not my desire

to keep the House on such a hot afternoon discussing such a dry subject. I leave the matter in the hands of hon. members; and I feel sure that in doing so it is needless for me to appeal to their good sense, because I am convinced they will exercise their good sense in every possible way when dealing with this question. They have the intelligence and the desire, I am quite sure, to deal with the Bill in a fitting manner. As I am certainly in favour of encouraging temperance in everything, even in Parliament, and as this Bill has been placed in my hands, I have much pleasure in moving—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS (Hon. W. C. Angwin—North-East Fremantle) [3.14]: I am thoroughly in accord with the principle of this Bill. In my opinion, shouting does more injury to many of our young people than does even the keeping of hotels open beyond reasonable hours. That is especially so in a country like Western Australia, where frequently a young man is away from home. In such circumstances young fellows get into parties and go to the hotels together and then, largely as a result of the shouting system, drink far more than is good for them. To my mind, there is no doubt that the vogue which the shouting system has now and has had for many years is highly injurious to the youth of Western Australia. The point has been raised that under this Bill it will be illegal to shout a soft drink in a licensed house. Under the Licensing Act "liquor" means intoxicating drink.

Hon. Frank Wilson: But this is not so here.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: I can speak from experience of soft drinks, though not of the other kind; and I think it would be well if people kept away from a lot of the concoctions termed soft drinks, because some of them are very injurious indeed. I welcome the Bill. I believe it will confer a benefit, particularly on the young people in our State, and will be the means of con-

siderably diminishing the drinking of intoxicating liquors.

The PREMIER (Hon. J. Scaddan—Brownhill-Ivanhoe) [3.16]: This is undoubtedly a non-party measure, and I wish to give my colleagues an opportunity of expressing their own opinions on it and voting in accordance with them. It is a non-party measure because, after all, in each party there are those who shout and those who do not. I anticipate that those who shout will support the Bill, while the man who drinks with the flies, and who is prepared to accept shouts from others, will be opposed to it. While I agree with the principle of the Bill, I cannot shut my eyes to certain weaknesses in it. In the first place there is no definition of "liquor," and I think there will be some difficulty in defining it. Suppose a little meeting is being held on licensed premises, and that he or she presiding invites the others to a cup of tea; what will the position be? The Rose Club and a number of other organisations hold meetings on licensed premises. There are public tearooms at the Savoy Hotel. How will the Bill affect the patrons of those rooms? I suggest to the sponsor of the measure that he frame a definition of "liquor." Again, provision is made for shouting when the liquor is consumed with a meal, but there is no definition of "meal." What is required here is the Attorney General's famous definition, namely, "a cooked meal"; then we will know what is intended. In all seriousness, while a good deal is to be said in favour of an anti-shouting measure at the present juncture, I am strongly of opinion that what has promoted it is the desire to prevent soldiers getting liquor.

Hon. J. Mitchell: Who said so?

The PREMIER: It was said in another place, and I am saying it again. The motive underlying the Bill is the desire to prevent soldiers getting liquor, because of the tendency on the part of the public to entertain a soldier rather freely. I can see no reason why a soldier should be treated like a prisoner. The reason why we are invited to accept such

rubbishy legislation as this is because of the positively absurd, silly, idiotic attitude of the military authorities in refusing to allow these men to have a wet canteen.

Mr. Heitmann: You have not read your *Reformer*.

The PREMIER: I have never yet tempered my remarks on the liquor question to suit the views either of the temperance party or of the trade. In fact, I am doubtful which of the two oppose me the more strongly. I wish to take a sensible view of the question. The man who voluntarily enlists, a citizen prepared to risk his life to protect the interests of those who ask for an anti-shouting measure to prevent a soldier being treated,—that man is put in camp for training and not as a prisoner. Is there any reason why we should specially legislate to deny a man in uniform—who is still a citizen, and a better man than the man out of uniform—and put restrictions on him, while the slacker in civilian clothes can get as beastly drunk as he likes? The whole complaint has been that men in uniform have got more liquor than was good for them. I am strongly convinced we will not get a satisfactory solution of the over-indulgence in liquor by our men in camp—who are voluntarily training to defend our interests—until we remove the bonds and bars which make those men prisoners. If a civilian is allowed to take a glass of alcoholic liquor lawfully dispensed, we have no right to say that the soldier shall drink, not what he likes, but what someone else selects for him. Recently I travelled from the Eastern States to Western Australia by the "Osterley." On that boat were 1,200 troops who had been taken aboard at Port Melbourne. When they arrived at Adelaide the military authorities declined to allow them to land. A local guard was provided, as well as a guard from the troops on the ship, to line the wharf at Port Adelaide. The men on board were not allowed to leave the ship. We then came on to Fremantle. When we arrived there a local guard, 50 to 100 strong, with fixed bay-

one's, lined the wharf, and about 150 men from the ship were told off as a special guard to prevent the troops from landing. It meant that from the time those men boarded the boat at Port Melbourne until they landed at Egypt they were actually under a guard with fixed bayonets, as though they were prisoners being deported. I am doubtful whether the German prisoners taken from Rottneest the other day to be encamped at Liverpool were placed under as strong a guard as were our volunteer soldiers, who were going to the front to risk their lives for us. At Fremantle, as soon as the local guard arrived on the wharf, the men on the boat called them everything they could lay their tongues to, and went further and said "We are going to land." Some of them jumped 15 or 16 feet from the deck to the wharf and, addressing the guard, said "Bayonet us if you like."

The Minister for Mines: It was to their credit.

The PREMIER: And I believe that by 8 o'clock it was found advisable to remove the guard and allow the men to land. Frequently comparisons have been drawn between the behaviour in Perth and Fremantle of the New Zealand troops and those from the Eastern States, to the detriment of the Australians. I do not know the New Zealanders, but I give them every credit for having behaved themselves. The Australian troops I am acquainted with, and I say that they know how to behave themselves. But if we place restrictions on an Australian who has freely offered his services in defence of the Empire, he will break through and behave in a way neither to his credit nor to ours. The New Zealand troops have a wet canteen on board the ship, where, like private citizens, they can get sufficient liquor to prevent them from doing things which, if they were treated as the Australians are on the boat, the New Zealanders would do with readiness. Over and above that, we have the men in camp. It is asserted that those men come into the City and misbehave themselves by taking too much liquor. Why is this? While they are in camp they are absolutely pre-

vented from obtaining any liquor. In my opinion, if there is to be prohibition for the soldiers, there should be prohibition for all. I am urging this, not with a view to defeating the measure, but with the object of asking the military authorities to act with some common sense. The position is that the men from camp, when they get leave, take a motor, and pull up at every hotel, getting as much liquor as they can while they have an opportunity. In consequence, they become beastly drunk—some of them men who, before they went into camp, were never known to indulge in liquor. If the military authorities were to establish a wet canteen at Blackboy, and properly control it, as they could, we would have less drinking by our soldiers in our cities and open places.

Mr. Male: You are quite wrong.

The PREMIER: They would not get drunk if they secured no more liquor than the hon. member would purchase for them.

Mr. James Gardiner: I heard two of the highest church dignitaries expressing the same opinion as you.

The PREMIER: Yes. I have heard of that also. I have been a teetotaler all my life.

Mr. Foley: You don't look it.

The PREMIER: I have remained a teetotaler because I will not allow any man to dictate to me what I shall drink. I have never yet attempted to dictate to another man what he shall drink. Because I can be satisfied with a ginger ale, is no reason why I should require anybody else to be satisfied with a similar drink. The position is absolutely absurd. As I am not prepared to take dictation on such matters from another person, I am not right in dictating to others. What I want to do is to remove the abuses in the traffic and I am nervous, after all, if this is going to do so much. I am prepared to support the measure, not on the ground that the hon. member for Subiaco (Mr. B. J. Stubbs) does, but merely as an experiment, and, I may tell the Honorary Minister, also for the purpose of seeing how it will affect candidates when they stand for Parliament, for I believe

there is more illegal shouting, if I may so term it, taking place at Parliamentary elections than at any other time. I want to say right here with all anti-shouting Bills and other restrictions placed on the people we shall not prevent a man obtaining a glass of liquor if he so desires. If men will face a bayonet, as I saw the men do at Fremantle, to land on the wharf for the purpose of getting drink, then they will get through every Act of Parliament we like to pass. I am prepared to take any action that will remove many of the abuses that exist in the liquor trade, but when we apply restrictions to one section only, and if our word is worth anything, the men who put on uniforms are heroes, and place restrictions on them and allow others to indulge freely, we are acting foolishly and make men act as they would not do under ordinary conditions. I am not saying that this applies only to soldiers. While we object to seeing soldiers in uniform drunk on our streets, it is not shouting so much as the restrictions placed on the soldiers in camp that is doing it. I do urge, if the liquor traffic is such an evil, that we dare not allow any one in the community to shout for anyone else, it is a convincing proof that the traffic is of so much evil that we ought to abolish it altogether. We will not do any good by fiddling with it in this manner, or acting in such a silly way. This Bill can never be administered properly. I believe thoroughly this will not be a success, but my objection is to the measure itself more than to the principle. It has originated in a great measure to an objection to treating soldiers, and I want to know if I meet a friend from the gold-fields who has volunteered to go to the front while I stay at home, why should I not treat him to a glass of beer, or to a glass of ginger ale, or sarto, or a cup of tea? No one has yet had the courage to get up and answer the people who are claiming these things, that they are deliberately making an attack on the men who put on a uniform. In these circumstances we must be careful. We must make the Bill so that it is possible to put it into practice. I want the House care-

fully to consider the measure, if it is going to be placed on the statute-book, to make it an effective one, and not direct it against one section of the community who are going away to risk their lives for us.

Hon. FRANK WILSON (Sussex) [3.37]: I think the one outstanding feature of the Premier's remarks is that they are consistent in their inconsistency. He says he is taking the sensible view of the question. If the same line of argument applies then his colleague, the Minister for Works, is taking the unsensible view. Then he describes the measure as a rubbishy one and wound up by saying that he was going to vote for it. I do not see anything consistent in that attitude. The Premier had evidently got it into his mind that this Bill is aimed at the soldiers.

The Minister for Mines: It is responsible for it, no doubt.

Hon. FRANK WILSON: I see nothing in the Bill that refers to the soldiers. The Premier believes that we should treat all alike. The Bill proposes to do that, soldier or civilian. Therefore, I think we can consider it without any heat. As regards the treatment of soldiers passing through our ports, or even in our camp at Blackboy Hill, I believe the Premier is right in his contention that possibly the wet canteen in our camp would do away with much of the excessive drinking amongst the soldiers we see in the streets. I have no doubt that if we pass the Bill we can still advocate the wet canteen to be established in that camp. I see nothing in the measure to prevent a wet canteen being established.

Mr. B. J. Stubbs: This Bill would not operate there, it is not a licensed premises.

Hon. FRANK WILSON: I do not know that it would. I would like to make it operate there. The question we have to consider is whether the shouting system, which is so large in vogue, more especially in Australia, but right throughout the civilised world, has reached the stage that we ought to step in and interfere—whether owing to war

conditions the practice of shouting is more utilised, and therefore on that account the time is opportune to legislate. When I view the position as we find it to-day and hear that legislation of a similar description has been passed in the Old Country—I do not know with what effect—

Mr. Heitmann: Only in certain areas.

Hon. FRANK WILSON: Probably it may not be as effective as we believe.

The Minister for Mines: It is operative only where there are large bodies of men engaged in army supplies, and so forth.

Hon. FRANK WILSON: The application, if successful there, would be equally successful in other districts where large organisations of an industrial nature are carried on, and in the ordinary walks of civil life. There is nothing in the Bill that applies it to one section of the community or district. It is a universal Bill, to attempt to relieve and prohibit shouting. I myself realise fully there will be very great difficulty in administering an Act of this description. Even if we get the restriction of the shouting habit by 10 per cent., it seems to me to be a step in the right direction and well worth trying. Admitting it is experimental legislation and that it may fail, I cannot see why we should not attempt something in this direction. Therefore, I intend to support the Bill. I want to see it pass into law and let us try it. If we can diminish in the slightest degree the drinking habits, more especially among the younger members of the population, I think we are doing some good. There is not the slightest doubt that shouting is the cause of drinking among the younger people, more especially.

Hon. R. H. Underwood (Honorary Minister): You want to look after somebody else.

Hon. FRANK WILSON: If we could do it, I should like to apply this system to the bar at Parliament House itself.

The Attorney General: Would you apply it to tea?

Hon. FRANK WILSON: Everything in the bar.

The Attorney General: If I took pity on you and asked you to have a milk and soda—

Hon. FRANK WILSON: But the hon. member does not take pity on me. I want to point out that this Bill, so far as I can judge, applies only to the habit of shouting in public bars on licensed premises. I think it will be a good thing. If it is restricted to the bar I agree it is unnecessary to restrict it to the table. If I am entertaining someone at luncheon I am entertaining them the same as in my house. Surely I can provide my own drink at my own table. Where this pernicious habit of shouting has become a menace is in the bars where a number of people congregate together and one man shouts and then another, and by the time there has been a round of drinks the people have had far too many for their health. That seems to be the underlying principle. I think we ought to disassociate this Bill from any treatment such as the Premier has described. I quite admit that possibly there has been too much restraint in regard to the soldiers, yet we must not forget that soldiers must of necessity be under discipline, and no matter whether we agree or disagree as to the amount of discipline, imposed upon them, that discipline must be upheld. It seems to me that the Premier and others, even if we pass this Bill, could take steps to place this matter before the military authorities, and see if the conditions which he states are prevailing cannot be relieved to some extent.

The Premier: It will be serious from your point of view. If the Bill is passed you will not be able to shout champagne in anticipation of coming over here.

Hon. FRANK WILSON: The Premier himself is not in the habit of shouting.

The Premier: You did the other day.

Hon. FRANK WILSON: I have not been able to afford champagne since the war broke out. I do not think the Premier is one who can guide us in this matter because he is a teetotaler. He has had no experience on this question. He

has never tasted intoxicating liquors, and does not know what the effect is on his constitution, so is unable to judge whether or not we ought to pass legislation of this description.

