

Clause 59—Ascertainment of duty where property given to an uncertain person or in uncertain event:

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: I have an amendment.

On motion by Chief Secretary, further consideration of the clause postponed till the end of the Bill.

Clauses 60 to 68—agreed to.

Clause 69—Legacies to certain public bodies:

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: I move an amendment—

That all the words after "69" be struck out and the following inserted in lieu:—

No duty shall be payable under this Act in respect of any gift, devise, bequest, legacy, or settlement made or given to or in trust for—

- (a) any public hospital within the meaning of the Hospitals Act, 1927;
- (b) any public educational institution in the State which is wholly or in part dependent on any State grant, aid, or subsidy;
- (c) any incorporated public body in the State which dispenses voluntary aid to indigent, aged, sick, blind, halt, deaf, dumb, or maimed persons;
- (d) any publicly subscribed medical service or fund in the State, the main object of which is the relief of the sick, or any public medical service or fund in the State which is assisted by any Government grant or subsidy."

The CHIEF SECRETARY: I move—

That the amendment be amended by inserting after the word "State," in paragraph (c) the words "the main object of"; and by striking out the words "dispenses," in line 2, and inserting the words "is to dispense or provide."

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

Clause, as amended, agreed to.

Clauses 70 to 73—agreed to.

Progress reported.

House adjourned at 10.57 p.m.

Legislative Assembly,

Wednesday, 5th December, 1934.

	PAGE
Assent to Bills	1780
Questions: State servants, retiring age	1780
Agricultural Bank, insurance premiums and claims	1781
Perth Mint, office of Deputy-Master	1781
Wheat export restrictions, transfer of public expenditure	1781
Secession, cost of delegation	1781
Leave of absence	1788
Motions: Standing Orders, suspension	1781
Liquor laws, trading hours on Goldfields and North-West	1786
Bulk handling sites, departmental committee's report	1796
Horse-racing, betting control	1797
Union Wheat Pool of W.A., to inquire by Royal Commission	1803
Bills: Loan, £3,038,000, returned	1783
Metropolitan Market Act Amendment, 1R.	1783
Plant Diseases Act, Amendment, 1R.	1783
Industrial Arbitration Act Amendment, 1R.	1783
Bread, 1R.	1783
Inspection of Machinery Act Amendment, 3R.	1783
Land Act Amendment, 3R.	1783
Factories and Shops Act Amendment, 3R.	1783
State Government Insurance Office, 3R.	1783
Public Dental Hospital Land, 3R.	1783
Workers' Compensation Act Amendment, 3R.	1783
Purchasers' Protection Act Amendment, 2R., etc.	1783
Cremation Act Amendment, 2R.	1799
Road Districts Act Amendment (No. 4), 2R., etc.	1801
Fremantle Municipal Tramways and Electric Lighting Act Amendment, 2R.	1806

The SPEAKER took the Chair at 7.30 p.m., and read prayers.

ASSENT TO BILLS.

Message from the Governor received and read notifying assent to the following Bills:—

- 1, City of Perth Superannuation.
- 2, Dried Fruits Act Continuance.
- 3, Land Tax and Income Tax.
- 4, Gold Mining Profits Tax Assessment.
- 5, Road Districts Act Amendment (No. 3).

QUESTION—STATE SERVANTS, RETIRING AGE.

Mr. HAWKE asked the Acting Premier: Will he, before the next session of Parliament, give consideration to the question of applying a uniform retiring age to all persons employed by the State, including judges and others not now covered by the retiring age provision?

The ACTING PREMIER replied: Yes.

QUESTION—AGRICULTURAL BANK.*Insurance Premiums and Claims.*

Mr. WARNER asked the Minister for Lands: 1, What amount of premiums has been paid to the various insurance companies through the Agricultural Bank, including the Industries Assistance Board? 2, What amount has been paid through the Agricultural Bank in settlement of claims?

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE (for the Minister for Lands) replied: 1, £279,734, includes payments to State Insurance Office. 2, £139,932.

QUESTION—PERTH MINT.*Office of Deputy Master.*

Mr. STUBBS asked the Deputy Premier: 1. Are the Government aware that Major Corbet is retiring at the end of this month from the position of Deputy Master of the Perth Mint? 2, As the Government provide funds for the maintenance of the institution, have they been consulted regarding the appointment of his successor? 3, If not, will they make an appeal to the Imperial authorities to consider the appointment of an officer from the present staff suitable for the position? 4, If an appointment has been made outside the present staff, will the Government protest against the practice of bringing into the State officers from abroad when suitable officers are available here?

