

Clauses 7 to 14, Title—agreed to.

Bill reported without amendment, and the report adopted.

House adjourned at 11.47 p.m.

Legislative Council.

Wednesday, 5th December, 1928.

	PAGE
Bills: Stamp Act Amendment, 3R., passed ...	2197
City of Perth Superannuation Fund, Com., progress arrested ...	2197
Electoral Districts Act Amendment, Com. ...	2197
Town Planning and Development, 1R. ...	2203
Poor Persons Legal Assistance, 1R. ...	2203
Coal Mines Regulation Act Amendment, 1R. ...	2203
Workers' Homes Act Amendment, Com. ...	2203
Licensing Act Amendment, 2R. ...	2204
Water Boards Act Amendment, Assembly's message ...	2210

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

BILL—STAMP ACT AMENDMENT.

Read a third time and *passed*.

BILL—CITY OF PERTH SUPER-ANNUATION FUND.

In Committee—Progress Arrested.

Resumed from the 29th November. Hon. J. Cornell in the Chair; Hon. J. T. Franklin in charge of the Bill.

Clause 2—Extension of power to make by-laws:

[Hon. A. Lovekin had moved an amendment, "That Clause 2 be struck out with a view to inserting other words.]

Hon. J. T. FRANKLIN: After considering the alteration proposed by the select committee and after consulting the actuary, I have come to the conclusion that if the amendment be passed the Bill will not be of any advantage to the Perth City Council. I therefore move—

That the Chairman do now leave the Chair.

Motion put and passed.

The Chairman accordingly left the Chair and the Bill lapsed.

BILL—ELECTORAL DISTRICTS ACT AMENDMENT.

In Committee.

Hon. J. Cornell in the Chair; the Chief Secretary in charge of the Bill.

Clause 1—agreed to.

Clause 2—Repeal of Section 4 and substitution of new section:

Hon. C. F. BAXTER: The agricultural areas are not receiving the consideration to which they are entitled. In other parts of the world greater recognition is given to the country. Some cities have no Parliamentary representation at all. My amendment will increase the number of metropolitan members by two and the number of agricultural members by three. The amendment has been carefully framed so that the Commission will experience no difficulty in arriving at the necessary quotas. I move an amendment—

That in paragraph (a) "three" be struck out and the word "two" inserted in lieu.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: I oppose the amendment. Under existing legislation passed in 1911 the metropolitan area has 12 members. When that measure was passed, the number of electors for the metropolitan area was 50,506. At present the number of electors is 108,866, so that the population of the metropolitan area has more than doubled. Now members can see the effect of the amendment. I communicated with the Chief Electoral Registrar and asked him to show the results of the application of the amendment. The results are—Metropolitan area, actual enrolment on the 24th October, 1928, 108,866 electors; reduction under the amendment, 54,433; quota arrived at by dividing by 46, 4,137. The total number of metropolitan districts under the amendment would be 13.2, so that the metropolitan area would have 13 members, an increase of one, although the population has more than doubled since 1911. In the agricultural areas the actual enrolment of 86,749 would be increased to 104,218, so that there would be 25.2 districts, or in other words, 25 mem-

bers. The actual enrolment for the mining and pastoral area is 15,836. That would be increased under the amendment to 31,671, which would have 7.6 districts; in other words, that area would have probably eight members as under the present Act. The agricultural area would have 25 members and the metropolitan area only 13. During the last three or four years there has been a constant demand in this House for justice for the metropolitan area in the matter of the distribution of seats. I do not think the hon. member can defend the amendment.

Hon. Sir WILLIAM LATHLAIN: I oppose the amendment if only for the reasons given yesterday by the Chief Secretary. Mr. Hamersley and other country representatives have from time to time put forth a similar plea for the agricultural areas, but Mr. Hamersley, in opposing the Bill, dealt most bitterly with everyone who was not actually a primary producer.

Hon. C. F. Baxter: Are you making a second reading speech?

Hon. Sir WILLIAM LATHLAIN: I have a right to point out this fact again.

The CHAIRMAN: I do not know that you have.

Hon. Sir WILLIAM LATHLAIN: If not, I shall withdraw.

The CHAIRMAN: For the moment I shall allow the hon. member to proceed.

Hon. Sir WILLIAM LATHLAIN: According to the Chief Secretary's statements, there are 10,000 producers under the heading mentioned by Mr. Hamersley and another 1,100 orchardists, so that out of the 86,000 electors represented by 21 members, there are fewer than 12,000 actual producers. These, according to Mr. Hamersley and other members, are the only people entitled to representation; and townspeople should receive no representation whatever.

Hon. H. Stewart: You said "Mr. Hamersley and other members." No other member put up Mr. Hamersley's argument.

Hon. Sir WILLIAM LATHLAIN: Then I shall withdraw that also. I have no knowledge of the Mitchell Government's redistribution proposal. I try to view the matter from an independent standpoint. While 21 seats are to have an average of 4,000 electors, 17 seats are to have an average of 6,500; I omit the goldfields, to which I have referred previously. The representation proposed seems to me fair and equitable.

Hon. H. STEWART: I speak now, as I did on the second reading, with reference to the position defined in the Act of 1903, which was considered an equitable measure. I have never advocated anything on the special behalf of farmers or producers. I gave three specific grounds for my attitude. Firstly, there was the difficulty of agricultural electors in recording their votes, a difficulty applying even more to electors in outback mining areas. Secondly, agricultural electors by reason of their avocation have to put up with many disabilities. Thirdly, there is the difficulty in maintaining contact between agricultural electors and their representatives. I wish to remove any misconception which may have arisen through misinterpretation of my remarks. If the figures are as the Chief Secretary has stated with regard to Mr. Baxter's amendment, I cannot support it. In 1911 the number of metropolitan electors was 51,000. It has now increased to 106,000. The existing Act laying down quotas was passed in 1923, and we should consider the position as it was in 1923. If the 1911 representation was reasonable, and if the 1923 Act caused no outcry against the representation granted to the so-called agricultural areas, or ex-metropolitan areas, those areas are now entitled to consideration. I do not want to see the mining areas penalised; I want to see them fully represented, with every consideration for their electoral disabilities. It is generally agreed that at the present time the mining areas are over-represented. But the giving of 13 seats to the metropolitan area and 24 to the so-called agricultural areas is not a proposal I can support. Even although it might be in accordance with the existing Act, the increase to the metropolitan area would not be proportionate in existing circumstances. In 1911 the ex-metropolitan areas had 42,000 electors and were given 21 seats. Like the metropolitan area, the agricultural areas have largely increased the number of their electors. The number now stands at 86,000. Under the existing Act the metropolitan area would have received 15 seats, the so-called agricultural areas 23, and the mining areas eight. At no time when the 1923 measure was under consideration, and at no time, so far as I am aware, up to the debate on the present Bill, has it been argued that the quota accorded to the so-called agricultural areas amounted to

over-representation relatively to other areas. Even in the mining areas there are seats which are more agricultural than mining—Kanowna and Yilgarn.