Mr. Foley: What is your opinion of the Bill?

Hon. FRANK WILSON: I have been trying to tell the hon. member, but he does not seem to be able to absorb my arguments. I am supporting the Bill because I think it will restrict the hon. gentleman and others in pursuing the habit of shouting.

Mr. Thomas: He is on the water-wagon.

Hon. FRANK WILSON: He says he has been drinking "Sarto," whatever that drink may be.

Mr. Foley: I never said what I had been drinking.

Hon. FRANK WILSON: I think I had the honour of shouting myself a "Sarto" drink the other day. The Premier was most emphatic that he would not submit to any dictation as to what he should drink. I do not think the Bill proposes to dictate to him in that way. I always understood that in shouting one asked a man what he would have first, whether he would have a milk and soda or even a "Sarto," or some other drink. At all events he names his drink. There is no dictation in the matter of shouting. There is no doubt that it is a pernicious system. It is calculated not only to create over-indulgence by those who do take intoxicating liquors, but it is against all the habits of thrift which we have been preaching, and which are more necessary now than ever before. For the reason that I want to save the hon. member's purse when he says he wants to shout me a drink, to save him his sixpences, and so induce him to economise, and so that he may not, by being too free with his invitations perhaps persuade me to take a drink too much, I support the second reading of this measure.

Mr. GREEN (Kalgoorlie) [3.50]: It is rather regrettable for the ultimate fate of this Bill that it should be introduced by the genial member for Moore (Hon.

H. B. Lefroy), whose hospitality a large number of the members of this House availed themselves of so freely only recently. Anti-treating is, I think, not a new idea. As a matter of fact, there are several States in America, apart from the States which have now gone dry, where anti-treating is already in operation. I am not going to say that I am altogether enamoured of the Bill coming in at this particular juncture. I recognise that war time is a greater excuse to bring in what might be termed freak legislation and this opportunity seems to have been seized for this Bill, and notwithstanding the disclaimer made by the leader of the Opposition, that this is not designed to deal with soldiers particularly, he lets the cat out of the bag at a later stage when he says that the soldiers must be kept under discipline. I would sooner see a measure of this kind brought in after the war. Those young fellows are going to the front and are risking their lives for the Empire and in the service of the country, and the little drinking they do they can hardly be blamed for in the circumstances, though some of those in whom the fires of youth have probably gone out, may not appreciate their actions. It seems to me there was a stage in our own lives when we probably enjoyed a convivial glass, such as these soldiers enjoy to-day. Our soldiers are probably getting a considerable amount of enjoyment out of these convivial glasses, and I would not be one to bring in a measure of this kind on that account. Treating undoubtedly leads to excessive drinking, and therein lies an evil. But there is also a good side to the treating question. There is the psychological reason. Though treating is so widespread one cannot get away from the fact that one can get closer to a man's heart by taking a couple of convivial drinks with him after a 15 minutes acquaintance than one can by drinking soda water with him for five years. That is the real reason for treating, as it is called, being as popular as it is to-day. The *Bulletin* some time ago in discussing the question why coffee palaces, in Mel-

bourne particularly, were such a frost financially, brought forward the fact that the reason was because in places of that kind, where only cold or warm tea and temperance drinks are allowed to be consumed, the class of men which foregathers there is unfortunately not composed of the red-blooded men of the community. It is an astonishing fact, and the statement cannot be gainsaid, that taking the average teetotaler—and I know there are exceptions which prove the rule even in this Chamber such as the Premier, the member for Subiaco (Mr. B. J. Stubbs), the member for Fremantle (Mr. Carpenter), and the member for Leonora (Mr. Foley)—who runs amok on the temperance question, is not usually the sort of personality to earn our admiration. I forgot to mention the member for Kanowna (Hon. T. Walker), who is one of the most convivial gentlemen in the Chamber. The trouble with the temperance movement in this State, and the treating question, is that up to date there has not been a decent temperance drink on the market for the use of mankind.

Member: Perhaps your taste is viliated.

Mr. GREEN: Not at all. I have tried going on the water-wagon, and I have tried drinking soft drinks.

The Minister for Works: Have you tried Sedna?

Mr. GREEN: No.

The Minister for Works: That contains 40 per cent. of alcohol.

Mr. GREEN: I will try Sedna at the earliest opportunity. That goes to prove that a temperance drink is only successful when it contains 40 per cent. of alcohol.

Mr. B. J. Stubbs: Is it not a temperance drink.

Mr. GREEN: If there was a decent temperance drink in existence to-day, one over which the moderate drinker could enthuse, I would be prepared to turn teetotaler and consume that sort of drink, but it has not yet been discovered. The question of the consumption of alcohol from the health point of view has been

raised. I have just had brought to my mind an incident in one of Cook's voyages. Hon. members may recollect that in the third voyage of Captain Cook the explorers were on the homeward journey and had arrived at Batavia, the chief port of Java. Batavia was riddled with malaria, that is so much seen in the tropics, and the diarist on the occasion of that expedition disclosed the remarkable fact that every member of the crews of the three ships was down with malaria except an old man of 75, who was drunk every day. I will leave the solution of that question to the temperance advocates in this Chamber. On the goldfields we have a system of getting away from the excessive drinking that is apt to be found in parts of this State, and have what is known as "the socialist's shout." If there are half a dozen of us we put in 6d. or 1s. each, and then go into the bar and have our drink and come out again.

The Attorney General: Who shouts?

Mr. GREEN: We have a trustee appointed who places the money on the counter for the brief period that it takes to consume a pint of beer. No hon. member who has been on the goldfields and has tried that, with the additional incentive of the wonderful beer they have there, would for a moment advocate that a man should be an absolute teetotaler.

Mr. Thomas: We do not advocate that. You are taking an extreme view.

Mr. GREEN: I am not taking an extreme view. I want to point out that this Bill is brought forward because the idea exists that it may do away with excessive drinking. I have pointed out a means whereby those persons who cannot trust themselves to take a drink from someone else may obviate that danger. I do not think that the Bill was aimed at the soldiers, but it is evidently due to the fact that there are a lot of soldiers in the streets who get drunk while in uniform that we have it before us. We admit it is a saddening sight but if the men were in plain clothes and not in uniform we would not take any notice of them. We should remember that these men are going to fight for their

country and therefore why should this Chamber constitute itself a committee of kill joys. My objection to the Bill is that it will hold the Chamber up to ridicule in the country and I trust therefore members will be found opposing it.

Mr. THOMAS (Bunbury) [4.3] The Bill has my entire approval, and next to the measure which provides for the earlier closing of hotels, it is one of the best which has been submitted to us for consideration. I am satisfied if the measure is enforced and if its penalties are made heavy enough it will largely diminish the consumption of alcoholic liquor and its best results will be noticed in future years, for this reason, that numbers of young fellows are in the habit of going into a bar to shout for one another and in that way they acquire the habit of drinking. In the next generation—perhaps it is a long way to look ahead—more benefits will be derived from the fact that the present younger generation have been prohibited from treating each other in this way. The member for Kalgoolie made a most charming and humorous speech which I enjoyed. There was in it a delicious logic, but it was very convincing. He objects to doing away with shouting, and he said that the way to get nearest another man's heart was by shouting a couple of drinks for him. I presume he meant that to apply to business transactions. It is a sorry state of affairs that in order to trade with a fellow man we must first dull the keenness of his intellect in order to get at a soft spot near his heart.

Hon. R. H. Underwood (Honorary Minister): Whisky brightens the intellect.

Mr. THOMAS: It may brighten the intellect of the hon. member but it has not that effect on others.

Mr. Bolton: How does it affect you?

Mr. THOMAS: It is so long since I have taken anything that I do not know.

Mr. Bolton: Your are hot.

Mr. THOMAS: To listen to the hon. member any one would think that I was in the habit of taking intoxicants. There is another point I take exception to and

it is making our soldiers the means by which it is hoped to carry this measure through. Any legislation which will have an influence on one class only will be unfair and will never receive my vote. I do not see why any section of the community should be singled out for this kind of treatment and therefore I intend to vote against the measure.

The MINISTER FOR MINES (Hon. P. Collier—Boulder) [4.7]: I think this Bill is a manifestation of the spirit of wowsersism which has been spreading over the land during recent months.

Mr. B. J. Stubbs: If it is spreading why oppose it?

The MINISTER FOR MINES: It is the greatest bit of puffing nonsense which has ever been introduced into this Chamber. I will go as far in regard to temperance reform as any man in this Chamber, but there is a limit to which reasonable and common-sense men might be expected to go. In the first place I am opposed to this or any other Bill which I am satisfied cannot be administered. If we find it is difficult, and it is admitted that it is difficult to administer our present Licensing Act, then a visit from a constable occasionally during the week ought to be sufficient to see that the provisions of the Act are complied with, and if under the existing circumstances it is difficult to secure a proper administration of the Act, how are we going to administer a measure of this kind? It will be necessary to have a policeman stationed in every bar in the State.

Mr. Mullany: And then the policemen would drink if you shouted for them.

The MINISTER FOR MINES: The ingenuity of the publican would devise many ways by which the law could be evaded.

Mr. O'Loughlen: The ingenuity of the customer would do that.

The MINISTER FOR MINES: No doubt it would be promoted by the thirst which follows hot days like the present. What are we coming to? This Bill has emanated from a Chamber the members of which have always put themselves up as guardians of the liberty of the subject.

Are we going to be prevented from inviting a friend into licensed premises to have a drink? If so, the liberty of the subject has gone. What right has Parliament to get down to an interference with what I call the domestic or the social life of the citizen in the manner that this Bill proposes. Is it because there have been seen in the streets occasionally men who have over-indulged in liquor, or because it is alleged that a number of soldiers have been imbibing too freely lately? If that is not so, how is it that we have never heard the question of legislation to deal with shouting introduced or seriously discussed until recent months or since we have had soldiers in our midst? It has been freely stated by the men who are sponsors for the Bill that they have been actuated by a desire to prevent soldiers from obtaining too much liquor. So far as I am concerned, I deprecate very strongly indeed this continual talk about our soldiers over-indulging in liquor. The men who are talking about them frequently are not in the same class as those they are traducing. If occasionally a few soldiers have had too much drink they have not been indulging any more freely than the average shirker or slacker who stays at home, but I do say that the citizens of the State have not arrived at that stage of over-indulgence in liquor due to the shouting habit which would render it necessary to introduce legislation to prevent it.

The Minister for Works: I do not think you could find a worse place than this.

The MINISTER FOR MINES: There is not a more sober community in Australia than our own and I have been all over the Commonwealth. If we take the per capita consumption of liquor in this State and compare it with that of the other States, and use that as an argument to show that there is excessive drinking here, the man who would use that argument surely does not understand figures. The details of this Bill show that the authors of it have gone further than has ever been attempted in any British Parliament. No person shall order or pay for

or lend or advance money to pay for liquor. What right has Parliament to say that I am not to lend a man 1s. to have a drink? Not only must I not shout for him on licensed premises, but if I meet him in the street I must not lend him 1s. so that he might have a drink.

Mr. James Gardiner: You try it on us.

The MINISTER FOR MINES: I venture to say that if I did I would soon be relieved of the shilling, but again we are told that no person shall consume liquor or pay for liquor with money which has been lent. The only thing that amazes me about the Bill is the fact that it comes from the Chamber which is always loud in its assertion that it stands for the liberty of the subject.

Mr. Hudson: I think they are only playing a joke.

The MINISTER FOR MINES: We here are a humorous lot to take it seriously. In my opinion the Upper House passed this measure yesterday in a slack moment while they were waiting for Messages from this Chamber. Parliament should not pass legislation which cannot seriously be administered, in which case it only tends to bring the statutes into contempt. There is no question about it that we would require an army of policemen in order to effectively administer the measure. The Bill in my opinion is a lot of nonsense and I am going to vote against it.

Mr. O'LOGHLEN (Forrest) [4.15]: If all hon. members were of the same opinion as the member for Bunbury, and refused to give a silent vote the discussion on this Bill would be carried on well into the night. The Minister for Mines raised the point regarding the effectiveness of this measure if it received the sanction of Parliament. If this measure could be effectively administered, there might be something to be said in its favour, but I would like some supporter of the Bill to show that any attempt has been made to put similar legislation into force in any other part of the world.

The Minister for Works: In England.

Mr. O'LOGHLEN: The member who introduced the Bill and those supporting

him have not given any evidence to show that the law has been successful there. If evidence is forthcoming, I hope it will be made available before the second reading is put. I am not so much concerned with the liberty of the subject as some members seem to be, because every Act of Parliament, to a certain extent, destroys the liberty of the subject. We bring compulsion into practically every Act of Parliament. The Premier who made the greatest yes-no speech. I have heard on any subject—

Hon. R. H. Underwood (Honorary Minister): I have heard you make a good yes-no speech.

Mr. O'LOGHLEN: Not equal to the Premier's.

Hon. R. H. Underwood (Honorary Minister): You still hold the record.

Mr. O'LOGHLEN: I am prepared to go as far as anyone in genuine temperance reform, but I do not look upon this as any measure of reform, because it cannot be administered by our police force.

Hon. J. D. Connolly: We would want a thousand detectives.

Mr. O'LOGHLEN: The hon. member for Moore said he objected to the consumption of liquor in the homes. If the referendum is taken, I believe the people in the metropolitan area will vote for the hours of 6 to 6. This would be a drastic, instead of a gradual reform, but whether it would encourage drinking in the homes remains to be proved. We find one of two Ministers supporting this Bill, and they must know there is no hope in the world of administering such a measure.

The Minister for Works: Yes, it can be administered.