The ACTING PREMIER replied: 1, Yes. 2, The Government were notified of the intention to make the present appointment and as this appointment is an Imperial obligation no effective objection could be sustained. 3, Answered by 2. 4, The Government always favour and follow this principle where they have undivided control.

QUESTION—WHEAT EXPORT RESTRICTIONS.*Transfer of Public Expenditure.*

Mr. SLEEMAN asked the Acting Premier: In view of the restrictions to be imposed on the export of wheat will he consider the advisability of not proceeding with the building of any new agricultural railway lines, but of transferring the moneys

earmarked for that purpose to the commencement of the building of a new bridge over the Swan River at Fremantle?

The ACTING PREMIER replied: The Government at the moment have made no substantial financial provision for funds for building new railways, so the question of transfer does not arise.

QUESTION—SECESSION.*Cost of Delegation.*

Hon. W. D. JOHNSON asked the Acting Premier: 1, What is the sum total of the expenses incurred to date by the State Treasury for the Secession Delegation at present in the United Kingdom? 2, What amounts, if any, have been paid under the following headings, and to what persons: (a) Travelling allowances; (b) Salary or other allowances; (c) Professional fees; (d) Hospitality? 3, What is his estimate of the total cost of the delegation by the time the mission is concluded?

The ACTING PREMIER replied: 1, £443 15s. 2, This is as yet unknown, as payments are being made in England. 3, This cannot be determined at this stage, and will depend entirely upon the time the mission is engaged upon its work.

MOTION—STANDING ORDERS SUSPENSION.

THE ACTING PREMIER (Hon. A. McCallum—South Fremantle) [7.35] I move—

That during the remainder of the session the Standing Orders be suspended so far as to enable Bills to be introduced without notice and to be passed through their remaining stages on the same day, and all messages from the Legislative Council to be taken into consideration on the day they are received.

This is the usual motion moved about this time of the year, and its object is to facilitate the passage of business between the two Houses. I do not think that any more new Bills will be introduced; certainly they will not be introduced to any great extent.

Hon. C. G. Latham: I know of two more.

The ACTING PREMIER: Yes, but I do not think they are contentious.

Hon. C. G. Latham: I am not so sure about that.

The ACTING PREMIER: There would not be any difficulty about getting through all our business if we could only inculcate into the minds of members opposite that when Bills are introduced by us they do not need any amendment.

Mr. Sampson: That is a new gospel.

Mr. Patrick: You want to convince another place of that.

The ACTING PREMIER: When I was sitting in opposition I used to think that Bills needed to be amended, but I do not think so now. Since crossing over here I have changed my mind.

Hon. W. D. Johnson: It has become the practice to leave it to another place.

The ACTING PREMIER: I hope we shall be able to finish the session by the end of next week.

Mr. Stubbs: Oh, oh!

The ACTING PREMIER: And I should like members to assist to that end. We should be prepared to work a little overtime now, as we generally do at this stage of the session. It will be the desire of every member not to be sitting until the last moment before the Christmas holidays. It has generally been the experience to sit up to Christmas Eve.

Mr. Stubbs: Another place will not get through unless days or hours of sitting are extended.

The ACTING PREMIER: I do not think there will be any difficulty on the part of this House. We should be able to finish our business comfortably enough by the end of next week. That is my view. We have worked fairly consistently right through the session and our work is up to date. If there is any delay, I do not think the blame can be laid on us. I am asking for the suspension of the Standing Orders so that when business is received from another place, it may be dealt with quickly and returned quickly. I am hopeful that we shall not have to sit until the last moment before the holidays. Members who live in the country would like to finish in time to reach their homes and have a few days with their families to make arrangements for the Christmas holidays. That has not been the experience for many years, but there is no reason why we should not do that if we apply ourselves to the work consistently during the next week.

HON. C. G. LATHAM (York) [7.39]: I oppose the motion. There are to be placed before us five new Bills which members have not yet had an opportunity to see, and some of them must be very contentious. I am not going to approve of the passing of legislation in an indecent manner, as I consider some of it was passed last night. This House has a perfect right to give serious consideration to all legislation introduced here, and we cannot do that if the Acting Premier is determined to pass Bills through as soon as they have been introduced. We on this side of the House cannot prevent that, but we can protest. I admit that it is usual at this time of the year for a motion of the kind to be carried, but this is the first time I have known it to be moved when the Government have contemplated the introduction of such a number of Bills that members have not seen. It would be far better for members to return after the Christmas holidays and complete the session then. We are not responsible for the delay that occurred in the earlier part of the session. Ministers did not have their Bills ready. I hope that next session we shall be able to get to work earlier. We were not responsible for the many days lost in the early part of the session, and with the undue haste that the Government would now make, we cannot expect good legislation. Let me mention one or two of the Bills on the notice paper. Last night the Minister for Agriculture moved the second reading of the Dairy Products Marketing Regulation Bill, a very important measure that we are anxious to have placed on the statute-book, but it will need serious consideration so that it may not have the opposite effect from that which we desire. The Minister for Employment is asking for leave to introduce a Bill for an Act to consolidate and amend the law relating to the making and sale of bread. I do not expect that that Bill will pass very easily. If I have any idea of it, it is a fairly substantial measure. It is unfair of the Acting Premier to ask us to agree to the motion without our knowing what legislation will be placed before the House.