Hon. Sir EDWARD WITTENOOM: I regret I cannot support the amendment. I have looked into the Bill, and am indeed surprised at it. I never expected such a Bill to be submitted to us by those at present holding the reins of government. Some years ago we did have an opportunity of getting a really good Bill, but circumstances unfortunately prevented it. Speaking on the Address-in-reply, and referring to the Redistribution of Seats Bill, I said—

If I know the Premier at all, and I know him to be exceedingly diplomatic, I can prophesy what will happen. A Bill will be submitted, it will pass another place by the usual majority and then will come along to the Legislative Council for approval. It will not be acceptable to the Legislative Council and so will be rejected. The Premier's diplomacy will then show itself. When the elections come round the Premier will say, "I promised to bring in a redistribution of seats and did so, but the recalcitrant Legislative Council threw it out."

So far my prediction has been proved to be wrong. I think we have a fairly good Bill, taking it all round, and consequently I feel that as we cannot get all we want, we should take what has been given to us. Unless we can induce the Government to improve the Bill in certain directions, I hope that what is proposed will be accepted, at any rate to such an extent that there will be no reason for the Premier to use that diplomacy at which he is so skilful.

Hon. C. F. BAXTER: The metropolitan rolls have always been in far better order than those of the agricultural districts. Therefore we have practically a maximum number of voters in the 6,000, but in the 4,000 we have nothing like the number that should be there to equal the numbers on the rolls in the metropolitan area. Again, the seat of Government is in the metropolitan area, which means a great deal to those districts that are adjacent. On the other hand, the agricultural areas are distant and cannot exercise the same influence on legislation as the districts closer at hand. I feel that the agricultural districts have been treated very scurvily, considering that the metropolitan area has such an advantage.

Hon. W. T. GLASHEEN: It is easy to anticipate the result of the amendment because practically the same people who pro-

tested on the second reading are protesting now in similar terms. I cannot help thinking that Sir Edward Wittenoom is right in his estimate of the generosity of the Government in bringing down this Bill. Everyone will admit that the goldfields industrial population has been the most sane industrial population, not in Western Australia, but in the whole of Australia, and when we take five seats away from them, even though there are not the same number of people there now that lived there in years gone by, and add an equivalent number to the metropolitan area, it creates a tendency to take representation from the sanest industrial population of Australia and place it in an atmosphere where anything might happen. Of the two proposals, I infinitely prefer what we have now to what is proposed by the Bill.

Hon. Sir William Lathlain: Do you mean to infer that the electors of the metropolitan are not sane?

Hon. W. T. GLASHEEN: All kinds of proposals emanate from the big metropolitan centres. We cannot escape from that fact. In my opinion it would be far better to leave the existing representation on the goldfields rather than transfer it to the already over-populated towns.

Hon. E. H. H. HALL: I support the amendment if for no other reason than to register my protest against depriving the country districts of further representation. May I remind Mr. Holmes, who suggested that we should accept this because we can get nothing better, that that was the cry when we were asked to support the Financial Agreement. I fail to see why I should support the Bill and thus approve of the methods adopted by the Government in giving representation to the metropolitan area, which representation I submit has never been asked for, notwithstanding what was said by the Chief Secretary that the members of this House were so misguided as to point out that the metropolitan people were not adequately represented in Parliament. Many of the disabilities from which this continent is suffering, so we are assured by those who have made a study of the matter, are due to centralisation, the great aggregation of people in the cities. What we are asked to do now is a further step in that direction. There has been no continued agitation or clamour for additional representation in the metropolitan area.

Hon. A. J. H. Saw: You have been going about with your ears' shut.

Hon. E. H. H. Hall: I shall reply to that interjection.

The CHAIRMAN: I may remind the hon. member that interjections are disorderly.

Hon. E. H. H. Hall: I do not take exception to the interjection, but I should like to inform the hon. member that it has not been necessary for me to consult my medical adviser as to my hearing or sight. I read the daily Press, but I have failed to see any reference to an agitation for increased representation in the metropolitan area. I support the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN: Mr. Stewart's amendment is not before the Chair. The difference between the two is the difference between Tweedledum and Tweedledee.

Hon. H. STEWART: The representation is not the same. If my amendment were carried it would give the metropolitan area three extra seats, the agricultural area two extra, and the goldfields eight seats. I believe the Government would accept such a fair proposal.

Amendment put and a division taken with the following results:—

Ayes	7
Noes	14

Majority against .. 7

AYES.

Hon. W. T. Glasheen	Hon. G. A. Kempton
Hon. E. H. H. Hall	Hon. H. Stewart
Hon. V. Hammersley	Hon. C. F. Baxter
Hon. E. H. Harris	(Teller.)

NOES.

Hon. J. R. Brown	Hon. A. Lovekin
Hon. J. M. Drew	Hon. J. Nicholson
Hon. J. T. Franklin	Hon. E. Rose
Hon. G. Fraser	Hon. A. J. H. Saw
Hon. J. J. Holmes	Hon. H. Seddon
Hon. W. H. Kitson	Hon. H. A. Stephenson
Hon. Sir W. Lathlain	Hon. Sir E. Wittenoom
	(Teller.)

PAIRS.

AYES.	NOES.
Hon. C. H. Wittenoom	Hon. C. B. Williams
Hon. W. J. Mann	Hon. E. H. Gray

Amendment thus negatived.

Hon. H. STEWART: In view of the division just taken, I do not propose to proceed with my amendment on the Notice Paper.

The CHAIRMAN: The hon. member could not do so; only on the recommitment of the Bill.

Clause put and passed.

Clause 3—agreed to.

New clause:

The CHIEF SECRETARY: I move—

That a new clause be inserted to stand as Clause 4 as follows:—"Subsections 1 and 2 of Section 2 of the principal Act are hereby amended by the insertion after the words 'Chief Electoral Officer' of the words 'or the Commonwealth Electoral Officer of Western Australia.'"

This new clause has been rendered necessary by the resignation of the Chief Electoral Officer. In the circumstances the Bill would become inoperative unless it were amended in the way indicated.

Hon. A. Lovekin: You could appoint a successor.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: It would not be the proper thing to appoint a new Chief Electoral Officer and charge him with the responsibility of this work. The Commonwealth Government were asked if they would place their officer at the disposal of the State Government, and both they and the officer in question agreed to the request.

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: The services of Mr. Cooke might well be continued until this job has been completed. He knows more about the conditions than the Commonwealth officer. I do not understand why Mr. Cooke was summarily retired, or was allowed to resign on the eve of completing so important a work as this. Some effort should be made to keep him in office until the work has been done.

Hon. G. Fraser: This may have something to do with his resignation.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: The Chief Electoral Officer tendered his resignation, which has been accepted. There has been no quarrel between him and the Government. He had reached the age of 61.

Hon. E. H. Harris: Did he retire because of that?

The CHIEF SECRETARY: That was not the reason.

Hon. A. Lovekin: The resignation was accepted in a hurry.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: There was no quarrel between the Government and that officer. I dare say he would have carried on under certain circumstances but

he resigned. The position will be vacant at the end of the month.

Hon. E. H. HARRIS: I am surprised that the Chief Secretary should have moved this important clause without notice. It is important in view of the circumstances surrounding the alleged retirement of the Chief Electoral Officer. Perhaps the Chief Secretary will produce the written resignation. Has Mr. Cooke resigned from the service? Will his services be dispensed with from the 31st December?

The Chief Secretary: His resignation has been accepted by the Executive Council.