Mr. O'LOGHLEN: I can prove that it is impossible. We have licensing legislation on the statute-book at the present time, and citizens are hedged in with all sorts of restrictions. As I pointed out a few weeks ago, a great outcry was made against a hotelkeeper here, running a good respectable house, and I further stated that Parliament was not devoting any attention to dealing with illegitimate trade, a man carrying on without a license under

the very eyes of the law. If the liquor traffic is an evil, the best course to adopt is to let the light of day shine upon it. When I stated that sly-grog shops are rampant in Perth—they can be found in every street in Perth, and if such a measure as this becomes law they will increase four-fold—the Premier said the Commissioner of Police was powerless. The Commissioner stated that sly-grog shops existed, but he could not get enough pimps to enable him to secure convictions. If that is the position, how will he be able to get men enough to adequately police a measure of this description? The member for Moore must be aware of the report that the Commissioner of Police cannot obtain convictions against the sly-grog shops. We know this illegal trade is being carried on. We know that a man can go into a place holding a gallon license and get a glass of beer. Yet the hon. member, who usually displays such sound common sense, has introduced a Bill which every member with any knowledge of the world must know cannot be enforced, but which will be a reflection on Parliament and make us the laughing stock of the public. Through party scenes and strife, Parliament has already been discredited enough, and before the second reading of this Bill is put, I wish to place on record my protest against making this institution, which is supposed to be a deliberative assembly, the laughing stock of every man and woman in the State.

Mr. B. J. STUBBS (Subiaco) [4.20]: We have been told this is the most rubbishy legislation ever introduced into this House. This class of legislation has been passed in the British House of Commons.

Hon. R. H. Underwood (Honorary Minister): That is a sink which accepts all sorts of rubbish.

Mr. B. J. STUBBS: The measure must have appealed to the statesmen of Great Britain and they must have been impressed with the necessity for such a law, or they would never have brought it forward, and the very fact that such legislation finds a place on the statute-book of Great Britain is a

sufficient guarantee that it cannot be designated as rubbishy. Some members have said that this antagonism to shouting has arisen only during the war ; such is not the case. The member for Kalgoorlie pointed out that similar legislation to this has been on the statute-books of many States of America for years past. In Ireland there have been for many years leagues to combat this system of treating. In a country where the liquor traders are strong, where the whisky interests were so strong that they were often able to dictate to the British Parliament, even during the present crisis, as to what legislation should be passed in that country, it has been recognised for many years that this system of treating is the greatest curse existing there.

Mr. Willmott : Do not forget that in Ireland practically every shop can sell whisky.

Mr. B. J. STUBBS : That does not alter the force of my argument.

Mr. Willmott : Of course it does.

Mr. B. J. STUBBS : Treating there has been found to be the greatest curse of the country, and these leagues to suppress it consist of influential citizens.

Hon. J. D. Connolly : They did not attempt to suppress it by law.

Mr. B. J. STUBBS : No, because they were powerless to do so.

Mr. O'Loughlen : It would be impossible to do so.

Hon. R. H. Underwood (Honorary Minister) : And they have a strong sense of humour.

Mr. B. J. STUBBS : That is no argument why we should not attempt to abolish by law the custom of shouting. The question of the treating of soldiers, in itself, is foreign to the Bill. It has been stated that the reason for bringing the Bill forward is that our soldiers have been treated and have over-indulged in liquor. That might have had some little influence, but if that was a reason what was the real cause underlying it ? Was not the cause mentioned by the Premier when he said that many men of his acquaintance who previously had never indulged in liquor to excess

had, since going into camp at Blackboy, over-indulged ? And why ?

Mr. Willmott : Because they have a dry canteen, a thing which is fatal all over the world.

Mr. B. J. STUBBS : It is nonsense to say it is because of the dry canteen. If a man in Blackboy camp desires a drink, he can go every evening to an hotel not far distant from the camp. If a man had never been in the habit of over-indulging, one glass of beer would perhaps satisfy him. But these men are over-indulging because of the foolish idea existing in the minds of many of the public that every time they meet a soldier they must treat him. That is responsible for the unfortunate spectacles we have witnessed. Our soldiers are as fine a body of men as can be found anywhere and are as good-living as the ordinary citizen, but they have been spoilt to a great extent because of the foolish action of the public in treating them. It has been said legislation of this class cannot be administered. We have been told there are sly-grog shops in every street in Perth.

Mr. O'Loughlen : And you know it.

Mr. B. J. STUBBS : Is the hon. member courageous enough to agitate here that the legislation against sly-grog shops should be repealed on that account.

Mr. Thomson : Why does not he name them ?

Mr. B. J. STUBBS : The hon. member is not courageous enough to say, either here or on the platform, that because there are sly-grog shops in Perth we should repeal the legislation dealing with them. Every sensible man knows it is impossible to properly administer any law. Because we have laws against murder, they do not prevent murders being committed. Because we have laws against a man getting drunk, we cannot prevent drunkenness. We cannot thoroughly administer any legislation, but it is a weak argument to bring against any measure that because it cannot be thoroughly administered it should not be placed on the statute-book. This Bill will do an enormous amount of good in the community. The

father of this Bill in another place told me to-day that he attended a meeting of a large number of business men in Fremantle this morning, and that, with one exception, they thoroughly endorsed the proposal contained in this Bill. Business men realise that the shouting system has become a curse in their commercial life, and the very fact of having legislation would influence these men. These men do not desire to break the law, and they would be glad of the excuse to be able to say, "We cannot do as we have done in the past. We cannot treat customers; it is against the law," and they would obey the law. There would be no necessity to have a policeman in the bar of any hotel or in any shop. It is extraordinary that members on the Government side, who profess to be democrats, use the argument that this legislation is against the liberty of the subject. If there is one old Tory argument brought forward against every piece of democratic legislation introduced, it is that it is against the liberty of the subject, and it is astounding to find members who profess to belong to the most democratic party in the most democratic country of the world, arguing that this measure is against the liberty of the subject. The member for Forrest said we could not show that similar legislation had been a success in any other part of the world. Is not much legislation introduced of which the same can be said? We are out to establish precedents and to show that we can make a success of such laws. I know that whenever a man attempts to do anything of a progressive nature, he is branded as a fool, and in many cases men have had to sacrifice their lives for principles they held dear. The fact that a good many members are telling supporters of this Bill they are fools and fanatics, does not influence me or retard my action at all. I am out to do what is best in the interests of the people, and though a few might sneer, I shall not be influenced by them. I shall support any legislation which will in any way bring about a curtailment of the great evils which exist in connection with the

liquor traffic. I realise that the greatest evils the world has to face to-day are the evils connected with the drink traffic.

Hon. R. H. UNDERWOOD (Honorary Minister) [4.30]: I admit that many members are most sincere in the views they put forward on this subject, notwithstanding that those views are foolish in the extreme. I may say I do not like to point out the foolishness of any one who holds a foolish idea sincerely, and that is why I do not care too much about speaking on this question. The member for Forrest (Mr. O'Loughlen) said that the Premier had made the record yes-no speech on this Bill. Of course the hon. member could not hear himself speaking, but I will say that I award him the palm for a yes-no speech on this question. I mention this because I intend later on to make a few remarks on the yes-no idea, so far as the present Bill is concerned. The member for Subiaco (Mr. B. J. Stubbs) tells us that we should pass this legislation because something similar has been passed by the British Parliament. I tried to point out to the hon. member, by way of interjection, that any amount of rubbish is passed through that Parliament; and the hon. member knows it. However, he went on immediately after to state that the whisky distillers of Ireland had the House of Commons in their grip. If the hon. member is right in that assertion, one cannot take much notice of the legislation passed by that House.

Mr. B. J. Stubbs: I said the whisky distillers prevented some good legislation.

Hon. R. H. UNDERWOOD (Honorary Minister): It is quite possible that the whisky distillers or whisky trade of Ireland had something to do with the passing of this law. On the question of the soldiers, I wish to compliment the Premier on his remarks in that connection. If anything more foolish has ever been done than the establishment of the dry canteen—I said just now that foolishness is often done sincerely—I have never heard of it. The most foolish act which the temperance fanatics

have ever committed is the institution of the dry canteen for our soldiers.

Mr. Willmott: It was absolutely wrong.

Hon. R. H. UNDERWOOD (Honorary Minister): They did it, or many of them did it, with good intentions. They thought they were benefiting the soldier, but in establishing the dry canteens they did absolutely the worst think they have ever done up to date. I trust it will not be long before that evil is remedied and our soldiers are allowed to have a drink, just as civilians are allowed.

Mr. Willmott: See that the soldiers get good liquor in a proper place.

Hon. R. H. UNDERWOOD (Honorary Minister): The leader of the Opposition gave us to understand that shouting is wrong only in the public bar; that is to say, it is wrong only for the navvy and the shearer. The man who can go into the back part of the hotel and purchase by the bottle may go on shouting. There is a good deal of that frame of mind in this kind of legislation. In my opinion it is as much an evil to ask a man to dinner and produce wine or other stimulant at that dinner as it is for me to take my friend, the Attorney General, into Grenike's hotel bar. With all seriousness I urge that there should not be one law for the rich and another for the poor. The Bill now before the House undoubtedly represents an attempt to prevent the poor from shouting, while allowing the rich to go on entertaining their friends as they have done previously. I was speaking of sincerity of motive in the introduction and passing of much of this legislation. A certain section of this Parliament are absolutely sincere in their endeavour to abolish alcohol altogether, or, at least, to try to impose every possible restriction on its use. But, at the same time, there is an enormous amount of insincerity. So far as my own opinions go, I believe that no alteration is required in the present hours of trading. If I have a vote on that question, I am going to vote for 11 o'clock. I have considered the matter pretty fully,

and I believe that any interference with the present system will work evil rather than good. I state that opinion clearly and openly. There are others who hold the same opinion as myself and are working to the same end, but yet endeavour, while doing that, to get the teetotal vote as well?

Member: Who are they?

Hon. R. H. UNDERWOOD (Honorary Minister): Why has this Bill been introduced? The passing of this Bill is not going to make any difference whatever. The Bill, if passed, is not going to be administered—it cannot be administered. There are many members in both Houses of this Parliament who support the Bill merely as a sprat to catch votes, as a sop to the wowsers.

Hon. Frank Wilson: Who are the wowsers?

Hon. R. H. UNDERWOOD (Honorary Minister): The fanatical, teetotallers. As a matter of fact, there are many members like myself who are desirous that existing conditions should continue. But if those members advocate that, they will be up against the West Australian Alliance and the big temperance movement in the metropolitan area, and they will lose a number of votes. To get over that difficulty they bring in a measure of this description, a measure which they well know can make absolutely no difference. Then they will go along to the temperance reformers and say to them, "I am entitled to your vote; I supported your anti-shouting Bill; I introduced the anti-shouting Bill; therefore the temperance party should vote for me." There is another argument, and a sound one, that I have to urge against the principles of this Bill. We are told that drinking in company or shouting leads to excessive drinking. But there is another point of view. The man who is absolutely gone when it comes to drinking, is the silent, solitary drinker.

Mr. B. J. Stubbs: But he is made from the other; he never starts as that.

Hon. R. H. UNDERWOOD (Honorary Minister): The man who goes into an hotel and drinks with the flies

is the man who is gone. When one sees a man doing that, one can be sure that man is shot. If one could prevent drinking in company and induce silent drinking, drinking with the flies, one would produce more drunkards than result from the shouting system, under which men drink only for sociability. Again, what we have to keep well under observation when dealing with this question is drinking in the home. Melbourne has had early closing legislation for some considerable time, and it has been found that consumption has not decreased there—that the consumption of bottled stuff has doubled and trebled, while the consumption of beer in the wood has fallen off correspondingly; which goes to prove that the closing of the hotels has forced the drinking into another channel—not stopped it.

Mr. B. J. Stubbs: Who is your authority for that statement?

Hon. R. H. UNDERWOOD (Honorary Minister): I am a good enough authority on this question. I contend that the channel into which the drinking has been forced in Melbourne is a more disastrous channel. After all, there is always danger to those who drink in their homes. The man who goes down town and has a few drinks, possibly gets so that he has to be escorted home. But that finishes it. On the other hand, once drinking is started in the home it goes on regularly and eternally. This has proved so not only in Melbourne but also in New Zealand. The case of New Zealand I have drawn attention to over and over again. New Zealand went half wet and half dry, and as a result the consumption of alcohol has increased, not decreased. Those are points we should keep in view when dealing with this Bill. I have no fear at all of this Bill causing anything of the sort, for the simple reason that the measure will be absolutely flouted and laughed at. The Parliament which passes such a measure will be ridiculed all over this continent.

Hon. Frank Wilson: The British Parliament has passed such a measure.

Hon. R. H. UNDERWOOD (Honorary Minister): The British Parliament has

passed such a measure; and, as I said before, and as the member for Subiaco has pointed out, the British Parliament is under the thumb of the Irish whisky distillers.

Mr. B. J. Stubbs: I never made that statement.

Hon. R. H. UNDERWOOD (Honorary Minister): I think the hon. member did. I have no desire to repeat what other members have said as regards the administration of the measure, but I point out that the Bill will be absolutely useless because it cannot be administered. It may get a few members of this House and another place a few votes from the temperance party. Outside of that, the Bill is only a waste of good ink and good paper, and I trust that we will waste very little more time upon it.

Mr. ALLEN (West Perth) [4-44]: I have listened to speeches from both sides of the House on this measure, but I must say that up to the present I have heard no argument whatever against it. The Bill has been called piffle. Its introduction has been attributed to the motive of obtaining the votes of wowsers and fanatics. If there is any foundation for that last statement, then wowsers and fanatics are increasing by hundreds and hundreds in Western Australia daily.

Mr. Taylor: But, you see, it is getting near the end of the month.

Mr. ALLEN: That may apply to the hon. member, but I do not think it applies to anybody else. I wish to point out that this legislation, like other legislation introduced since the outbreak of the war, is war emergency legislation. The operation of this Bill is for a limited period. The measure is deemed necessary, I take it, on the score of economy. I do not think anyone will deny that the most rigid economy should be practised at the present time. Although possibly we in Western Australia have not yet felt the strain of this war the day is not far distant when we will have occasion to realise that every shilling that can be saved should be saved. I am satisfied that if the measure becomes law it will reduce the consumption of liquor very

considerably. We are told that this legislation was not sought before war broke out. That is scarcely correct, because we have had advocates of anti-shouting for years past.

Mr. Taylor: We get fanatics in every country.