The Acting Premier: This motion is designed chiefly to facilitate business between the two Houses.

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: We were having some difficulty in getting amendments drafted because the Crown Law officers are

so busy. I believe the Minister has overcome that difficulty to-day. Last night I desired to move an amendment to a Bill, but I could not even discuss it. The Minister was adamant and said that the Bill would be put through whether we moved amendments or not. Such an attitude on the part of a Minister does not give members a reasonable opportunity to digest proposed legislation. I think the passing of the motion could be deferred for a week. I prefer to come back after the Christmas holidays rather than have legislation passed hastily. We have to remember that legislation does not merely affect members of the House; it affects the public, and we have no right to hurry through legislation that might have a detrimental effect both on our industries and on our people.

HON. N. KEENAN (Nedlands) [7.43]: The Acting Premier said that this is the usual motion moved at this stage of the session. Of course it is, but on every occasion when it has been moved, so far as I know, members have been given distinct information as to the Bills the Government intended to ask the House to proceed with, so that members might know that, by sacrificing the rules of the Chamber for the time being, it was done for a definite purpose. No statement of the kind has been made to-night. The motion is to be passed as a blank cheque. We know nothing of what it will involve. The Acting Premier has also told us that the business in this House is so far forward that we can comfortably finish the session by the end of next week. That being so, why the necessity for the motion? The passing of the motion will not in any way expedite the business in another place, and I cannot see why we should agree to it in view of our lack of knowledge of the business to be brought before us. If it were definitely stated that only those Bills of which the House has knowledge would be proceeded with, even though the suspension of the Standing Orders were wholly unnecessary in this House, as the Acting Premier has told us, I would not oppose the motion, but we should be made aware of what the Government propose to ask the House to assent to before rising for the Christmas holidays. But I decline to give a blank cheque. I venture to say that never in the past have the Government of the day asked for a

blank cheque. They have always disclosed their whole programme, and then asked for the passing of this motion in order to enable the House to rise some time before Christmas. We have no assurance at all as to the use to which this motion, if passed, will be put; and therefore I join in the protest.

Question put and passed.

BILL—LOAN, £3,938,000.

Returned from the Council without amendment.

BILLS (4)—FIRST READING.

- 1, Metropolitan Market Act Amendment.
- 2, Plant Diseases Act Amendment.

Introduced by the Minister for Agriculture.

- 3, Industrial Arbitration Act Amendment.
- 4, Bread.

Introduced by the Minister for Employment.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

On motion by Mr. Doney, leave of absence for four weeks granted to Mr. Griffiths (Avon) on the ground of ill-health.

BILLS (6)—THIRD READING.

- 1, Inspection of Machinery Act Amendment.
- 2, Land Act Amendment.
- 3, Factories and Shops Act Amendment.
- 4, State Government Insurance Office.
- 5, Public Dental Hospital Land.
- 6, Workers' Compensation Act Amendment.

Transmitted to the Council.

BILL—PURCHASERS' PROTECTION ACT AMENDMENT.

Second Reading.

MR. WILSON (Collie) [7.53] in moving the second reading said: This Bill is for the purpose of making an amendment in an Act that was passed last year. The amendment will make the parent