Hon. E. H. HARRIS: It is rumoured that he has quarrelled with the Government on the ground that he should have been paid for special services to be rendered under this Bill. It is said that because the Government did not accede to his request he retired from the service. In 1923 a Bill was passed providing that the Governor may in the absence of the chairman of the Commission appoint some other judge to act as Commissioner in his place, and may appoint any fit person to act temporarily as Commissioner in place of the Surveyor General or the Chief Electoral Officer. When the Redistribution of Seats Bill was in another place in 1923, the present Premier made some derogatory remarks concerning the Surveyor General. I will not quote them now. Some officer could be appointed in place of the Chief Electoral Officer. Unless the boundaries have already been arranged, there is no time for any officers to complete their work by the 31st December.

The Honorary Minister: Has that ever been suggested?

Hon. E. H. HARRIS: No, but I am just pointing out what might be done. There is no one more qualified than the present occupant of the position and, although his resignation will take effect shortly, his services should be retained for this work.

Hon. W. T. Glasheen: Perhaps his services may not be available.

Hon. E. H. HARRIS: But if they are we should make use of them. The amendment moved by the Chief Secretary meant that the Commonwealth Chief Electoral Officer will carry out the duties and the State Chief Electoral Officer will be cut out of it.

Hon. J. J. Holmes: The amendment refers to one or the other.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: The hon. member stated that the Government had retired the State Chief Electoral Officer.

Hon. E. H. HARRIS: No, I did not.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: At any rate, that is not a fact. The Chief Electoral Officer resigned of his own volition. We could do what the hon. member suggests under the provisions of the original Act, but I am certain that any such action on our part would be resented by the people. My amendment refers to the State officer or the Commonwealth officer, so that it refers to both and does not cut out the State officer. When we discovered that our Chief Electoral Officer had resigned, we realised that it would become necessary to fill his place and we thought that by selecting the Commonwealth Chief Electoral Officer for Western Australia, we had picked on a man who would have the confidence of this House and of another place.

Hon. E. H. HARRIS: There is no doubt about that.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: The hon. member did not make any alternative suggestion that would bear a moment's consideration. It would be wrong for the Government to permit the Bill to go through, and utilise the powers under Subsection 2 of Section 2 of the Electoral Districts Act which reads—

The Governor may, in the absence of the chairman, appoint some other judge to act as a commissioner in his place, and may appoint any fit person to act temporarily as a commissioner in place of the Surveyor-General or the Chief Electoral Officer.

With the amendment in the Bill, both the Federal and State officers will be mentioned, but it is hoped that in future there will be no need to seek the services of the Commonwealth official.

Hon. A. J. H. SAW: I support the amendment. The one thing we should be concerned with is that we secure the services of a competent person to carry out the duties, one who will be entirely independent of political parties. Our own State Electoral Officer is not available, as he has resigned, and I agree with the Chief Secretary that it would not be wise to appoint him to the position, in view of the circumstances. In order to meet the difficulty we have the Commonwealth Chief Electoral Officer. I do not know the gentleman, but he is independent and, I should imagine, entirely competent. I have heard compli-

mentary references made to him regarding his work.

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: Cannot we amend the Bill as it stands and provide that the Commonwealth Electoral Officer shall be the acting State electoral officer, provided we get the consent of the Commonwealth? If we were to do that, it would get over the difficulty.

Hon. E. H. HARRIS: Perhaps I did not make my meaning clear. If the State Government are to appoint the Commonwealth officer to undertake this work, it would be wise that he should be appointed as a temporary officer to do the work. Of course, in future the State Chief Electoral Officer will be the officer to carry out the duties.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: I support the amendment. No better course could be suggested. I entirely disagree with the point raised by Mr. Harris that the Commonwealth Chief Electoral Officer should be appointed as a temporary official. We do not want temporary officers on this work.

Hon. E. H. Harris: But you agree that he should be included in the Bill.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: I congratulate the Government on their decision not to appoint a temporary officer at this juncture. I do not think it would be wise or right.

Hon. A. Lovekin: But under the amendment he will be a temporary officer.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: No.

Hon. E. H. Harris: Yes, you agree to provide for two officials!

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: Two men are provided for, the State Chief Officer, or the Commonwealth Chief Electoral Officer. In our present circumstances we have no State Chief Electoral Officer. Even with the inclusion of the amendment, it will not be suggested for one moment that the State Government would ever propose to override the State Chief Electoral Officer by utilising the services of the Commonwealth Chief Electoral Officer. If it is a State matter to be dealt with, the State officer will be the man for the work. We do not know why our State Electoral Officer has resigned; that is another matter. While I regret the position that has arisen, I do not see that anything else could have been done by the Government. I do not know the Commonwealth Chief Electoral Officer for this State, but I have heard complimentary remarks concerning his ability.

Hon. Sir EDWARD WITTENOOM: As the State Chief Electoral Officer has resigned, why has not some other officer been appointed in his place? Why do we want to bring in the Commonwealth Electoral officer at all?

Hon. A. Lovekin: Look for the nigger in the woodpile!

Hon. Sir EDWARD WITTENOOM: I have not had anything to do with wood-piles! If a State officer were appointed to the vacant position, the difficulty would be overcome. In view of the circumstances, and if we are to have an alternative, do not let us have the Commonwealth officials overriding the State officials.

Hon. H. SEDDON: There are one or two aspects that should receive a little consideration. The State Chief Electoral Officer has resigned and that has caused complications. I do not know what the circumstances were that led up to Mr. Cooke's resignation. I do not know whether he considered he had not received a fair deal. The point I have in mind is that the retiring electoral officer is more qualified than anyone else in the State to carry out the work contemplated under the Bill. He will be more acquainted with our electoral boundaries than the Commonwealth Chief Electoral Officer could possibly be. In those circumstances I hope the Government will be able to make use of the services of Mr. Cooke in an honorary capacity, even although he has resigned. It appears to me that of all the available officers Mr. Cooke is the best qualified to carry out those duties, and I hope the Government will be able to arrange for his services.

Hon. E. H. H. HALL: I regret that the Government should have seen fit to accept the resignation of Mr. Cooke. But that resignation having been accepted, the Government are to be congratulated on showing their independence and impartiality in providing for the Commonwealth Chief Electoral Officer in this State acting in case there should not be a permanent appointment made. Sir Edward Wittenoom surely must know that the filling of a vacancy in the Public Service is not nearly so simple as the filling of one in private employment. All sorts of formalities have to be complied with, and they take time.

Hon. Sir Edward Wittenoom: They have six weeks in which to do it.

Hon. E. H. H. HALL: Since at present we have no Chief Electoral Officer for the State, the Government would be well advised to take the full step and substitute the Commonwealth Chief Electoral Officer in this State. Mr. Way, the Commonwealth Chief Electoral Officer in Western Australia, is unknown to me personally, but I understand he is quite capable of efficiently carrying out the duties.

Hon. E. H. HARRIS: I cannot allow Mr. Hall's remarks to go without drawing his attention to the fact that if we had passed the Bill providing for joint rolls, it was intended that the State Chief Electoral Officer would maintain the rolls for the Legislative Council. Mr. Hall apparently does not realise that the roll for this House with its property qualification needs as much, or even more, attention than the other rolls. The State Chief Electoral Officer will be required to look after the State rolls, even assuming that our boundaries are made co-terminous with those of the Federal divisions.

Hon. E. H. H. HALL: I am not advocating the abolition of the office of Chief Electoral Officer of Western Australia. If the hon. member thinks that was my intention, he has misunderstood me.

Hon. E. H. HARRIS: But you virtually said it.

Hon. E. H. H. HALL: I did not, and if I did I did not mean to say so.

New clause put and passed.

Title—agreed to.