Mr. ALLEN: Even the hon. member would not regard the Dean of Perth as a fanatic; yet the Dean from his pulpit in the Cathedral has frequently advocated anti-shouting. And the Archbishop of Perth and many other leading clergymen and priests of the State have advocated a Bill of this kind. It has been said that business cannot be done without shouting. I will admit that at one time here a great deal of business was done over a glass of beer, but fortunately that day has very nearly passed altogether. Many of our citizens have imposed this legislation on themselves, realising as they do the necessity for economy. I know of a little group of men in the City who were in the habit of meeting at 5 o'clock and going round to the Palace Hotel for a drink. They have now given up that practice on account of the urgent need of economy. We are told that the proposed law cannot be administered. That argument will apply to many other laws. Yet the fact that a law is in existence serves as a deterrent against crime. If on that score alone, I think it is desirable that we should have this legislation. It seems to me it is not to the credit of the Government that Ministers should say they know there are two or three sly-grog shops in every street in the City, and that they cannot suppress the evil. No Government should be proud of a statement like that.

The Attorney General: Who said it?

Mr. ALLEN: I heard it said over there.

Mr. Bolton: It was said by the member for Forrest, not by any Minister.

Mr. ALLEN: Well, I will withdraw the statement. I thought it was said by a Minister. In any case, it is nothing to be proud of.

The Premier: They will never be suppressed until they become State

sly-grog shops, and then we will have the pimps on them.

Mr. ALLEN: One thing that appeals to me more than another is the fact that the very existence of such a law would serve as a deterrent. We require to suppress drinking as much as we possibly can, especially at the present juncture. Something has been said of our soldiers drinking. I am not going to denounce them. I think it is a pitiful sight to see civilians in a helpless condition of drunkenness, and even more pitiful to see in that condition men wearing the King's uniform. With others I deplore the fact that the wet canteen at Blackboy was removed, and I think I may safely say that those who advocated its removal have since been sorry for their action. The sooner it is restored the better. The men concerned have just as much right to drink as I have.

The Premier: What have those who were responsible for knocking out the canteen done to provide the soldiers with comforts in town to keep them out of the hotels?

Mr. ALLEN: Very little, I am afraid. The Y.M.C.A. has done something. I would like to see a wet canteen for soldiers instituted in the City. Most of the so-called arguments adduced against the Bill seem to me to be utterly worthless.

Hon. J. D. CONNOLLY (Perth) [4.53]: I agree with the principle in the Bill, but I do not intend to vote for the measure, because it does not represent a practical reform. If it were possible to do away with shouting, the drink evil would be very considerably minimised, but it cannot be done. I am not going to condemn the Bill on the score of its being unworkable, and then vote for it. I am going to vote against it, because I hold it to be an impracticable measure. It is of no use voting for something which it is impossible to carry out. My chief complaint against the temperance advocates is directed at their methods.

The Premier: Why worry about the methods?

Hon. J. D. CONNOLLY: What is the good of a principle if we apply the wrong method?

The Premier: Get the principle, without worrying about the methods.

Hon. J. D. CONNOLLY: How are we to introduce a principle without first adopting the right methods? There can be no principle without method. If the temperance people of Australia adopted different methods they would advance their cause more rapidly.

Mr. B. J. Stubbs: Do you suggest that they should support the hotels?

Hon. J. D. CONNOLLY: We cannot greatly diminish the liquor traffic by Act of Parliament. I agree that if we could abolish shouting it would certainly minimise the drink evil. The member for Subiaco made some scathing references to the whisky interests in Ireland, and went on to say that anti-shouting was enforced in Ireland. But it is not enforced by Act of Parliament.

Mr. B. J. Stubbs: It is not enforced at all. I never said it was.

Hon. J. D. CONNOLLY: If the temperance reformers would adopt the methods of the late Father Matthews they might find it comparatively easy to minimise the drink evil. One of the pledges advocated by Father Matthews was total abstinence, and another was a pledge neither to accept a drink from another in an hotel nor to buy a drink for another.

Mr. B. J. Stubbs: Where is the result of Father Matthews's work to-day?

Hon. J. D. CONNOLLY: The hon. member does not know anything at all about him. I have visited the native home of Father Matthews, and I have seen his monument in Cork. There are in the district many temperance leagues founded by that worthy man.

Mr. B. J. Stubbs: His work has been killed by the whisky interests in Ireland.

Hon. J. D. CONNOLLY: Nothing of the sort. The whisky interests in Ireland, in Scotland, and in England are very great. I know, for I have been there.

The Premier: But you are not a very keen observer, anyhow.

Hon. J. D. CONNOLLY: I think I can observe just as keenly as the

Premier. Father Matthews's anti-drinking pledge has done more for the cause of temperance in Ireland than all the restrictions imposed by law. In no other country in the world is there so much liberty in the selling of liquor; yet it will be found that there is no more drunkenness in Ireland than there is in other countries where the restrictions imposed are very much greater. All Father Matthews's methods were based on voluntary action. It has always seemed to me absurd that one should be expected to ask a man to have a drink, or that a man should take it as a slight if one declines to have a drink with him. If there is justification for this Bill it certainly is at the present time. One is almost willing to give it a trial seeing what has taken place here with so many soldiers about. I am not casting any reflection on the soldiers; they are no more desirous of drinking than other people are, only people want to be seen in the company of soldiers. They want to have the honour of treating them, and the people will insist on showing everybody that the soldiers are their friends. One cannot close one's eyes to the absurdity of the law being put on the statute-book. The cost of administration would be very great. The Government would require an army of detectives to stand behind every bar to see that the people did not treat one another.

Mr. NAIRN (Swan) [5.2]: I desire to make a few remarks on this measure which proposes to take from me some of the liberties I enjoy and some of the liberties which I do not desire to forego. I wish to talk on the attitude of the Premier to-day. It has been rightly described by his colleagues as the record yes-no speech made in this Chamber. The Premier did not give any particular information as to what would be the result of the measure if it happened to be carried, although I do not think it is going to be. The Premier does not realise what it will mean if it is carried. It means taking away from a man a liberty he enjoys, the liberty of friendship. That is the root principle of shouting although I am prepared to

admit that people absurdly shout, and they shout beyond their means. It is a proposal which appears to me to come from a source that I do not find myself at any time in harmony with. I am speaking of those who represent a class who, if they had their wishes, there is not one particle of liberty that would be left to the people. No one would be permitted to partake of a drink: no one would be allowed to go to a dance: no one would be allowed to attend race meetings or theatre. If the Premier wants to find himself amongst that class, then I do not want to find myself in his class. I have absolute supreme contempt for that view of life. I want to speak of what has been mentioned here as freak legislation. If carried it cannot be put into effect. What is the opinion the Premier expressed when he says that such legislation could not be carried into effect? It is that the people of the country are going to repudiate the laws passed by this Chamber. If we carried such a law here, we should do so with a desire to have the law recognised, but the Premier says that it will not be recognised, and yet he is prepared to vote for the measure.

[Mr. McDowall took the Chair.]

The Premier: I do not see that.

Mr. NAIRN: The hon. member said that generally he disapproved of the measure and yet he was going to vote for it. I appreciate the attitude of the member for Subiaco, who is a teetotaler. He is logical but the Premier is illogical. If the Premier is going to stand up and tell the public that he will vote for a measure which he does not think can be put into effect, and be placed on the statute-book which would encourage the people to break the law, then that is a bad example.

The Minister for Works: Why would you vote against it?

Mr. NAIRN: Because it represents the sentiments of a class I have a contempt for. I have no objection to the teetotaler. I drink as any reasonable man in the community. I have contempt for the irrational teetotaler and puritan. The Premier is inconsistent and illogical. As far as the teetotaler and the genuine

liquor reformer is concerned he has my admiration. We have anti-street betting legislation on the statute-book, and if one goes down the street one may see hundreds of men engaged in betting.

The Premier: Where?

Mr. NAIRN: In St. George's-terrace.

The Premier: That is where all spiliers congregate.

Mr. NAIRN: In all seriousness, I have objection to the liberty being taken from me. The system of temperance is a system of temperament between one man and another. I meet a man in the street, perhaps a friend of long standing; I am delighted to see him and he to see me. Naturally we meet in a convivial manner and we have a drink. What reasonable objection can be taken to that? If one man out of ten makes a fool of himself, why should I be denied what gives me pleasure and does none an injury? The measure will be absolutely unworkable.

Hon. J. MITCHELL (Northam) [5.10]: Some legislation is necessary at this juncture, and I believe that the passing of this Bill will do more to restrict drinking than the passing of all the other Bills in this Chamber during the last month or two. The member who has just sat down twitted the Premier with saying that if this Bill is placed on the statute-book, it will not be enforced; but the Premier does not enforce the licensing laws now on the statute-book.

The Premier: We do not enforce the law preventing you from spending more than £100 in election expenses.

Hon. J. MITCHELL: I obey the law and I believe 80 per cent. of the people will obey this law. If we place the law on the statute-book, it will be obeyed by nearly everybody, notwithstanding that the Premier may do nothing to enforce it. I do not say that everybody will obey it, but 80 per cent. or 90 per cent. of the people will obey it. I would like the Premier to tell the House how it is he has not tried to enforce the licensing laws which are on the statute-book now. It is all very frank of him to tell us that he will not enforce this law.

The Premier: You are a direct descendant of Annanias if you say that.

Hon. J. MITCHELL: Well, that the law will not be enforced. The Premier does not obey the law himself sometimes. The Premier has referred to drinking amongst the soldiers. Of the thousands of soldiers in camp very few get drunk. They do not get drunk because other people are willing to shout for them. The bulk of them, or the whole of them are willing to pay for what they consume. I think we shall do far more good in passing this Bill than other legislation which we have had before us during this session.

Hon. H. B. LEFROY (Moore) [5.13]: I have not heard any really solid ground advanced against the Bill. The measure has been held up to ridicule. It has been called by all sorts of ugly adjectives but that is all we have heard against it. I do not think I have heard during the time I have been in Parliament the Minister for Mines use so many ugly adjectives as he has done in regard to this Bill. I am surprised that the hon. member, who is usually so courteous, should have done this. The member for Swan has told the House that this Bill has been taken up by a class for whom he has the greatest contempt. I support the Bill but I do not know whether I am to be included in that category, because I have the greatest admiration for the member for Swan. The hon. member said that it has been introduced by the wowsers. The member who introduced the Bill in another place I am sure, and members will agree with me, cannot be classed amongst those who are commonly called wowsers in this community.

The Premier: What is a wowser?

Hon. H. B. LEFROY: No one has been able properly to define the term. I do not believe it can be applied to the hon. gentleman who introduced the measure in another place, or to myself. It is said that those who introduced this Bill are not sincere. I am glad this House has had an opportunity of expressing an opinion on this important question. I believe that anything we can do to encourage temperance is a wise thing. I have

often thought that the system of shouting, which has grown up amongst the people, has done more to create intemperance than anything else. Many a young man has been led astray through it. I believe in hospitality. If anyone comes to my house I am only too pleased to extend my hospitality to him and, not only to be able to offer him a glass of whisky or a glass of beer, but to offer him anything else of a minor character that he may require. Although some hon. members have said that the Bill will not be observed if it is carried into effect, there is no reason why it should not be observed just as much as any other Bill which has been placed upon the statute-book. The fact that it is in existence will deter many people from indulging to excess in this pernicious habit. Although I am not the parent of the Bill, I consider that as it has come from another place it should be received with that respect which all measures sent from another place are entitled to receive at the hands of this House. I was pleased, at the request of my old friend whom I have known from boyhood, to become the stepfather of this Bill on the present occasion. I am sure it was introduced merely for the good of the community, and that neither the hon. Mr. Holmes nor myself thought by this means to catch any votes. I do not think that my own electors are likely to allow their attitude towards me to be influenced by my support of this measure, and that our electors return us to Parliament on more than one principle. I am sure that a large number of the community, and the right-thinking people who are anxious that the welfare of the country should be considered, will welcome the introduction of a Bill like this. I never once mentioned our soldiers in introducing this Bill, and I had not the soldiers in my mind for a moment.

The Premier: You cannot get them out of your mind in a Bill of this sort.

Hon. H. B. LEFROY: The Bill has been introduced at an opportune time. The resources of everyone should be husbanded as far as possible, and I consider

it is sheer waste of money to spend it in the foolish habit of shouting. That habit is of no benefit to anyone. I thank hon. members for the manner in which they have dealt with the Bill, although many of them have held it up to ridicule and called it foolish. I have not heard one sound argument against it, and I trust the House will vote in favour of it.

[The Speaker resumed the Chair.]

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

Ayes	19
Noes	19
				—
A tie	0
				—

AYES.

Mr. Allen	Mr. Scaddan
Mr. Angwin	Mr. Smith
Mr. Carpenter	Mr. B. J. Stubbs
Mr. Griffiths	Mr. Thomas
Mr. Harrison	Mr. Thomson
Mr. Hickmott	Mr. Veryard
Mr. E. B. Johnston	Mr. Walker
Mr. Lefroy	Mr. F. Wilson
Mr. Mitchell	Mr. Gilchrist
Mr. Robinson	(Teller).

NOES.

Mr. Chesson	Mr. McDowall
Mr. Collier	Mr. Mullany
Mr. Connolly	Mr. Nairn
Mr. Cunningham	Mr. O'Loghlen
Mr. Jas. Gardiner	Mr. Underwood
Mr. Green	Mr. Wansbrough
Mr. Heftmann	Mr. Willmott
Mr. Holman	Mr. A. A. Wilson
Mr. Hudson	Mr. Bolton
Mr. Jobuson	(Teller).

Mr. SPEAKER: From the vote I gather that the Assembly has not made up its mind, and, therefore, ruling strictly in accordance with precedent, I give my vote with the noes. The Bill will, therefore, be open to further consideration.

Question thus negatived; Bill defeated.

BILL—LAND ACT AMENDMENT.

Council's Message.

A Message having been received from the Council notifying that it insisted on its amendments Nos. 1, 3, 5, and 6 and proposed an alternative amendment to No. 4, the Message was now considered.

In Committee.

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

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: We have arrived at rather a critical stage with the Bill. Another place has insisted on all the amendments it has made. It is impossible for the Government to agree to the suggestion, but having an earnest desire to prevent the Bill being defeated I move—

That a conference be requested with the Legislative Council on the amendments insisted upon.