Act a more equitable measure. I remember securing the insertion in the original measure of a provision of this nature. The Bill was sent to another place, and there by some means the provision which, in my opinion, represented the most serviceable feature of the Bill was omitted. Last session I gave particulars of cases where men and women in the country had been practically victimised. When using the word "victimised" I do so in the sense that the people in question did not know what they were doing. Some five or six years ago vendors of land got into the country districts and induced people, in many cases unsuspecting people, to purchase land at very high prices. In those days wages were fairly good, and work was fairly constant. Since then, however, the work is no longer there and the wages have gone down, with the result that contracts made by people in those days cannot be carried out, for the simple reason that the people in question have not the wherewithal to live, quite apart from paying for land. One man was sent to gaol because he ignored a fine—payment imposed on him by a court. The man had three children; he was paying for the house he was living in, and he is still paying for it. In addition, he took on a block of land, and paid the instalments continuously for three and a half years. Then he was called upon to continue paying. He offered to forfeit the block, to give it back to the vendor company. In order to show how good a bargain the company must have made, let me mention that they refused to let the man forfeit the amount he had already paid for the land, in return for cancellation of the sale. They said to him, "You must pay the balance." The court ordered the man to pay 5s. per week. He refused to pay, and was committed to gaol for contempt. I state advisedly that this man had to serve 30 days in Bunbury gaol, and that his wife had to obtain rations while he was in gaol. He was herded among criminals. I tried to get him released. But no, he had to do 30 days' gaol. I mentioned in this House a case where a half-time waiter was compelled to go on paying for land while he earned hardly enough to keep him going. Further, I have here a letter concerning a man who had paid £78 towards the purchase price of a block of land, the full price being £130. He wrote to the vendor company

stating that he wanted to forfeit the land. However, they refused to permit him to forfeit, and took him to court, obtaining an order from the Bunbury magistrate for 5s. per week; this although the man was working only half-time. In the last amending Bill sent to another place there was provision enabling men in such circumstances to appeal to the court under Section 10 of the principal Act. Peculiarly enough, that amendment was adopted in Committee in another place, but was struck out upon re-committal. The Bill came back here, and we said we would rather lose the provision I had sought to have inserted than lose the Bill altogether. And so that Bill became the present Act. The present Bill consists practically of only a few words—

Section 11 of the principal Act is amended by inserting after the word "provisions," in line three, the words "of the preceding section and."

Those last five words will give to men and women who are practically on the breadline the right to appeal to the courts for justice. Surely there is something wrong when purchasers who have paid practically two-thirds of the total price are refused permission to forfeit. For land sold six years ago at £120, one could not get more than £60 or £80 nowadays.

Mr. Patrick: Would one get that much?

Mr. WILSON: I will speak for myself. I have some land in Hardy-street, Nedlands, for which I was offered £140 before the deeds were obtained. To-day I could not get £90 for it. The man I previously mentioned has paid £78 towards the purchase price of land sold to him for £120. In view of the fall in values, I say he has already paid for that land. Yet he was taken to court and ordered to continue paying 5s. per week out of his half wages. Surely it is up to us to pass the Bill, notwithstanding any cry of "repudiation." Letters have been sent to members of the Legislative Council asking them to throw out the Bill, but I hope members there will ignore them. I would repudiate anything that has been done by people responsible for such transactions. I have one of the company's letters in my possession. I merely wish to do justice to people who have been victimised in connection with land transactions. Hundreds of such instances can be quoted. I do not refer to any one

company in particular, but to all companies guilty of these practices. If Parliament thought fit, a valuator could be appointed to revalue the properties. When the soldiers returned from the Great War, land was sold to them at prices ranging from £50 to £120, but on investigation it was found that many of the blocks were not worth £10. The Government of the day passed legislation to deal with that evil, and I ask the House to agree to remove the evil that exists now. I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

MR. STUBBS (Wagin) [S.1]: The Bill represents retrospective legislation, and probably every member is averse to measures of that description. At times, however, such legislation is justified. I am in accord with everything the member for Collie (Mr. Wilson) said in moving the second reading of the Bill when he pointed out how people had been victimised. A striking instance was brought under my notice recently. A farmer, esteemed highly as a fine type of settler, whose holding is situated many miles away from town, was gulled in an extraordinary manner by one of the agents who run around the country in motor cars trying to sell blocks of land. The land about which I intend to speak is somewhere in the Como district, miles away from anywhere. A glowing picture was painted by the land agent in this instance regarding the wonderful value of the land, how cheap the blocks were, and how in the course of a year or two the land would be worth five times as much as the company were asking for it. Evidently this particular land agent succeeded with his story, because he secured a fairly substantial cheque from the farmer, who had just received the proceeds of his harvest. After paying their debts, the farmer and his wife thought the purchase of the land would be a good investment, and they paid a considerable sum as a deposit for the purchase of five blocks. About 12 months later I received a letter from the farmer telling me he had paid £90 on the blocks, but had found himself hard up against it so that he could not pay any more. He asked me to ascertain if the company would give him one of the blocks that he had been assured by a man, who had inspected it, was worth about £15. He was willing to allow his £90 to go if he could get the title deeds for that one block. He told me the company's office