Bill reported with an amendment.

BILLS (3)—FIRST READING.

- 1, Town Planning and Development.
- 2, Poor Persons Legal Assistance.
- 3, Coal Mines Regulation Act Amendment.

Received from the Assembly and read a first time.

BILL—WORKERS' HOMES ACT AMENDMENT.

In Committee.

Hon. J. Cornell in the Chair; the Honorary Minister in charge of the Bill.

Clause 1—agreed to.

Clause 2—Amendment of Section 3:

The HONORARY MINISTER: I move an amendment—

That after "line" in line 2, the words "of the interpretation of the word 'worker'" be inserted.

Inadvertently those words were dropped in another place.

Amendment put and passed; the clause, as amended, agreed to.

Clause 3—agreed to.

Clause 4—Amendment of Section 8:

Hon. E. H. H. HALL: Here the maximum advance is increased from £650 to £800. I should like the Minister to clear up a doubt created in my mind by some remarks made by the Premier in another place. I want to know whether in future we are to function under two Workers' Homes Acts.

The CHAIRMAN: The hon. member must confine his remarks to the clause.

Hon. E. H. H. HALL: I wish to know whether the maximum in this State is to be £800 or £1,800.

The HONORARY MINISTER: In future, when a worker secures an advance not exceeding £800, the money will come out of the State's funds, whereas if the advance be anything between £800 and £1,800, as provided for in the Commonwealth housing scheme, the money used will be money from the Commonwealth.

Hon. E. H. H. HALL: I should like the Minister to make this quite clear: The Premier said he hoped to be able to extend the State expenditure under the Workers' Homes Act to the building of homes in the country.

The CHAIRMAN: That has nothing whatever to do with the clause. The hon. member can get the information he desires by formal question on the Notice Paper.

Hon. E. H. H. HALL: I really should like to know whether the Government intend to spend only £800 on homes in the country, while spending £1,800 on homes in the city.

Clause put and passed.

Clauses 5 to 15—agreed to.

Clause 16—Application of Commonwealth Housing Act, 1927-28:

Hon. E. H. H. HALL: May I now repeat my question to the Honorary Minister?

The CHAIRMAN: The Honorary Minister can please himself whether he answers it.

The HONORARY MINISTER: The question is unnecessary. Applications from all parts of the State will be made to the Workers' Homes Board, who will consider whether they can be approved or not. In the event of the applications being approved, the conditions I have already related will apply. If the limit approved is up to £800, the money of the State will be available. If the limit approved exceeds £800, the Commonwealth scheme will operate. There will be no discrimination between country and metropolitan applicants.

Clause put and passed.

Title—agreed to.

Bill reported with an amendment.

BILL—LICENSING ACT AMENDMENT.

Second Reading.

Debate resumed from the previous day.

HON. E. H. HARRIS (North-East) [64]: I venture to say that if the Chief Secretary had introduced the Bill on the eastern goldfields and had made any reference to the de-licensing court, many of the citizens would have wanted to approach him with a double-barrelled gun. The reasons for this I shall mention later. I believe the ball cartridge aimed by Subclause 1 of Clause 2 will prove very effective as regards the de-licensing court. If I understood the Minister aright, the trade pays 7 per cent., consisting of 5 per cent. for a license fee and 2 per cent. payment to the compensation fund for the closing of hotels. Two-thirds of the cost of the de-licensing court's administration is paid from the 2 per cent. fund and the other third is paid by the Treasury. Last year the cost of administration was £4,744 and the contribution from the compensation fund was £3,162, leaving an amount of £1,582 that had to be found by the Treasury. By extending the operation of the court the Treasury will be relieved from the payment of that amount for the period of two years during which it is proposed to continue the de-licensing court.

Hon. J. J. Holmes: The salaries have to be paid.

Hon. E. H. HARRIS: But from the information given by the Leader of the House and by the Premier in another place, it is not contemplated that any further money will be required for compensation. That is to say, no further licensed houses will be closed.

The Chief Secretary: I did not say so.

Hon. E. H. HARRIS: It was not stated definitely either here or in another place.

Hon. A. Lovekin: The Premier said the board would finish their work.

Hon. E. H. HARRIS: He practically said there would be no more work for the board to do, and the Government would have the £13,700 in the compensation fund that could be utilised by continuing the board to pay the salaries of the de-licensing court which, I suggest, must operate as a licensing court. If my interpretation is correct, it will mean that the money will be utilised in that way. That being so, why not take the £13,700 and hand it to the Treasurer?

Hon. A. Lovekin: On top of that there is another £7,000 due now.

Hon. E. H. HARRIS: I have heard that roughly an additional £7,000 is due by the 31st of the month.

Hon. Sir Edward Wittenoom: How much will the administration cost during the next two years?

Hon. E. H. HARRIS: Two-thirds of the money received.

Hon. A. Lovekin: The Minister said the cost to the Treasury last year was something over £1,500.

Hon. E. H. HARRIS: That will do away with any further payments after the end of this year. If we determine to carry on the operations of the Act minus the collection of the 2 per cent., will the licensed houses have to pay the 2 per cent. after the end of this year, or will it be collectable only to the 31st December? That is a point I should like the Minister to clear up. If we do not continue the operation of Part V of the Act, will the amount be collectable at the end of the year?

The Chief Secretary: No.

Hon. E. H. HARRIS: The Minister might give us information of the estimated cost of administration during the two years.

Hon. J. J. Holmes: Your point is that the Government will have £20,000 and no further hotels will be de-licensed.

Hon. E. H. HARRIS: I suggest that the Government have £13,700 now and other members have suggested that there is £6,000 or £7,000 to come in, making a total of £20,000, and it is not expected that any further hotels will be de-licensed. Therefore, the Government propose to continue the operations of the board knowing that they will have practically no work to do in that direction. Evidently they intend to continue the board in order that they may utilise that money to pay the expenses of the ordinary licensing court. The contributions to the compensation fund during the five years total £114,479, inclusive of the figures for 1928. The compensation paid amounted to £83,804, leaving a balance of £30,675. It has been stated that there is available for compensation £13,700, which gives a difference of £16,975. Therefore it would seem that sum represents the salaries and expenses of the board members plus administration costs.

Hon. V. Hamersley: For how many years?

Hon. E. H. HARRIS: During the five years the board have been operating. Apparently the expense for salaries, travelling allowance, administration, etc., was £16,975. I understand the board members receive a salary and travelling expenses. I should like the Minister to explain the financial aspect.

Hon. Sir Edward Wittenoom: How many members are there on the board?

Hon. E. H. HARRIS: Three, but I understand that one is at present on leave. During the five years 110 premises have been de-licensed, inclusive of 49 on the eastern goldfields. I am prepared to admit that most people are of opinion the eastern goldfields were overstocked with licensed houses, and the work of the board in its early stages was commended by everyone. Under the original determination of the board 30 eastern goldfields houses were de-licensed, and a storm brewed very quickly on the question of the compensation to licensees. All the owners have apparently been fairly well compensated, for they received amounts ranging from a minimum of £40 to a maximum of £936. The compensation originally paid to licensees ranged from the small sum of £1 to a maximum of £686. I stress the point regarding the compensation paid to licensees, because no

fewer than 19 of them were awarded a sum of £1 as compensation—not as much as they had paid into the fund for their own protection.

Hon. Sir Edward Wittenoom: I think we must have a very good board.