Question passed.

[The Speaker resumed the Chair.]

Resolution reported and the report adopted.

Request for Conference.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL (Hon. T. Walker—Kanowna): I move—

That a Message be transmitted to the Legislative Council requesting a conference on the amendments insisted upon by the Legislative Council on the Land Act Amendment Bill and notifying the appointment of Hon. H. B. Lefroy, Mr. Cunningham and the mover as managers for the Legislative Assembly.

Question passed.

BILL—SALE OF LIQUOR REGULATION (No. 2).

Request for Conference.

Message received from the Legislative Council requesting a conference to consider the amendments made to the Bill, the managers to represent the Legislative Council being the Colonial Secretary, Hon. H. P. Colebatch and Hon. J. J. Holmes.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL (Hon. T. Walker—Kanowna): I move—

That a Message be sent to the Legislative Council agreeing to the conference and that Mr. Robinson, Mr. Harrison and the mover be appointed managers on behalf of the Legislative

Assembly, and that the conference meet forthwith in the Speaker's room.

Question passed.

BILL.—LAND ACT AMENDMENT.

Message received from the Council notifying that it had agreed to the Assembly's request for a free conference in respect to the Land Act Amendment Bill.

Sitting suspended from 6.5 to 8 p.m.

Report of Managers.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: I desire to report that the managers from this Chamber have met the managers from another place in regard to the Land Act Amendment Bill and a compromise has been arrived at unanimously in regard to the amendments that should be submitted to each House. I move—

That the Speaker do now leave the Chair for the purpose of considering the amendments agreed to by the conference.

Question passed.

In Committee.

Mr. McDowall in the Chair, the Minister for Lands in charge of the Bill.

No. 1.—Clause 2: In paragraph (a), line 5, strike out the word "ten" and insert "nine":

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: It was decided that this amendment should not be made. I move—

That the Council's amendment be not agreed to.

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

No. 3.—New clause: Add the following new clause to stand as Clause 4:—
"In respect of any land held under Conditional purchase lease, which is more than twelve miles from any station or siding on an existing railway, the Minister may exempt the lessee of such land

from payment of rent for any period up to five years, and may extend the term of the lease, subject to the conditions set out in the last preceding section":

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: The Council's proposal was to add a new clause to the Bill, and that was the principal amendment submitted by another place. As pointed out in the Chamber when under consideration, the amendment as it read imposed too great a loss upon the revenue of the State which the Government were not prepared to endorse. A compromise has been agreed upon which limits the operations of this amendment to the lands that come within the meaning of the Act, or in other words only applies to land alienated since 1910. Instead of it applying to land 12 miles from an existing station it will read that it will apply to land 12½ miles from an existing railway. That will continue the accepted policies of different governments in bringing farmers to within 12½ miles of an existing railway. The only other alteration is that "exempting" settlers from the payment of rents. The word "deferred" is used.

On motions by the MINISTER FOR LANDS, the new clause was amended by adding after the word "lease" in line 2, "coming within the meaning of this Act"; also after the word "twelve" in the same line, adding the words "and a half"; also by striking out lines 2 and 3 the words "any station or siding on"; also in line 4 by striking out the words "exempt the lessee of such land from" and inserting in lieu "defer the."

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: The clause as amended by the conference will read: In respect of any land held under Conditional Purchase lease coming within the meaning of this Act which is more than twelve and a half miles from an existing railway, the Minister may defer the payment of rent for any period up to five years, and may extend the term of the lease, subject to the conditions set out in the last preceding section.

Mr. HEITMANN: Will the Minister explain what will be the determining

factors when considering the claims of an individual for assistance.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: This will be applied in a general sense. It is to be left to the discretion of the Minister and I indicated that while I would have a great deal of consideration for the resident farmer I would not have much consideration for the absentee unless of course he was farming under difficulties, although we would take into consideration whether the holder would be able to pay the rent.

Mr. Heitmann: Will the exemption cease if the railway is built in 12 months time?

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: There are not many settlers now who are not 12½ miles from an existing or a proposed line. There will be exemptions for a year and in some cases perhaps two years.

Mr. Taylor: Will the 12½ miles be measured as from the homestead to the nearest point of an existing line?

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: The original proposal suggested that the distance should be from a siding or station. The amendment makes it apply to the nearest point on the line.

New clause as amended put and passed.

No. 5—New Clause, regulations:

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: It was recognised that we have the power we require in the principal Act and it was agreed that this amendment should not be made. I move—

That the Council's amendment be not agreed to.

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

No. 6—New Schedule:

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: I move—

That the Council's amendment be not agreed to.

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

Resolutions reported, the Report adopted and a Message transmitted to the Legislative Council.

BILL—SALE OF LIQUOR REGULATION (No. 2).

Conference Managers' Report.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL (Hon. T. Walker—Kanowna) [8.15]: I have to report that the managers appointed by this House have met the managers appointed by the Council and after conference it has been agreed that the Council be requested to withdraw the amendments requested to be made in this Bill and submit others in lieu thereof by way of compromise. I move—

That the report be adopted.

Question passed.

BILL—PERMANENT RESERVE (No. 2).

Council's Amendment.

Amendment made by the Council now considered.

In Committee.

Mr. McDowall in the Chair; the Minister for Works in charge of the Bill.

Add a new clause as follows to stand as Clause 3:—"No lease shall be granted under this Act in respect of the lands excised until the expiration of one month after the draft of such lease has been laid upon the Table of each House of Parliament. If either House of Parliament pass a resolution at any time within one month after any such lease has been laid before it disallowing such lease then the same shall cease to have effect".

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: I move—

That the amendment be not agreed to. It would be almost impossible to start an industry under the conditions laid down. There is 50 acres of land which should never have been included in the reserve. A portion of the area, which is at Capel, was leased and had not it been for the fact that it was forfeited for non-payment of rent, the lease would have extended until 1916. There was a lime kiln on it at one time. It is merely quarry and without timber. Several parties are anxious to start cement works in this State. We should not give any-

one a monopoly. The more who come the better for the State. I have been informed that some people are anxious to deal with areas which the Government are free to lease and to hold up this area, and that they have been using influence in that direction. We desire this area to be put on the same basis as the Lake Clifton area. There is a gentleman ready to take up the area and pay rent and ask no preference in the way of the Government taking his cement. He is prepared to spend £80,000 to £100,000 on works, and supply lime to the farmers. No promise has been made to any person, but it would be impossible for anyone to start under the conditions of this clause and we wish to be in a position to make the best terms possible.

Hon. FRANK WILSON: I agree with the Minister. The Government have thousands of acres of similar land which they can lease on special terms. I understand the stone in this deposit has been tested and proved to be more suitable for cement manufacture than that in any other district. The amendment would mean hanging up the proposition for 12 months and perhaps indefinitely and is absurd. We do not want a monopoly, but should encourage all outside capital to come into the State. I believe the gentlemen in question come from South Australia and if they are prepared to expend money, build works, employ labour and take their chance with us, we should welcome them. If the Government were asked to give a special concession which they would not give to other people, then Parliament should be consulted as to the terms.

Hon. J. MITCHELL: There are not thousands of acres of limestone near to the railways. The settlers of the South-West have been calling out for lime for a long time, and it is not necessary to supply that part of the State from Dongarra if there is a supply at Capel. Some portion of this deposit should be reserved for farmers or provision should be made to supply them with lime at cost price. I consider those deposits should be dealt with as speedily as possible.

Mr. O'Loghlen: The member for Murray-Wellington the other day agreed to tie the Government up in that respect.

Hon. J. MITCHELL: I have no objection to the lime deposits being dealt with by the Minister. I think the Minister should treat with consideration the people negotiating with him, and get the industry established as speedily as possible, because we want the lime for our lands and we want the work for our people. I support the Minister's motion. In the ordinary way, of course, Parliament would have liked to see the agreement; but Ministers have delayed this matter. Before spending £100,000 on the lime deposit, the people negotiating will want a pretty secure lease.

Question put and passed, the Council's amendment not agreed to.

Resolution reported, and the report adopted.

A committee consisting of Hon. W. D. Johnson, Hon. Frank Wilson, and Mr. Harrison drew up reasons for not agreeing to the Council's amendment.

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

Sitting suspended from 8.40 to 9.45 p.m.

BILL—SALE OF LIQUOR REGULATION (No. 2).

Council's Message.

Message received from the Legislative Council notifying that it had made the amendments in the Sale of Liquor Regulation Bill as agreed to by Conference.

In Committee.

Mr. Holman in the Chair; the Attorney General in charge of the Bill.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: I desire to inform this Committee what transpired in conference. As hon. members know, I have taken the stand all through that we should have a referendum measure, and I desired that referendum measure to become law. Unfortunately a deadlock occurred between the two Chambers, and it was a matter of either drop-

ping the Bill altogether or endeavouring to come to some understanding as to what might be considered a modicum of temperance reform in the times through which we are passing.

Mr. Thomas: And any sacrifice of principle.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: There were two principles at stake. One principle was that of referring this matter to the people. We were informed that if that were settled upon the Bill would be dropped in another place. That principle was sacrificed therefore, to that extent before the conference took place. The other principle was that the Legislative Chambers of their own initiative and authority fixed the hours of closing. It was deemed that some shortening of the hours for the sale of liquor was necessary, but at the present time the example set by every nation, by England herself, by His Majesty the King, and by every other State would not be an unwise example to follow in this State, and therefore we were fixing by Parliament or by the vote of the people the shortening of the hours. It was considered that would be a benefit to the people. But it was pointed out that the same conditions did not prevail in every portion of the State, and the application of a fixed hour in every portion of the State without the people's concurrence, without them having a voice in it, might be considered unjust. It might be an imposition on some parts of the State. The conference first of all took into consideration what portion of the State was most affected by the conditions prevailing at the present time. It was considered that the metropolitan area being the place whence the troops are sent abroad and to which the troops return, the seat, so to speak, of recruiting in this State, that there was a greater tendency to expend the people's money on drink in that area than in any other district of the State. Therefore, it was considered that where the law should apply most rigidly should be that portion of Western Australia.

Mr. Heitmann: Is that why you included Geraldton?

Mr. Thomas: And is that why you included Bunbury?

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: I am stating what has occurred, and not at this juncture, giving other reasons than those I expressed to the House, and I wish hon. members to understand that I have been defeated in my purpose. I have not been able to obtain what the Government desired. It is no longer possible for us to consider the Referendum Bill.

Mr. Heitmann: There are things that are worse than honourable defeat.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: I am not denying that, but I ask the House to deal with this matter without party bias, remembering this though, that we should not lose an opportunity of checking the drink evil if it be possible.

Mr. Thomas: How does the provision in regard to clubs stand?

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: It applies to clubs, refreshment rooms, and all those places which were fixed in the original Bill.

Mr. Thomas: I was informed otherwise.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: The hon. member was informed wrongly, and I hope he has not arrived at wrong conclusions on the information he has received. The clubs will close at nine, the refreshment rooms will close at nine, and the hotels and all the other places where liquor is sold will close at nine o'clock.

Mr. Thomas: What about the people residing in the hotels?

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: I do not know about those who reside there, but I imagine that it will not apply to those partaking of supper in their own hotels. The provisions made for closing under the referendum are now included in the nine to nine clause.

Mr. Thomas: I have been informed that a member of a club will still be able to get a drink at any time, but that a member of the public cannot.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: I do not know what the hon. member has been informed. I am stating the position. I am not taking the responsibility for the

measure, as it will be amended. It is not mine. It is a compromise, and it is for the House to consider whether it will be accepted. Briefly, the proposition is that in the metropolitan area and the country districts—hon. members will recollect that we divided the whole State into licensing districts for the purpose of the Act—the metropolitan and farming districts, so to speak, will be under the compulsory provisions fixed by the Legislature to open only between nine and nine. The goldfields areas have not asked for nine to nine or any other alternative.

Mr. Heitmann: And in all the ports?

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: Yes.

Mr. Heitmann: Where?

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: By every species of public meeting and deputation.

Mr. Heitmann: Nine to nine?

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: I do not want hon. members to get savage with me; I am only an actor in the tragedy.

Mr. Taylor: It is indeed a tragedy.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: But it is relieved by the comedy of some hon. members.

Mr. Heitmann: Who is the heavy villain?

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: The hon. member might well aspire to that position. I think, however, that the whole matter is too serious for frivolous interjections.

Hon. R. H. Underwood (Honorary Minister): I think the Bill is too frivolous for serious consideration.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: I do not want the hon. member to express those views. His mind does not appear to be able to rise above the froth of his beer. I am asking hon. members now to consider the position which we have arrived at, to consider whether we are to allow so many people to continue wasting their substance, ruining their health, and undermining their energies at a time when, above all others, they should keep their mental balance exact, their health perfect, and their strength of character unimpaired. We are discussing a matter concerning the whole of the

State, and it is my desire to get what little reform I can. If we cannot obtain all that we want, I hope the Committee will accept so much as is offered. It will bring us into line with other parts of the Empire engaged in the present terrible struggle. Most certainly if we cannot secure all the reform we want, it is wise to get what we can. In the districts I have mentioned it is proposed that the hours shall be 9 a.m. to 9 p.m. On the goldfields, where the conditions are more or less normal, it is held that the people should be allowed to fix the matter for themselves. The North-West is omitted from the operations of the Bill. Further than that, the townsite of Westonia is to be placed among the goldfields. That is practically the whole of the proposal. It is for the Committee to consider whether the compromise shall be accepted or whether we shall go without any reform at all.

Mr. E. B. Johnston: What is to be the position of clubs?

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: They will be just the same as public houses; they are licensed premises.

Mr. Thomas: I was informed that the old conditions would still obtain in regard to clubs.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: Then the information was wrong.

No. 1, Clause 3.—Districts: Add at the end of paragraph 2 "and the townsite of Westonia in the Avon electoral district":

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: I move—

That the amendment be made.

Hon. FRANK WILSON: I am prepared to accept the compromise the Attorney General has put before us, but I cannot refrain from expressing regret that the 9 to 9 principle has not been adopted right through the State. The Government have undoubtedly sought to make some distinction in respect to the goldfields. I do not see why there should be any distinction at all. However, if we do not accept the compromise we will have no measure of reform at all.