Hon. E. H. HARRIS: The original determination was made on the 8th February, 1924. On the 7th November the board made a further determination regarding compensation payable to licensees. No one has yet been able to fathom the reason why the board differentiated between the first and second allocations of compensation. If I may use the term that the Minister applied to me yesterday, I suggest that the board seemed to be bursting with benevolence, not on the first but on the second occasion. The 19 licensees who were awarded £1 compensation subsequently received between them £1,893 as further compensation, but three of the number did not receive anything more. They were given only the original £1. The additional amounts paid were—£3, £5, £8, £37, £38, £48, £51, £92, £93, £127, £156, £169, £210, £227, £298 and £326. Here is a board that awarded £1—

Hon. J. R. Brown: Some of the licensees would not take the pound.

Hon. E. H. HARRIS: No. I know of a licensee who was offered £1, and she refused to take it. She said to the board, "You may rob me of my business, but you cannot insult me by giving me £1."

Hon. Sir Edward Wittenoom: What has that to do with the Licensing Bill?

Sitting suspended from 6.15 to 7.30 p.m.

Hon. E. H. HARRIS: Before tea I was drawing attention to the number of licensed premises in the eastern goldfields district which have been de-licensed, receiving compensation to the extent of £1 and higher amounts. In two cases the compensation was £4, and in another two it was £12. The range went as high as £686. What has troubled those chiefly concerned is the board's method of arriving at compensation. The statute provides that the compensation payable to licensees and landlords may be assessed. Section 91 of the Act of 1923 provides that the board shall as soon as practicable assess the maximum amount of compensation payable with respect to each and every licensed premises deprived of a

license. The board are to fix the maximum amount. Section 92 provides—

Every determination of the board shall be final and conclusive, and shall not be questioned in, or reviewed or amended by, any court whatsoever.

That section gives the board sovereign powers, so to speak. Once they fix the compensation, according to my interpretation, they are to fix the original amount of the assessment. However, Sub-section 2 of Section 92 provides—

The board may at any time, if it thinks fit, re-hear any matter which has been heard and determined by it.

I am not quite sure whether cases have been re-heard, but from general conversation with people engaged in the trade it appears that many of these cases were not re-heard. As I pointed out, nine months after the original amount of compensation had been fixed the board determined, with or without re-hearing, to grant some further compensation to certain licensees.

Hon. Sir Edward Wittenoom: When is finality reached, then?

Hon. E. H. HARRIS: As far as we know, finality has been reached. If we may judge by the terms of the Bill, one determination is to complete the transaction. Now I wish to draw the Chief Secretary's attention to the fact that no one has yet been able to extract from the board what method was used by them in differentiating so widely as regards compensation. The payments made in respect of 30 houses de-licensed ranged from nil up to £326. This resulted in local governing bodies on the goldfields taking the matter up, and they entered an emphatic protest. On the 24th February, 1928, the municipal council of Kalgoorlie carried the following resolution:—

That this council vigorously protests against any further de-licensing of goldfields hotels, and in regard to the de-licensing of hotels now cited this council expresses itself in decided opposition.

That was when several other houses had been cited with a view to being de-licensed. Some of them were, in fact, de-licensed. The Town Clerk of Kalgoorlie wrote as follows to the Premier:—

My council feels very strongly on this question, and the depressing effect that the de-licensing of hotels, and their subsequent pulling-down in most instances, has on the community is incalculable, and its happening at a time when every endeavour should be made to dispel the

depression and cause a renewal of confidence in the fields is to be deplored. How can this confidence be restored when the news goes forth that half the street is in a state of ruin through the pulling-down of buildings? In the opinion of my council the licensing board has outlived its usefulness, and the sooner it is abolished the better. The loss of revenue to the municipality from each hotel de-licensed is on the average about £70 per annum.

The Premier pointed out that Parliament had vested the board with sovereign powers, and that he had no right to interfere. A deputation of the local governing bodies then preferred a request to interview the members of the board, who graciously decided to hear what they had to say. After receiving the deputation courteously, the board stated that they had the power and were going to exercise it in accordance with the law, which gave them certain powers and duties. They said they had to reduce the number of licenses in the State, meanwhile retaining a sufficient number to meet the convenience of the public and the requirements of the locality. They also quoted population figures to justify their action. However, a protest was entered as I have stated, through the local governing bodies. The board continued to function as they had done, and subsequently eight more hotels were de-licensed. The compensation in respect of premises de-licensed in May of 1927 was on an entirely different basis from those de-licensed in August of 1928. The local governing bodies wrote to each member of the Legislature embodying their protest. The Chief Secretary may be able to state the method of calculating adopted by the board to determine compensation payable to the first batch de-licensed, having regard to the great variation in the compensation granted later.

Hon. Sir E. H. Wittenoom: How do the board arrive at the amounts?

Hon. E. H. HARRIS: On the 30th March, 1928, a communication was sent to each of the members of the Legislature conveying the following resolution:—

That the Eastern Goldfields members, including the member for Kanowna, be asked to bring down an amending Bill to suspend the powers of the Licenses Reduction Board on the Eastern Goldfields, or to provide for an appeal against the decisions of the board.

The local governing bodies claim that Parliament should not have vested the Licenses Reduction Board with supreme powers. That, of course, is a point for Parliament.

to determine. However, there is the protest. Having regard to my remarks earlier in the debate, it would seem that the board were to function for another couple of years, when apparently no further de-licensing of hotels was to be considered. After a further look at the provisions of the statute as to compensation, it appears to me that although there may be the power referred to by Mr. Lovekin, it will not be available if the Bill is passed. However, the Chief Secretary may put me right on that point. As regards the other proposal, to reduce the two per cent. contribution to one per cent. that was referred to in another place as being on a fifty-fifty basis. It seems that the two per cent. is to be divided between the licensee and the landlord. Which ever way it goes, the Government contemplate getting another one per cent. of revenue, by a form of indirect taxation. It has been suggested that there should be half per cent. each to the lessee and to the landlord. I have it on very good authority that at least two Western Australian breweries, subsequently to the Act being passed, compelled their licensees to enter into an agreement to pay the full amount of two per cent., the landlord's one per cent. as well as the licensee's one per cent.

Hon. A. Lovekin: It will reduce the price of beer.

Hon. E. H. HARRIS: If there is a reduction of one per cent., does the hon. member think that will reduce the price of beer? I do not think I can do better than quote Mr. Holmes's remarks with regard to railway freights, when he said that the freight on cigarettes had been reduced by 5s. per ton and asked who was going to get the benefit of that reduction. The public would not get any benefit if there was a reduction to one per cent. The publicans would not increase the size of the pots or glasses. I suggest that the Treasurer's object is to get by indirect taxation the other one per cent. The fifty-fifty basis is not going to apply at all. However, I am prepared to take that part of the Bill on its merits. I have said that I would vote to terminate the Licenses Reduction Board, and I suggest to the Government, if they are keen on having the £13,000 to pinch it straight away and put it into the Treasury. If later it happened that one or two hotels here and there required de-licensing, the

Government could by a short Bill reinstate Part 5 of the Act.

The Chief Secretary: We are too modest to do that.

Hon. E. H. HARRIS: I will vote for the second reading with a view to amending the Bill on the lines I have indicated.