The PREMIER: We have not asked for any special consideration for the

goldfields. We provided a measure of local option, and we have tried to adhere to it. We set up districts because we recognised that the conditions are different in different districts. The whole of the agitation for the Bill has centred in the metropolitan area, where it is desired that whatever hours are fixed should apply throughout the State, but I hold that the people of Perth have no right to dictate to the people of the goldfields. Both centres should be consulted. Another place wanted 9 to 9 throughout the State. We refused, a conference has been held, and certain proposals submitted as a compromise. Members have to consider it from the point of view as to whether it is better to accept this or nothing at all. They have now to choose whether we shall have this or nothing. I know that some of the representatives of temperance organisations had approached members of the Legislative Council asking them to bring forward the 9 to 9 proposal.

Hon. Frank Wilson: Alleged members.

The PREMIER: They were members. I have heard other members of the temperance organisation say that they would not be disappointed if they got the 9 to 9 hours. One difficulty is the shifting attitude of those who have been asking for some reform. We on our side have not shifted our ground.

Hon. R. H. Underwood (Honorary Minister): Chuck it out.

The PREMIER: I am not going to chuck it out. Before the session opened we declared that we were prepared to submit the question of the opening and closing hours of hotels to the people for their decision, per medium of a referendum, and we have not wavered from this position.

Hon. R. H. Underwood (Honorary Minister): Why shift now?

The PREMIER: We are not shifting. If the hours are fixed in the metropolitan area members of the metropolitan area will be held responsible. We still adhere to the principle of submitting this per medium of the referendum. If that is not a fair compromise it is better than

nothing, and better than the 9 to 9 throughout the State without consulting the people.

Mr. Heitmann: Did any majority of people in any district ask for these hours?

The PREMIER: So far as we are able to judge from public opinion, and by the demonstrations which have been made at public meetings, there has been a demand for the fixing of hours so far as the metropolitan area is concerned by way of the referendum. I speak of the preponderance of public opinion, which I believe is in the direction of the referendum. The trade is fearful of the result of the referendum, and is prepared in lieu of it to give the 9 to 9 hours. In many cases the advocates of some measure of reform, as well as a fair section of the public, have agreed that this is something in the nature of a compromise which might be accepted. There has been no definite expression of opinion of any kind by public meetings or otherwise outside the metropolitan area from which one could fairly say that the public has asked for anything else but the referendum.

Mr. Gilechrist: What about the 8 to 8 movement?

The PREMIER: That was made in anticipation that the Government might by executive act make some alteration in the closing hours. I consider that the Government have adopted the correct attitude. I am going to vote now from the point of view of being a member representing a constituency, and every other hon. member is entitled to do likewise. This is a non-party measure. Rather than lose the Bill and rather than that my constituents should have something forced upon them either by the trade or by reform in Perth, I am going to protect their interests by accepting this.

Mr. Heitmann: You are not protecting the interests of other individuals.

The PREMIER: The hon. member is apparently worrying more about other people than about his own interests. From the outset of the session, notwithstanding the changing attitude of some who claim to be supporting us, we have

adhered strictly to the referendum principle.

Mr. B. J. Stubbs : The hon. member opposed it

Mr. Heitmann : I did not oppose the referendum. I have a perfect right to do so if I choose.

The PREMIER : I am in favour of the referendum. If the representatives of the metropolitan are satisfied that their constituents would accept the 9 to 9 movement in preference to the referendum, then let them take the responsibility of saying so. My constituents should express their opinion per medium of the referendum. I am speaking in my capacity as member for Brown Hill-Ivánhoe.

Mr. ROBINSON : The dominant feature of the Bill is a desire during this time of war to shorten the hours of the sale of liquor. The dominant feature of the Bill is not the method by which this is to be gained.

Mr. Taylor : Why do you not accept 9 to 9 ?

Mr. ROBINSON : This Committee has decided in favour of the principle of the referendum and I have voted for it. If I cannot get my way in regard to the subsidiary point I am not going to have the Bill sacrificed. If I cannot get these hours shortened in one way, I want them shortened in another way.

Hon. R. H. Underwood (Honorary Minister) : Any way will do you.

Mr. ROBINSON : Any way, so long as the hours are shortened, and in a lawful manner. If we are to put our feet down and say we will not have this liquor law reformed unless we get it per medium of the referendum, I do not think we shall get anything at all. The reason why the State was divided into four districts for the purposes of this Bill was that what would suit one place in the State would not suit another. As reasonable men we should accept this compromise. It is the best we are going to get and if we do not accept the Bill as it has come down to us now, we shall have no liquor reform at all.

Mr. Taylor : It is not a compromise, it is a sacrifice of principles.

Hon. R. H. Underwood (Honorary Minister) : It is an idiocy.

Mr. ROBINSON : There is no sacrifice of principles. The people on the goldfields will get the full benefit of the referendum principle, and we shall then see how they will use those benefits. It is a small request to make, that 2,000 people on the goldfields should have a referendum. The Government will not be justified in spending money on a referendum on the goldfields unless 2,000 people applied for it. I should like the same principle extended to the metropolitan area, but I cannot get it. The managers sent from this Committee to the meeting of managers from another place supported one another on the question of the referendum.

The Attorney General : We were told we would lose the Bill if we did not give way.

Mr. ROBINSON : Yes, that is so.

Hon. Frank Wilson : You should have gone for the 9 to 9 throughout the State.

Mr. ROBINSON : What I want is a reform in our liquor laws. If we cannot get it in one way we should get it in another. If any man in this Chamber turns down the Bill he will be turned down in his constituency. Remarks have been made regarding the closing of clubs. There is no difference between clubs and public houses. All are to close at the same hour.

Mr. Thomas : Are you emphatic on that point ?

Mr. ROBINSON : Yes. "Licensed premises" include hotels and clubs and "licensed persons" include the hotel proprietor and the club secretary. When the Attorney General reads the clause dealing with the hours, it will be seen that the position is fully covered.

Mr. Thomas : A lot depends on that particular clause.

Mr. ROBINSON : When we come to it members will be satisfied.

Hon. Frank Wilson : We want to know the whole of the facts.

Mr. ROBINSON : The Committee will receive them in due course. I hope members will apply themselves to the Bill and the serious matters they have to face in connection with it.

Mr. HUDSON: The hon. member seems sure that the amendments will apply to clubs. I ask your ruling, Mr. Chairman, whether we can hear the clause?

The CHAIRMAN: Seeing that one amendment of necessity affects the others, it will be wise to allow some member to explain the amendments to save time. We cannot separate one from the other.

Mr. HUDSON: If the provision applies to hotels only, it will make a considerable difference in our attitude to the amendments.

The Premier: Clause 2 has not been interfered with.

Mr. HUDSON: The proposal is to alter the hours in Section 97 of the Licensing Act by substituting 9 a.m. for 6 a.m., and 9 p.m. for 11 p.m., so that licensed premises shall be open from 9 to 9. In the Bill there is a definition of "licensed premises," which is more extensive than the definition in the Licensing Act. In reading Section 97 for the future we shall have to interpret "licensee" as in the past. This Bill does not add to that definition. The managers recommend that the prohibitive provision in the Bill be struck out, so that the only prohibitive section remaining will be that in Section 97. We are told that these proposals extend to all classes of licensed premises, but Section 97 exempts the bona fide traveller, lodger and inmate if the liquor is not consumed in the bar. Will it be possible for that provision to operate after 9 o'clock?

The Minister for Lands: If it is not struck out the provision in the principal Act will apply.

Mr. HUDSON: Then bona fide travellers, lodgers and inmates will be entitled to be served with liquor after 9 o'clock. Soldiers coming to Perth from the Blackboy camp will be entitled to obtain liquor in any quantities they like. The distance is six miles. This shows the ineffectiveness of the proposed Bill. I would like to know if the definition in the Act or the definition in the Bill is to apply and what provision there is to carry it into effect.

Mr. WILLMOTT: This is not a party measure but one on which members must vote according to their consciences. I fail to see why one portion of the State should be treated differently from another. Why should the North-West and the goldfields be treated differently from the South-West? In the metropolitan area there are reasons why more drastic legislation is required, but why deprive the country districts of the right of local option? It looks as if those who recommended these amendments consider the country district cannot be trusted to choose for themselves. I say they can be trusted. In the country there might be reasons why the hotels should be closed at later hours than in towns. Men travel long distances and arrive late. People might claim that country hotels should be closed at 11 p.m. or they might favour 6 o'clock closing. Whichever they favour should be adopted and no arbitrary rule should be laid down for one portion of the State while other portions are allowed to choose for themselves. This is unjust and unfair and the country districts are being treated as if they were not capable of judging for themselves, which is a slur on that section of the community.

Hon. J. D. CONNOLLY: I protest against the exceptional treatment meted out to the metropolitan districts under this compromise. Last evening, because I dared to suggest that we should accept the 9 to 9 proposal instead of going to the expense of a referendum, I was roundly abused by the Premier. Yet to-night the Government come back to the same proposals for the metropolitan area. The Attorney General has complained that under this compromise his principle has had to go by the board. His principle has not gone by the board, and neither has the Premier's. The Premier and the Attorney General have upheld the principle they have always adopted whenever a Licensing Bill has been before the House. The Premier yesterday said I was standing here for the liquor interests of the metropolitan area—

The Premier: And I say it again.

Hon. J. D. CONNOLLY: Then the Premier stands for the liquor interests on the goldfields. I congratulate the Premier and the Attorney General on their consistency in meting out this exceptional treatment to the liquor interests in Kalgoorlie. When the present Licensing Act was before the House the Premier suggested, in the interests of hotels on the goldfields, that they should be open for six hours on Sunday, from 8 to 10, 12 to 2, and 6 to 8.

The Premier: What has that to do with this matter?

Hon. J. D. CONNOLLY: It has a lot to do with the Premier's consistency.

The Premier: I shall give you a little to go on with if you want it.

Hon. J. D. CONNOLLY: Now the Premier and the Attorney General are still consistent. In October, 1910, when the present law was being enacted, the Premier voted that the licensing bench should be able to distribute the 17 hours of trading for goldfields hotels over any portion of the 24 hours. It was suggested that the hours should be from 8 a.m. to 2 a.m., so that the publican could give the miner a drink at 8 o'clock in the morning when he went to work, and also between 12 and 1, when he came off his night shift. The Premier voted for that in 1910. The Attorney General took up exactly the same attitude at the same time. A motion that goldfields hotels be opened for five hours on Sunday was defeated on a division, by 25 to 16, and in that instance we find the present Attorney General voting with the present Premier, and we find the same position here to-night. Because I suggested the very thing now recommended to the Committee by the Government, I was accused of standing for the liquor interest. The Premier has stood for that interest for years past. I protest against the exceptional treatment meted out to the metropolitan area, and more especially to the agricultural areas, which have had no voice in this matter at all. I make my protest with due humility, and in spite of the heroics and the threats of the member for Canning.

Mr. HARDWICK: I cannot help expressing my surprise at, not to say my disapprobation of, the amendments submitted to us this evening. These amendments reflect what has always been the policy of the Government. We have practically a goldfields Ministry, who never on any occasion fail to give to the goldfields districts benefits which are denied to the metropolitan and country areas. My intention had been to vote for the nine to nine hours, until I discovered that the goldfields were excluded. A piecemeal enactment of this kind cannot be satisfactory. I do not agree with the member for Canning that to vote against these amendments will mean the last of one's being seen in this Chamber. These amendments represent unworkable, unpractical, and unconstitutional legislation. Westonia, I observe, is proposed for inclusion in the goldfields district. The line of demarcation would, no doubt, be in the vicinity of Westonia, or perhaps within it; and thus to serve an individual with liquor after 9 o'clock at night would be a crime on one side of an imaginary line, while a man on the other side of that imaginary line could wallow in drink and still remain a respectable citizen. A Bill of this nature should apply universally throughout the State. It will be a source of great dissatisfaction to traders of the metropolitan area and the country districts to find that they are denied privileges extended to goldfields traders.

Mr. HARRISON: As one of the managers entrusted by the House with the task of doing the best we could on the lines of the Bill presented by the Government, but returned with unacceptable amendments from the Council, I wish to state that various propositions were brought forward in regard to this first scheme of taking a referendum, which meant local option, because of the division into districts—the metropolitan area, the agricultural area, the goldfields area, and the North-West. Industrial and climatic conditions on the goldfields differ widely from those obtaining in the metropolitan area. This applies especially to the

prevalence of night work on the goldfields. Westonia, which happens to be at the eastern end of the Avon electorate, is a mining centre, and its working conditions are the same as those obtaining on the goldfields. Therefore it would have been unfair to deprive Westonia of goldfields conditions under this Bill. In the North-West, where there is a comparatively small population distributed through a wide area, journeys are necessarily long; and the hotels of the North-West exist for residential and accommodation purposes far more than for the sale of liquor. As regards the agricultural areas, if local option cannot be obtained, why should we not obtain what we can in the way of liquor reform? There is no reason why the agricultural areas should not be treated on the same lines as the metropolitan area. Has not finance also some bearing on the question? Do not we want to conserve the energies and resources of the people throughout the Empire? Again, shall we spend £6,000 or £7,000 on a referendum if we can do something towards liquor reform without that expenditure? The matter is in the hands of the hon. members, and they must do as they think best.

Mr. MULLANY: I regret the Attorney General seems inclined to accept the Council's amendments. He has referred to them as a compromise. In my opinion they represent an abject abandonment of the principles contained in the Bill sent to the Council. The Bill, as passed here almost unanimously, provided that the people themselves in each district should say how the liquor traffic should be controlled in their particular district. There has been no desire on the part of the goldfields people to obtain different treatment from that given to other sections of the State. As a representative of a goldfields constituency, I cannot bring myself to accept such amendments as these. If the metropolitan area ought to have hours from nine to nine, those hours would also be right for the goldfields. The member for Perth has said that the Government, as usual, have given special consideration to the goldfields. I re-

sent that. I have never asked for special consideration.