HON. A. LOVEKIN (Metropolitan) [7.45]: I congratulate the Licenses Reduction Board on the good work they have done since they were first appointed and the improvements that have been effected in the various hotels of the State. When the Bill is in Committee I propose to move an amendment to Clause 2 to provide that the Act shall continue only until 1929 instead of 1930. This will give the board another year instead of two years as proposed in the Bill, in which to clear up their work. We have it on the authority of the Premier that the board has been in operation for over five years and that practically all the hotels that required to be closed have been closed. Therefore if we give the board another year's tenure, that will be as much as we shall be warranted in doing.

Hon. E. H. Harris: What do you suggest should be done with the surplus compensation money?

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: I have no doubt the Government will be able to spend it wisely. It is my intention to support a further amendment that will be moved by Mr. Nicholson to reduce the 6 per cent. to 5½ per cent. I shall support it on the ground that the Licensing Court, which is practically the reduction board, have been paid from this fund and I do not want to deprive the Treasurer of the money that will enable the Government to continue to pay the salaries of the court. I am not agreeable to letting the Government take the whole control of the 1 per cent.

HON. J. CORNELL (South) [7.48]: I desire at the outset to make a personal explanation, or perhaps a partial apology to the liquor trade for a remark I made in reply to an interjection during the debate on the Profiteering Bill. I characterised the pot as an English pint of 16 ozs. and said that it had been reduced to 8 ozs. A great friend of mine, a publican in the State, told me that I knew nothing about it. He said that the original English pint contained 20 ozs.

Hon. E. H. Harris: You did not mention Imperial pints.

Hon. J. CORNELL: What I said was that at one time you could get an Imperial pint for 6d.

Hon. A. Lovekin: You can now get what is called the *reputed* pint.

Hon. J. CORNELL: I should say it was a reduced pint. The position is that it is 12 ozs. to-day, and I hope that my remarks did not cause offence to the liquor trade. Regarding the Imperial pint, it is as dead as the Dodo so far as the liquor trade in Perth is concerned. In that part of the State I come from the old pot still exists, and anyone can have it by paying for it. All that, however, is by the way. I am opposed to the Bill as it stands. In 1919 when the present Licensing Act was passed, all who had anything to do with it were pleased to get rid of it. It is essential now that the part of the Act referred to in the Bill shall be continued, and with that I am in agreement. Re-enacting that proposal for two years will mean the present board functioning as a discontinuance board and as a licensing board as well.

Hon. G. Fraser: At the same rate of salary?

Hon. J. CORNELL: Yes, and they are not getting enough.

Hon. E. H. Harris: For how long do you say they should continue?

Hon. J. CORNELL: For ever, so far as I am concerned. There is no doubt about it that in the old days many licenses were gained by favour. Now we have a competent board that is in the position to take an impartial view. What the board stands for is not more licenses—without good and valid reasons being submitted—but for better hotels and better service for the people who patronise them, and I venture to say that there is not a person legitimately engaged in the liquor trade in this State to-day who desires to see the present board abolished. There is no gain-saying this fact that the board, as the members of it have functioned, have put the liquor trade in the place it should occupy. The board have the respect of the community except perhaps those people who cannot be convinced. Everyone recognises to-day that the liquor trade performs a very big service and fulfils many requirements, particularly in isolated country districts, and so long as the trade continues to give the service required of it and remains in the

position it occupies to-day, so long will it command the respect of the community. The board have done more to put the liquor traffic in a sound position than was ever done in the whole period of the old regime.

Hon. Sir Edward Wittenoom: Can they do any more?

Hon. J. CORNELL: The hon. member's interjection I imagine refers to discontinuance. It would be a wise provision if the Government and the State legislature retained the board.

Hon. A. Lovekin: But there will remain the Licensing Court.

Hon. J. CORNELL: There seems to be an idea that the work of discontinuance is finished and that the board will have to go.

Members: No.

Hon. J. CORNELL: I want to see the board remain and to carry on the good work they have done up to date. I do not intend to unduly praise the board, because I think the work the members of it have done will speak for itself. The board have insisted on improvements to hotels for the accommodation of the travelling public, and I have yet to discover that the travelling public are not prepared to pay for these improvements. What the public do object to is having to pay and getting nothing in return.

Hon. Sir Edward Wittenoom: You consider that the licensees cannot carry on without the supervision of the board, and at the same time give satisfaction to the public.

Hon. J. CORNELL: Some licensees could carry on without the supervision of anyone, just as some individuals can go through life without having recourse to the police. In regard to a big percentage of those engaged in the trade, there is no need for them to be told by the board that they have to do certain things, but it is necessary that the board should exist to deal with those who try to fleece the public.

Hon. Sir Edward Wittenoom: Do you require the board to remain in existence for another two years to see that those publicans carry on their trade properly?

Hon. J. CORNELL: I should like to see the board remain in existence for the term of their natural lives. I can see no valid reason why the law as it is should not continue for all time. If there are no more hotels to close, none will be closed. All the hotels that have been closed have not been

closed by the direction of the Minister or the Government: they have been closed by the direction of the board for the reason that it is considered the premises were no longer necessary. If the board have nothing further to do, they will not function, but if there is something to do it will be possible for the board to do it without the matter having to be referred to Parliament.

Hon. A. Lovekin: But the expense will go on for nothing.

Hon. J. CORNELL: I agree that at the present time the liquor trade should not pay into the compensation fund, but it is not necessary to limit the powers of the discontinuance board, which should go on all the time. When the Act was passed, it was thought by all parties concerned that a new impost was being placed on licensees in the method by which licenses were granted. It was considered that a fair impost on the trade would be 5 per cent., and that the trade should pay into a compensation fund for the closing of certain hotels. Now we have arrived at the position when it is proposed to do away with the 2 per cent., and it is intended to ask the liquor trade to pay another 1 per cent. in addition to the 5 per cent. they are already paying. That is wrong. I have not heard one logical argument in this Chamber or outside why a greater impost should now be placed upon the liquor trade. From information I have gathered from the trade, it appears the licensed victuallers are not, all things considered, as favourably placed as they were when the law was first passed. They are not getting the returns or the turnover that they were accustomed to in the past. Any reputable publican will vouch for that. On top of this they have been asked to effect certain improvements, and spend large sums in country areas for certain accommodation before they can hope to get a license. They have also been asked to provide services, and have done so, that are 10 per cent. better than when the law was first passed. The prices, however, are not 100 per cent. greater. It is now proposed to ask the trade to contribute another 1 per cent. They should not be asked to do that unless more valid reasons for it are advanced. It is no argument to say that the compensation fund has been abolished, and that therefore the trade will gain 1 per cent. by paying this other 1 per cent., instead of 2 per cent. into the compensation fund.

When the Bill was first passed it was considered that 5 per cent. was a fair impost, and that in order to meet the reasonable requirements of discontinuance, the trade ought to pay a further 2 per cent. This was cheerfully done. We are now coolly asked to pass a Bill to provide that the trade shall pay 1 per cent. for all time into the Consolidated Revenue. Much has been said about the evils of drink and the dangers that lie in its train. I have this to say to the lifelong teetotaler, "What you have never had you can never desire." There are times when he would probably like to have had things the other way about.

Hon. Sir William Lathlain: No.

Hon. J. J. Holmes: There is hope yet.

Hon. J. CORNELL: Yes. He is a wonderful piece of human machinery who can arouse as much enthusiasm and conviviality without drink as he can with it. The people who conduct the liquor industry and those who patronise it pay more into the Consolidated Revenue of the country than any other section of the community. If they commit errors they pay for them. If we are going to demand more of them, they will have to find the extra amount. I would prefer to see the impost left as it is. It would even things up far more if we placed a tax on cups of tea.

Hon. A. Lovekin: You would have to get medical advice about that.

Hon. W. T. Glasheen: You are perhaps afraid of a further reduction in the size of the pint.

Hon. J. CORNELL: That would automatically follow.

Hon. E. H. Gray: And it would save a lot of indigestion.

Hon. J. CORNELL: I hope this extra impost will not be placed upon the trade. If the taxation goes on being built up, not only will the Imperial pint go, but the substitute for it will also go. We do not want to see that, and I am sure the people of the goldfields where the climate creates such a leaning towards a weakness of this kind, would not care to see it. It is said that if people left their beer alone they would be all right. I say, let us leave the poor man's beer as it is. Let us leave the impost as it now stands, and we shall be doing a fair thing all round.

HON. E. H. H. HALL (Central) [8.5]: Most of Mr. Cornell's remarks are like the flowers that bloom in the spring, they have nothing to do with the case. I am with Mr. Harris in his statement that there is no necessity to continue the operations of the Licenses Reduction Board, seeing that their work is just about finished. I endorse what Mr. Cornell said in praise of that board. I wish to record my opinion of something upon which the Government might have asked the board to report. Immense profits are made out of the hotel business. Countless opportunities present themselves to the Government for participating in these profits. It is greatly to be regretted that the board were not empowered to report when and where in their opinion it would be advisable for the State to secure a monopoly of the trade in certain districts.

Hon. J. Cornell: It would be the end of State socialism if a State brewery were started.

Hon. E. H. H. HALL: Only this afternoon the hon. member, as Chairman of Committees, said that interjections were disorderly. The Government missed a glorious opportunity of raising revenue. I have the assurance of a prominent gentleman that he has repeatedly brought under the notice of the Government the advisability of calling for tenders for the conduct of hotels. By that means they would reap twice as much revenue as they do at present.

Hon. E. H. Harris: Do you mean State hotels?

Hon. E. H. H. HALL: The conditions required by the Licenses Reduction Board in some distant parts of the State are altogether ridiculous. They will grant a license to a man but insist that he shall erect buildings far ahead of the necessities of the district. Instead of tenders being invited from persons who will put up the most expensive building and pay the highest premium, it would be better in the interests of the State if the board called for tenders for the conduct of hotels, and thus ensured additional revenue for the country.

On motion by **Hon. J. R. Brown**, debate adjourned.

BILL—WATER BOARDS ACT AMENDMENT.

Assembly's Message.

Message from the Assembly notifying that it had agreed to amendment No. 3 made by the Council, but had disagreed to amendments Nos. 1 and 2, further considered.

In Committee.

Resumed from the previous day; **Hon. J. Cornell** in the Chair; the Chief Secretary in charge of the Bill.

No. 1—Council's amendment: Clause 2.—Delete the first three lines and insert in lieu thereof the following:—"In every case where the Public Works Department has expended or may hereafter expend money in providing a water supply of sufficient capacity to supply the reasonable requirements of the ratepayers within the area to be rated in agricultural areas."

The **CHAIRMAN**: When progress was reported on the Assembly's message the Chief Secretary had moved an alternative amendment to the Assembly's amendment as follows:—

In every case where the Public Works Department has expended, or may hereafter expend money in providing water supplies in agricultural areas.

Hon. V. HAMERSLEY: The debate was adjourned in the hope that we might bring forward some amendment that was more suitable than that proposed by the Chief Secretary. In my opinion the original amendment of the Council more nearly fills the bill than anything else. We must do something to ensure that those who pay for their water can get a supply. The Assembly's reason for rejecting our amendment was that the proposal would restrict the work of providing water supplies. I cannot see that it would have that effect. The objection raised by the Legislative Assembly is not valid. The water supplies that will be put in throughout the country areas will be for the convenience not only of the settlers but of the railways, and it will be interesting to know what contribution the railways will pay.

Hon. W. T. GLASHEEN: The more I hear about the amendment, the less I am inclined to like it. I do not think either the clause or the amendment will be practicable.

The Chief Secretary intimated that, in his opinion, the matter would resolve itself into one affecting water supplies put in at a cost of about £5,000. Such a scheme would not by any means provide a district with all that the settlers would reasonably require. In fact, I do not think that any such scheme could be expected to be a success, even if the settlers were rated, unless it was big enough to warrant the expense of an attendant in charge to dispense water to individuals requiring it. Unless the position is safeguarded to that extent, it may be that one settler will be able to mop up all the water that is available, and yet the whole district will be rated for the water supply! In my opinion a £5,000 water scheme will serve about 30 settlers, and that will mean that each will have to pay £12 10s. a year in water rates, based on a return of 6 per cent. on the capital outlay. In past years, the provision of water supplies for people pioneering new districts, has been recognised as a community obligation. Now we turn a somersault on that principle and expect settlers to pay, where they should be exempt. The object of these water supplies is not to make available reasonable quantities of water to the settlers, but to provide some water in drought periods.

Hon. J. Nicholson: Can you suggest any alternative?

Hon. W. T. GLASHEEN: I do not know of any better alternative than the old scheme that was followed in the earlier days, when free water was supplied in new districts.

Hon. A. J. H. Saw: Would you extend that principle of free water to people in the metropolitan area?

Hon. W. T. GLASHEEN: I do not care where the people may be. There is this to be remembered, however, that in the metropolitan area it would not be possible for big business premises to be insured, if adequate water supplies were not available. That is a consideration that is often forgotten when we talk about free water supplies in the city area.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I have allowed Mr. Glasheen latitude to roam wide of the amendment. I hope hon. members will confine themselves to the amendment.

Hon. Sir WILLIAM LATHLAIN: Hon. members who have so far spoken have not presented any solution of the difficulty. The

Chief Secretary intimated that water supplies had been provided on the undertaking of settlers to pay for them, but those settlers had refused to meet their obligations. Now there are centres where water supplies are required, and the Government are prepared to instal them. The Government desire the people who will receive the benefits of the schemes, to pay rates that will be fixed. A payment of £12 10s. a year as suggested by Mr. Glasheen would represent a small amount if the settler were saved the trouble of carting water for distances of upwards of 30 miles, particularly during a dry season.

Hon. W. T. Glasheen: I am afraid most of their time would be spent waiting for water at the standpipe.

Hon. Sir WILLIAM LATHLAIN: The weaknesses of such a scheme have been emphasised more than the convenience to the settlers. One would have thought that those representing country districts would desire to assist the Government in carrying out the scheme.

Hon. W. T. Glasheen: Have we indicated that we have not that desire?

Hon. Sir WILLIAM LATHLAIN: Well, obstacles are being placed in the way of passing the measure. We know that in one district the spending of £5,000 might result in a very poor water supply, while in another a really good supply would be furnished for the same expenditure. When we consider the great convenience these schemes will be to the settlers, especially in times of drought, we must admit that the time has arrived for something to be done on the lines suggested by the Government. I will support the Chief Secretary's amendment.