Mr. Thomson: Then, if you are sincere, move that the nine to nine hours shall apply to the goldfields.

Mr. MULLANY: We cannot now alter these amendments. We must accept the whole lot or lose the Bill. I am going to vote against the amendments. The absurdity of the whole thing must appeal to any hon. member. As an afterthought, we are going to alter the boundaries so as to bring in the mining township of Westonia. Why is not Collie, the coal mining district, included, and if it is on geographical lines we are going on, why has not something been done for Esperance. So far as the goldfields are concerned, I am satisfied, but why should the goldfields get separate treatment in this manner as the amendment proposes to give them? It appears to me it is a question on which we cannot get a direct expression of opinion from anyone. The member for Canning dramatically told us that anyone who opposes the amendment will assist to bring about the loss of the Bill. But if my constituents are not pleased with what I am going to do, they are at liberty to make a change. I cannot consider this question from that view point and I think we would get better legislation if more hon. members did the same thing. I do not intend to support the amendment; I shall vote against it and if necessary divide the House. If it is good to close from 9 to 9 in the metropolitan area it is good to do likewise in other places, but above all, if it is good to have a law like this in one part of the State, it must be good in every other. I am not prepared to support a hybrid proposition such as this.

Mr. TAYLOR: We were told by the managers who represented this House that the conference did not get very far in the discussion when they reached that point upon which the managers of another place decided that unless the 9 to 9 proposal was accepted, or rather that the referendum suggestion was dropped the Bill would be lost. It was not for us to wait until to-night to know

that; we knew it yesterday. I have known it since another place began to deal with this Bill. No member could walk through the corridors without realising that the other Chamber was determined to have the 9 to 9 proposal, at any rate for the metropolitan area. Last night I pleaded to the House to accept the 9 to 9 hours. I told hon. members that if they did not do so and they held rigidly to the referendum suggestion, they had not a shadow of democracy left. We could have had the 9 to 9 proposal last night.

The Minister for Lands: Not for the whole of the State.

Mr. TAYLOR: Yes, and the whole of the State should be dealt with by this Chamber. I opposed the separate districts.

The Minister for Lands: You did not.

Mr. TAYLOR: I am not allowed to refer to *Hansard*, but hon. members can turn it up if they like and find from my remarks the exact position that I did take. I opposed the cutting up of the State into divisions and I instanced that the vote for the Senate was taken for the whole of the State, and not in divisions, and if it were necessary to divide the State on this question into different areas so that the people might express their views as they desired, why should not a similar thing be done in connection with the Senate? The Alliance know full well that they have no power on the goldfields and cannot compel members of Parliament to vote as they desire, but if I can accept the hon. member for Canning as an authority the man who speaks as I speak to-night and votes as I intend to vote will make his last appearance in the House. That is what the hon. member has conveyed and he has been somewhat successful in getting some members round to his way of thinking. He will not however, get me in this same way. Ever since the Bill was brought down the soldiers at Blackboy have been dragged in as something to justify this temperance vote. It is a disgrace that men with noble aspirations should be pointed to for having taken a glass of liquor. Even the Attorney General, in his climb-down,

referred to the alleged indulgence in drink by our soldiers. The member for Avon (Mr. Harrison) has been successful in getting Westonia shifted into the goldfields because the men there are miners. If those men require liquor over long periods, what about the man at Carrabin, only a few miles away, working in the broiling sun all day?

The Minister for Lands: He can get a drink when he knocks off work.

Mr. TAYLOR: The man at Carrabin must not drink after 9 o'clock, but the man at Westonia, associated with 700 votes, must have the hours of 6 to 11 and must be shifted into the goldfields. This side of the House are perfectly willing to break down all their principles of referendum, except in respect to the goldfields. The goldfields are responsible for returning Labour members to the House, but the goldfields desire no privileges.

The Minister for Lands: They make blunders.

Mr. TAYLOR: They made no blunder when they sent the hon. member out of Kalgoorlie down to Midland Junction. I suppose they make a blunder in sending me back here year after year.

The Minister for Lands: I do not cry, at all events.

Mr. TAYLOR: Why, a swan could have floated on your tears a few weeks ago! The goldfields require no differential treatment. If the goldfields hold this Parliament in their grip I say it is a poor Parliament. The goldfields believe in the referendum, but not in a referendum for the goldfields alone. Why should Bunbury and Collie be compelled to shut their doors at 9 o'clock when a man at Westonia can be shifted into the goldfields to enable him to get a beer? Why is it all? Is it because the goldfields are so politically strong that Parliament must yield to them? If the referendum is good for the goldfields, it is good for the whole State. If democracy demands the voice of the people on the goldfields, democracy should demand that voice throughout the length and breadth of the State.

Mr. Green: Why did you oppose it a night or two ago?

Mr. TAYLOR : On the ground that it was not democratic.

Mr. McDowall : You went for 9 to 9.

Mr. TAYLOR : I believe Parliament should take the responsibility, but Parliament is shirking the 9 to 9 issue for the goldfields. It has not the moral courage to pass that law for the fields.

Mr. Green : We have no right to.

Mr. TAYLOR : Members have not the courage.

Mr. Allen : You did not show much courage last night.

Mr. TAYLOR : I am not under the alliance.

The Minister for Lands : You are changing your attitude of last night.

Mr. TAYLOR : Last night I considered 9 to 9 was the proper thing for the State as a whole, but now it is to apply to the metropolitan and agricultural areas, but not to the goldfields. The goldfields people do not want preferential treatment.

Mr. Green : Do you believe the goldfields should have 9 to 9 ?

Mr. TAYLOR : I am not an authority on the hours hotels should be kept open but, if 9 to 9 is good for Perth, it should be good for every part of the State. The only unfortunate position is there are not sufficient wowsers in other parts of the State to make themselves felt. It is not a matter of justification but a matter of force and political power, and anyone who would take advantage of the war to force through his principles is no friend of mine. Our noble soldiers have been dragged down, degraded as being drunkards, in order to force through this principle of liquor reform. This is not an emergency measure rendered necessary through war or stress ; it is liquor reform absolutely, just to get a leg in. Have not we heard the reformers ? Are not they the same old crowd ? Are not some of my friends on the platform ? They were on the platform for the 8 to 8 movement. They would have been pleased to get 8 to 8 and, last night, would have been satisfied to take 9 to 9 rather than lose this Bill, but I hardly think they would be satisfied to sanction certain conditions

for Perth and the country and preferential treatment for the goldfields. When we find Westonia lifted to the goldfields for the purpose of creating a thirst, merely because there are 700 voters for the Government there, and when we find that an unfortunate man six miles away at Carrabin has to accept the conditions prevailing in Perth, it is too awful for words. I shall vote against this proposition and, if my vote will defeat the measure, I shall be proud and pleased. We are dealing with a principle without being seized of all the facts. We have it on good authority that the bona fide traveller will be left loose and free, but we do not know what the managers of the conference had before them. This amendment is really the Bill.

Mr. Harrison : You ought to remember that the miners work on shifts at different hours.

Mr. TAYLOR : I have heard that before. It is like the widow-and-orphan tale. Miners are as sober and steady and exercise as much self-control as any men. They know when to take drink and when to leave it alone. I am absolutely opposed to this class of legislation. The Attorney General called it a compromise. It is an absolute backdown from and desertion of all the principles which the hon. member has advocated in this House. Just imagine a democratic party like this, with the initiative and referendum on their platform, and the only place which is going to get the referendum is the goldfields after 2,000 wowsers have asked for it ! Is not that a most democratic situation ? Cannot I return to my constituents and say what noble democrats we are ?

[Mr. McDowall took the Chair.]

Mr. Heitmann : A man need not be a wowsers to ask for a referendum.

Mr. TAYLOR : The wowsers are forcing the situation.

Mr. Allen : You do not know what you are talking about.

Mr. TAYLOR : The wowsers are the force behind it. I was surprised

that the member for Subiaco did not accept 9 to 9. He was on the platform in favour of the 8 to 8 movement but in his work there was a fine tinge of political effort from which he could not escape. He almost got me on the water wagon on one or two occasions but, unfortunately, I could not stay there. I hope the conditions of this compromise will not be accepted. If one could get to the bottom of the attitude of the conference managers, I think we would find that fighting for the referendum there was one man alone, the Attorney General, and that he was the dying friend of the referendum; the other gentlemen were wedded to the compromise and did not mind sinking their principles when they could not secure what they desired. I am going to vote against the proposal even if it means the loss of the Bill. I prevailed upon the Committee the other evening to support the hours of nine to nine in order to save the Bill. If they accept the position now, they accept it with degradation, and with the sacrifice of those principles which are associated with the party. I hope the Committee will not accept the conditions offered by the managers of another place.

THE MINISTER FOR WORKS: I am surprised at the remarks of the member for Mt. Margaret. Anyone would think to hear him talk, that he was a champion advocate of the referendum, but as a matter of fact he has opposed the referendum from A to Z.

Mr. Taylor: I am opposed to the idea of placating electors.

THE MINISTER FOR WORKS: I have had the temperance alliance and the publicans together opposed to me, but I express my views no matter what may be the views of either body. I am going to vote for the arrangement which has been arrived at by the managers, because I believe that it is better than nothing, and that if we cannot get the referendum, we should make some attempt to decrease the hours for the sale of intoxicating liquor. A good deal has been said about our soldiers. In reference to the statement of the member for Mt. Margaret on this matter, I would

ask how many men there are in camp in this State who are over the age of 54? I venture to say there are very few indeed. On the initiative and referendum, the hon. member has said that no one ought to throw away the principle that is dear to all of us. But there is no man in this House who has taken up the same stand as he has in regard to that principle. He is willing to sacrifice it at the first offer. He said the country was hard up, and wanted money, that we should not bother about the principle but should save £6,000 and make the hours 9 to 9 throughout Western Australia, and that then Parliament would be doing what it was justified in doing. What might be suitable in the metropolitan area would not be suitable in other parts of the State. All the hotels in the State would have been closed if everyone had felt in the matter as I feel. There would be no necessity for legislation because they would all be closed for want of custom. We are offered a measure of reform. I prefer that the people should have a choice in the matter, and I honestly believe that if a referendum was taken the hours of closing would be six o'clock in the evening, and not nine o'clock. The referendum would also have a tendency to place Parliament in the position of not being able to pass any legislation to extend the hours subsequently, because the people would have stated at what hours the hotels should be closed. Are we to say that we shall not give anything at all, simply because we cannot get the referendum? Though my temperance friends have written to me and attached to me the responsibility of hundreds of murders and suicides in the State, and the death of thousands of those who have gone down to a drunkard's grave, nevertheless, I intend to do everything in my power to decrease the hours for the sale of intoxicating liquors. If the people cannot get what they desire in this instance, we should be doing an injustice to them if we did not accept the hours placed before us, even though we cannot get what we desire.

Mr. B. J. STUBBS : While strongly supporting the compromise which has been arrived at, I feel a certain amount of satisfaction in hearing the member for Perth and the member for East Perth opposing that compromise. I made certain remarks at a meeting the other evening and brought some criticism upon myself, and for that reason I feel strong satisfaction in the fact that they are opposing the recommendations adopted at that meeting. We have been told distinctly that each of the managers from this House voted strenuously for the referendum proposals to be carried into effect, but that they were told by the managers of another place that if they did not accept the compromise they would lose the Bill. That fully justifies the statement I made at the public meeting, that another place was out to kill the referendum proposals. This has been fully endorsed to-night by the information we have received. The member for Mt. Margaret, in an impassioned speech, was at the pains of proving himself logical ; but I cannot fathom his logic at all. The hon. member sought to show that in accepting the amendments we would be differentiating between the miner and the farmer. His argument was based on the fallacious assumption that in accepting the amendments we would be insisting that goldfields hotels must keep open for the ordinary hours. But the mining centres are given the power to petition for a referendum by which they will be enabled to fix on any hours they please. Rather than lose the Bill, I would accept so much in the shape of reform as is obtainable under the amendments.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM : It is generally considered that the fairest method of restricting the liquor traffic, and thereby achieving that economy which is so essential, would be to leave the people interested to decide for themselves what the trading hours shall be by way of the referendum. The control of the liquor traffic is a subject to which the referendum principle could most advantageously be applied. Being influenced by an ardent desire to restrict the traffic,

we have endeavoured to arrive at a compromise. That compromise is a mixture of two principles—the referendum for the goldfields, and legislative restriction for the metropolitan areas and the agricultural districts. My electorate, which is agricultural, happens also to contain two or three hundred miners for whose interests I am as anxiously concerned as I am for those of my farming constituents. Why should those two or three hundred miners be meted out different treatment from that which has been given to miners elsewhere in the State ? I feel bound to vote against the compromise, which is neither fair or equitable.

Mr. THOMAS : I am disappointed, perhaps even disgusted, with the proposed compromise, which is unfair and illogical in the extreme, and will not meet with the approval of many people in this State. Why should special favours be extended to any section of the community ? It is hard to understand why the goldfields are singled out for privileges in this matter. If the referendum is good for Kalgoorlie and Westonia, it is good for Bunbury and Albany and Geraldton. The withholding of the referendum from the metropolitan area and the agricultural districts seems, in the circumstances, a reflection on the intelligence of their residents. However, I am anxious for liquor law reform, a cause for which I have battled through ten years ; and this compromise, obnoxious, distasteful, unjust, and unfair as I conceive it to be, still does give something of what I have fought for ; and for that reason my vote will be given in its favour, subject to the one reservation that the Committee receive the assurance of the Attorney General and of the member for Canning that the conditions applying to hotels apply also to clubs. If that point is clear I am prepared to vote for this hybrid production of a compromise. I should like to see the same conditions apply to all parts of the State, but since we cannot give them, I am prepared to have the little they are prepared to give us.

The Attorney General : I am prepared to give the hon. member the assurance he wants.

Mr. Robinson : I agree with the opinion expressed by the Attorney General.