Hon. Sir EDWARD WITTENOOM: In the past the Government have done their best to give the settlers water from the catchments. But although they have made agreements with the settlers for the payment of rates in one form or another, those agreements have not been honoured by the settlers. So the Government find that if they are to continue developing those catchments, they must have statutory authority to collect revenue. Hence the Bill. In the past the Government have provided water without any onerous conditions at all. So there is no reason to doubt that in the future they will carry on without imposing any hardships on the settlers, ex-

cept that they propose to have their agreements confirmed by legislation. We should give the Government every credit, not only for what they have done, but for their good intentions regarding the future. Any amendments distasteful to the Government should not be insisted upon by members. If I were in the position of the Chief Secretary, I would say, "If you do not choose to give us reasonable conditions, we will go no further with the Bill." The great point is to get the water to the settlers. If we are going to put impediments in the way of the Bill—

Hon. V. Hamersley: What impediments? Where are they?

Hon. Sir EDWARD WITTENOOM: Ask the Chief Secretary.

Hon. W. T. Glasheen: We are merely trying to make the Bill a practicable one.

Hon. Sir EDWARD WITTENOOM: Why have not all these conditions worked in an onerous manner before? This has been going on for some time.

Hon. E. H. H. Hall: No, it has not.

Hon. Sir EDWARD WITTENOOM: Oh, you know something about it, do you? If we pass the Bill as the Government require it, what is to prevent us from amending it next year if it is found to require amendment?

Hon. V. Hamersley: Once we pass it we shall not get it back.

Hon. W. T. Glasheen: We are trying now to make it work properly, but they will not let us.

Hon. Sir EDWARD WITTENOOM: If you make amendments that to the Government seem to be unworkable, you will get neither the Bill nor the water. I will support the Bill.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: I feel it my duty to put Sir Edward Wittenoom on the right track. He says this thing has been going on for long past. As a matter of fact it is an entirely new procedure. Hitherto, as pointed out by Mr. Glasheen, the people have been supplied with water by the State. The new departure is that the new settlers are now asked to pay so much per acre for a supply that the Government may or may not provide. If the scheme were practicable, it would have my whole-hearted support. If the Government would undertake to put in a sufficient supply and place a man in charge to see that each settler got his quota of the water, it would be a practicable scheme. The water could then be

sold at so much per thousand gallons, which would ensure that the man paying for the water would get it; whereas the man not prepared to pay would not come into the scheme. Imagine Sir William Lathlain with £10,000 worth of stock in his store saying to a crowd outside, "Let 10 people pay me each £1,000, and the doors will be open to you all and you shall be free to take what you like." The same thing would apply with this limited supply of water in a drought-stricken area. Men are to be asked to pay so much per acre, and the first man to come along will take the whole of the water. The solution of the difficulty is to put in an adequate supply for the requirements of the district and then station an officer there to sell the water from day to day. I agree with Sir Edward Wittenoom that the thing to do is to get the water to the settlers. But I do not want to get the water to the individual, which is all that the scheme provides. The first thirsty individual to come along will get the whole of the water. The idea is merely to fix up the catchment and then leave it with no one in charge. There will be a windmill, which will not pump water if the wind does not blow. On a hot day like this, if you had 40 windmills watering stock, it would be necessary to have a man to look after the windmills in order that the stock might get their water. The pump leather may go wrong or an air-lock may occur in the pipe, and yet the scheme provides for windmills anywhere and everywhere, and there will be no one in charge of the water. The whole thing is impossible.

The Chief Secretary: Apparently the Bill is not wanted.

Alternative amendment put and a division called for.

The CHAIRMAN: Before appointing tellers I give my vote for the ayes.

Division resulted as follows:—

Ayes	9
Noes	9
				—
A tie	0
				—

AYES.

Hon. J. R. Brown	Hon. A. Lovekin
Hon. J. Cornell	Hon. A. J. H. Saw
Hon. J. M. Drew	Hon. Sir E. Wittenoom
Hon. W. H. Kitson	Hon. J. T. Franklin
Hon. Sir W. Lathlain	(Teller.)

NOES

Hon. W. T. Glasheen	Hon. J. Nicholson
Hon. E. H. H. Hall	Hon. E. Rose
Hon. E. H. Harris	Hon. H. A. Stephenson
Hon. J. J. Holmes	Hon. V. Hamersley
Hon. G. A. Kempton	(Teller.)

PAIRS.

AYES.

Hon. E. H. Gray	Hon. H. J. Yelland
Hon. G. Fraser	Hon. H. Stewart
Hon. C. B. Williams	Hon. C. H. Wittenoom

NOES.

Hon. H. J. Yelland
Hon. H. Stewart
Hon. C. H. Wittenoom

The CHAIRMAN: The voting being equal, the question passes in the negative.

Alternative amendment thus negatived.

The CHAIRMAN: I suggest to the Chief Secretary that he move, "That the amendment be not insisted on" so that if necessary the question may be debated from every angle.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: I move—

That the amendment be not insisted on.

Question put, and a division called for.

The CHAIRMAN: Before appointing tellers I give my vote for the ayes.

Division resulted as follows:—

Ayes	8
Noes	10

Majority against .. 2

AYES.

Hon. J. R. Brown	Hon. W. H. Kitson
Hon. J. Cornell	Hon. A. J. H. Saw
Hon. J. M. Drew	Hon. Sir E. Wittenoom
Hon. J. T. Franklin	Hon. Sir W. F. Lathlain
	(Teller.)

NOES.

Hon. W. T. Glasheen	Hon. A. Lovekin
Hon. E. H. H. Hall	Hon. J. Nicholson
Hon. E. H. Harris	Hon. E. Rose
Hon. J. J. Holmes	Hon. H. A. Stephenson
Hon. G. A. Kempton	Hon. V. Hamersley
	(Teller.)

PAIRS.

AYES.

Hon. E. H. Gray	Hon. H. J. Yelland
Hon. G. Fraser	Hon. H. Stewart
Hon. C. B. Williams	Hon. C. H. Wittenoom

NOES.

Hon. H. J. Yelland
Hon. H. Stewart
Hon. C. H. Wittenoom

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

No. 2. Clause 2,—Insert a new proviso to stand as paragraph (i), as follows: "that where land is included in a rateable area which belongs to an owner who has at his own expense provided a sufficient water supply for his own exclusive use on such land he shall be exempt from rates."

The CHAIRMAN: The Assembly's reason for disagreeing to amendment No. 2 is that the proposal would mean the violation of a generally recognised principle.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: I move—

That the amendment be not insisted on.

Question put and a division called for.

The CHAIRMAN: Before appointing tellers I give my vote for the ayes.

Division resulted as follows:—

Ayes	8
Noes	9

Majority against .. 1

AYES.

Hon. J. R. Brown	Hon. W. H. Kitson
Hon. J. Cornell	Hon. Sir W. Lathlain
Hon. J. M. Drew	Hon. Sir E. Wittenoom
Hon. J. T. Franklin	Hon. H. A. Stephenson
	(Teller.)

NOES.

Hon. W. T. Glasheen	Hon. A. Lovekin
Hon. E. H. H. Hall	Hon. J. Nicholson
Hon. V. Hamersley	Hon. E. Rose
Hon. J. J. Holmes	Hon. E. H. Harris
Hon. G. A. Kempton	(Teller.)

PAIRS.

AYES.

Hon. E. H. Gray	Hon. H. J. Yelland
Hon. G. Fraser	Hon. H. Stewart
Hon. C. B. Williams	Hon. C. H. Wittenoom

NOES.

Hon. H. J. Yelland
Hon. H. Stewart
Hon. C. H. Wittenoom

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

Resolutions reported, the report adopted and a message accordingly returned to the Assembly.

House adjourned at 9 p.m.