Mr. HEITMANN : I have never before seen such political shilly shallying or such gerrymandering by those who were unfortunate enough to have to meet members from the other Chamber and arrange what has been called a compromise. I do not know of one single effort to justify whether for climatic, geographical or other reasons, the inclusion of Westonia. The audacity of a member representing that particular part of the State picking out a few hundred men for special treatment is simply extraordinary. I remember the leader of the Opposition introducing his famous gerrymandering Bill with what was known as Wilsons' corner in it, and the storm of criticism it evoked, and yet we have the Attorney General and the member for Avon doing now exactly what was done on that occasion.

The Attorney General : We gave to the miners what it was my wish to give to all.

Mr. HEITMANN : I never heard such extraordinary sentiments as those expressed by the Premier to-night. He said he was going to vote as the member for Brown-Hill Ivanhoe in favour of the Bill, because he was opposed to his constituents having anything imposed on them upon which they did not have the opportunity to speak. Where is the logic in an hon. member saying he is in favour of a compromise because he does not wish to force his constituents to accept any particular proposal. Yet he is applying that same force to other parts of the State. If we are sincere and if we say that this is the time when we should economise, and at the same time effect a reform in the direction of reducing the consumption of liquor, that desire should be expressed towards all the people of the State instead of only one section being singled out. What were the considerations given to the agricultural areas ? I have said it from the beginning that I approved of the

introduction of this Bill, not because it was a war measure but because I was prepared to make the war the occasion for the introduction of some such reform.

The Minister for Works : There is no doubt that our electors believe that.

Mr. HEITMANN : The electors have never had an opportunity of expressing an opinion on the matter, and after all while it is not pleasant to do, all our electors would like us to do, if ever the time arrives when the actions of individual members of the House shall be guided by what one section of our constituents require, we shall place some extraordinary legislation on the statute-book. Suppose a referendum on the goldfields is held and it is decided to close at 6 o'clock. What an extraordinary position we would have ! But the Attorney General will, of course, say, "Well, the people themselves have decided it." Still the fact remains that other districts are not entitled to the same privilege. We will have the goldfields, with their hot, dry climate, closing at 6 o'clock while all the rest of the State closes at 9 o'clock. It is almost impossible to vote for this shandy-gaff measure. Again, I am told that clubs do not come within this provision.

The Attorney General : They do.

12 o'clock midnight.

Mr. HEITMANN : How will it operate in regard to lodgers and bona fide travellers ? They will be able to get drink at any hour, as they can now. And if by any chance the Attorney General is wrong in respect to clubs, we will have the clubs remaining open for their members, while soldiers will be able to come to Perth from Blackboy and get what liquor they require after hours. Much as I desire to see the consumption of liquor curtailed, I can with justice place the blame for the present situation on the Legislative Council, members of which have acted in such a way as to make one believe they voted in the interests of the liquor trade. The measure is positively unfair and impracticable and will do more harm than good to the liquor reform movement

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

Ayes	23
Noes	9

Majority for	14
--------------	----	----	----

AYES.

Mr. Allen	Mr. McDowall
Mr. Angwin	Mr. Plesse
Mr. Bolton	Mr. Robinson
Mr. Carpenter	Mr. Scaddan
Mr. Connolly	Mr. Thomas
Mr. Foley	Mr. Thomson
Mr. Gilchrist	Mr. Troy
Mr. Griffiths	Mr. Vervard
Mr. Harrison	Mr. Walker
Mr. Johnson	Mr. F. Wilson
Mr. E. B. Johnston	Mr. B. J. Stubbs
Mr. Lefroy	(Teller).

NOES.

Mr. Chesson	Mr. Hudson
Mr. Collier	Mr. Mullany
Mr. Cunningham	Mr. Underwood
Mr. Green	Mr. Taylor
Mr. Heitmann	(Teller)

Question thus passed; the Council's amendment agreed to.

No. 2—Amend Subclause 3 by inserting after the word "Avon" in the second line of the subclause the words "exclusive of the townsite of Westonia":

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: This is a consequential amendment. I move—

That the amendment be agreed to.

Question passed; the Council's amendment agreed to.

No. 3—Strike out Clause 4:

On motion by the ATTORNEY GENERAL, the Council's amendment agreed to.

No. 4—New clause to stand as Clause 4:—The North-West district No. 4 is excluded from the operation of this Act.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: I move—

That the amendment be agreed to.

Mr. TAYLOR: The Minister should explain why the managers concluded that citizens in the North-West alone should be allowed to handle alcohol without the interference of Parliament. I have been informed the people in the North have had so much practice that they can juggle with drink without

suffering any evil effects. The managers have offered an insult to the rest of the people of the State.

Hon. R. H. Underwood (Honorary Minister): We can stand it, and so they give us plenty of liberty.

Question passed; the Council's amendment agreed to.

No. 5—New clause to stand as Clause 5: Section 97 of the Licensing Act, 1911, is amended by striking out the word "six" in line six thereof and inserting the word "nine," and by striking out the word "eleven" in line seven thereof and inserting the word "nine." This section shall apply solely to the metropolitan district No. 1 and the agricultural district No. 3:

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: I move—

That the amendment be agreed to.

Point of Order.

Mr. Hudson: On a point of order, I submit it is not within the power of the Committee to amend the Licensing Act under this Bill, as the amendment is not provided for in the title of the Bill. When this Bill was sent to the Council, it was considered and sent back to us with certain amendments. They recognised the fact that it was necessary that the title of the Bill which was sent to them should be amended, and in No. 6 they provide that after the word "to" in the Title the words, "amend the Licensing Act, 1911, and to" should be inserted. Amendment No. 6 was considered by the Committee last night, and according to the Votes and Proceedings amendments 3 to 6 inclusive were disagreed to. To-night I inquired of the clerk as to the nature of the amendments sent down by the Legislative Council and these were produced to me several times for inspection. There was not at the time, and there is not now, I presume, any provision for an amendment to the Licensing Act in the amendments that are now under consideration by this Committee, which have been sent to us from the Council. I therefore submit

that the proposed amendment is not in order.

The Chairman: The hon. member mentioned the matter to me. I have made careful inquiries, and from information gathered from the Minister in charge of the Bill in another place I understand that the amendment was made. Further inquiries were made through the Assistant Clerk of the Assembly, from whom we find that through a clerical mistake the amendment itself was not inserted. We now have the amendment sent to us amending the title of the Bill by inserting after the word "to" the words "amend the Licensing Act, 1911, and to." This is signed by the Clerk of the Legislative Assembly.

Mr. Hudson: I ask this particularly because I am at some disadvantage in not having had the printed amendments placed before me. Has that amendment been made since the adoption of the Message which was sent from the Council by this Committee? When I saw that document I saw no such provision made. I have your assurance now, Sir, that it has been inserted because of your discovery of the omission in the way indicated. If the omission had been made by the error of the Assistant Clerk after the House had received it he had no right to write in the document a certain amendment which was not there originally, after the signature of the Chief Clerk of Parliament, Mr. Hillman, and I protest against such procedure.

The Chairman: The hon. member is hardly correct in referring to the officer in question in the manner in which he has done. I can only go by the official records. When we received the Message from another place, the Message was gone into and it was found that through a clerical error the amendment had not been sent on. We were waiting here for some considerable time to have the amendments typed out and sent on here. In the typing out of the amendments the omission was made, but that has since been rectified. The alteration has now been made and we must accept it

in that way. I do not think it is possible for any clerk to make an alteration to any amendment of this description until such amendment has been carried in another place. I must ask the hon. member to accept that.

Mr. Hudson: It is an improper procedure for the Assistant Clerk of the Council to insert words in a document signed by the Chief Clerk, and sent by Message which was subsequently adopted by the Assembly.

The Chairman: The hon. member has already drawn attention to the matter. An amendment was carried in the Legislative Council in this direction and omitted from the Message by the person who typed the Message out. A correction had to be made so that we could deal with it here. If the amendment was not made that would be shown in the records of the Council, and the person who is responsible for doing anything that is not right should be treated accordingly.

Mr. Hudson: It is a marvellous thing that it was only discovered in this way.

The Chairman: I ask the hon. member to accept the position and not discuss it further.

Mr. Hudson: As you have the Message now it is not as it was when it came down from the Council to be adopted.

The Chairman: I may say further that at the time we received the Message we had the title of the Bill sent down with an amendment providing that this should be an amendment to the Licensing Act, 1911, to regulate the closing time of hotels, etc. The mistake was that this did not appear in the typed amendments which were sent on. I accept this as authentic and I ask the hon. member not to discuss the matter further.

Mr. Hudson: It seems a strange thing, anyway.

The Chairman: Order! The hon. member is not in order in discussing it further.

Mr. Taylor: The Message arrived and was adopted by the Committee. When the member for Yilgarn asked about the Message it had previously been adopted

and we now find that there was an error in it.

The Chairman: I ask hon. members to accept the position and not deal with it further.

Committee resumed.

Question put and passed.

On motions by the ATTORNEY GENERAL, the following amendments were agreed to:—

No. 6—New Clause 6—Upon receipt of a requisition signed by not less than 2,000 electors of the goldfields district No. 2, the Governor shall on a date to be fixed by proclamation, in the prescribed manner, submit to the electors resident in such district, the question of the closing time of licensed premises in the district.

No. 7—New Clause 8—Strike out in line 2 the words "in each" and insert "the goldfields" in lieu.

No. 8—New Clause 11—Strike out in line 1 the word "every" and insert "the" in lieu.

No. 9—Clause 12, strike out in line 3 the word "each" and insert "the goldfields."

No. 10—Clause 13, strike out the clause.

No. 11—Clause 15, omit the first two paragraphs and insert the following:—"If at the commencement of this Act any licensed premises are held under lease the lessee shall be allowed by the lessor a proportionate reduction of the rent of the premises, in the same ratio to the full rent as the reduction in hours bears to the time during which the premises might have been lawfully open for the sale of liquor except for this Act, and a like proportionate return of a part of the premium (if any) paid by the lessee to the lessor, apportioned to the period during which this Act is in force: Provided that if any lessee or lessor considers himself unduly penalised by the incidence of this section he may require the question of adjustment of rent or rent and premium to be submitted to arbitration under the provisions of 'The Arbitration Act,

1895,' and by an award to be made thereunder the rent or rent and premium to be payable by the lessee or sub-lessee during and in respect of such period shall be at such reduced rate as in the circumstances of the case may be deemed reasonable, and the award shall be binding upon the parties and final." Amend the last paragraph of the clause by adding to the interpretation of "lessee" "and also a mortgagee of a lease or sub-lease," and by adding to the interpretation of "lessor" "and also a mortgagee of the lessor or of the land comprised in the lease."

No. 12—Title, amend the title by inserting after the words "An Act" the words "to amend the Licensing Act, 1911, and."

Resolutions reported, the report adopted, and a Message accordingly returned to the Council.

BILL—PERMANENT RESERVE
(No. 2).

Message received from the Council notifying that it did not insist on its amendment.

BILL—APPROPRIATION.

Returned from the Council without amendment.

BILL—FREMANTLE MUNICIPAL TRAMWAYS AND ELECTRIC LIGHTING ACT AMENDMENT
(No. 2).

Returned from the Council without amendment.

BILL—LAND ACT AMENDMENT.

Message received from the Council notifying that it no longer insisted on amendments Nos. 1, 4, 5, and 6, and, in

lien of No. 3, agreed to the following amendment:—"New clause; add the following to stand as Clause 4: 'In respect of any land held under conditional purchase lease, coming within the meaning of this Act, and which is more than twelve and a half miles from an existing railway, the Minister may defer the payment of rent for a period up to five years, and may extend the term of the lease, subject to the last preceding section.'"

The following notices appeared in the *Government Gazette*s of 10th and 21st January, 1916, respectively:—

It is hereby notified, for general information, that on the 10th day of January, 1916, His Excellency the Governor, in the name and on behalf of His Majesty, assented to the under-mentioned Act passed by the Legislative Council and Legislative Assembly in Parliament assembled, namely:—

An Act to amend the Licensing Act, 1911, and to Regulate the Closing Time for the Sale or Supply of Liquor on Licensed Premises, and in State Hotels, Refreshment Rooms, Restaurant Cars, Vessels for which Packet Licenses are held, and Registered Clubs, during War Time.

It is hereby notified, for general information, that His Excellency the Governor, in the name and on behalf of His Majesty, assented to the under-mentioned Acts passed by Parliament during the second session of the ninth Parliament, namely:—

An Act to apply out of the Consolidated Revenue Fund the sum of Six Hundred and Fifty-nine Thousand Three Hundred Pounds, and from Moneys to Credit of the General Loan Fund, Four Hundred and Fifty Thousand Pounds, to the Service of the Year ending 30th June, 1916; and to apply out of the Public Account the sum of Three Hundred Thousand Pounds for the purposes of temporary advances to be made by the Colonial Treasurer.

ADJOURNMENT—CLOSE OF SESSION.

The PREMIER (Hon. J. Scaddan—Brown Hill-Ivanhoe) [12.35 a.m.]: I move—

That the House at its rising adjourn until the 25th January, 1916.

Question passed.

House adjourned at 12.36 a.m. (Saturday).

An Act to amend the Adoption of Children Act, 1896.

An Act to impose a Land Tax and an Income Tax.

An Act to amend the Fremantle Municipal Tramways and Electric Lighting Act Amendment Act, 1909. (No. 1.)

An Act relating to Contracts.

An Act to further amend the Bread Act, 1903.

An Act to authorise a further Extension of the Newcastle-Bolgart Railway.

An Act to apply out of the Consolidated Revenue Fund the sum of Five Hundred and Fifty Thousand Pounds; and from Moneys to Credit of the General Loan Fund, One Hundred Thousand Pounds, to the Service of the Year ending 30th June, 1916.

An Act to amend the Government Electric Works Act, 1914.

An Act to enable the Purpose of portion of Reserve A14803 to be changed. (No. 1.)

An Act to transfer to the Colonial Treasurer, on the expiration of the Grain and Foodstuff Act, 1914, the assets and liabilities of the Board created under the said Act.

An Act to amend and continue the operation of the Roads Act, 1911.

An Act to validate the Rates made by the Road Board of the Cottesloe Beach Road District.

An Act to continue the operation of the Postponement of Debts Act, 1914.

An Act to amend the Marriage Act, 1894.