was in Howard-street. I ascertained that a prominent Barrack-street solicitor was one of a syndicate who had bought the Como property. I was referred by him to a firm of public accountants in Howard-street who were the liquidators for the estate. I placed all the cards on the table, and asked the public accountant if he could meet the wishes of the farmer. He told me he would consult the other man whose office was in Barrack-street, saying that he was the individual from whom instructions had been received to collect all moneys due to the syndicate. He said, "If you leave it with me, Mr. Stubbs, I will get into touch with the syndicate and see what can be done." A week or so later I received a letter from the accountant informing me that the man could not be released from his contract, that a large sum had to be paid annually to the road board for rates on the property, and, in the circumstances, the purchaser would have to stand to his contract. On the other hand, he informed me that the syndicate would give the farmer extra time within which to pay for the blocks, and in the meantime promised not to sue him until after the next harvest. I wrote to the farmer acquainting him accordingly. A few weeks ago I received another pitiable communication from the man who informed me it was impossible to pay any more, and that the syndicate were pressing him. I am convinced from the information I have received, as well as from my inspection of the blocks, that the land was sold to the farmer at five times its true value. I know there is no excuse for a foolish man who is gulled and cajoled into buying land he has never seen, but there is not the slightest shadow of doubt that a large number of people have been rooked by agents who have sold land under the conditions I have indicated. I am reluctant to agree to retrospective legislation, but it is sometimes necessary for Parliament to take action respecting what, in our opinion, are absolute swindles. I do not say that the syndicate in this instance had any desire to take down an individual. I do not know who the particular agent was who sold the block to the farmer, but I know the latter has been asked to pay five times what the land was honestly worth. In view of such transactions, Parliament is warranted in stepping in to prevent people from being robbed.

MR. THORN (Toodyay) [8.8]: I support the Bill, and congratulate the member for Collie upon once more making an attempt to rectify the position that exists to-day. I was indeed disgusted when his effort last year went by the board as a result of an adverse vote in another place. On that occasion the members of the Legislative Council were well and truly canvassed by the parties concerned.

Mr. Wansbrough: And they have been this year, too.

MR. THORN: This was one of the biggest land swindles ever perpetrated in this State. Several extremely unfortunate instances have been brought under my notice, and I will mention one or two. A woman asked me to assist her. She had signed a blank form the day before and then awakened to the fact that she had signed a contract. She got out of it by paying £10 for signing a piece of paper. She was fortunate. In another instance a foreigner bought two blocks in Victoria Park for £120 each. The blocks were merely two patches of sand. This is a serious matter. The Bill represents retrospective legislation, but it is surely not too late to remedy the position that exists. Contracts that unfortunate people signed three or four years ago are to-day still weighing heavily upon them, and the purchasers are in an uncertain position all the time. A threat is held over their heads constantly, and whenever the particular company concerned has the slightest knowledge that it is worth while pressing, they duly press their claims and take the unfortunate people before the courts, thereby imposing additional hardships. Members have heard of this series of transactions over and over again. We have a good knowledge of what took place. We represent the people and it is our duty to tackle propositions like this, no matter whether it involves retrospective legislation or not. I wish the member for Collie every success in his present effort. There are many instances of people having purchased blocks at upset prices ranging up to £120 each, and after paying off £70 or £80, have asked the company to take the blocks back. The company would not agree to that, because the blocks had not cost them £5 each.

Mr. Warner: They will not stop so long as they can continue their blood-sucking.

Mr. THORN: They are past masters at blood-sucking, and they are persecuting people.

Mr. Marshall: Which company are you speaking of?

Mr. THORN: I will not mention the name of the company; the hon. member is well aware of it.

Mr. Marshall: There are several such companies.

Mr. THORN: But the company I refer to is an outstanding one. After fleecing the people of South Australia they came here, and fleeced our people. Their transactions constitute one of the biggest swindles ever perpetrated in this State. Members in this Chamber have done their best to rectify the position, and the member for Collie is now making a further effort to do so. I hope he will receive the support he deserves.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee, etc.

Bill passed through Committee without debate, reported without amendment, and the report adopted.

Read a third time, and transmitted to the Council.

MOTION—LIQUOR LAWS, TRADING HOURS ON GOLDFIELDS AND NORTH-WEST.

Debate resumed from the 7th November on the following motion by Mr. Marshall:—

That in the opinion of this House, the Government should take the necessary steps so to amend the Licensing Act as to permit of certain trading hours on Sundays in all recognised goldfields towns and in all towns situated in that portion of the State north of the 27th degree, south parallel.

THE MINISTER FOR POLICE (Hon. H. Millington—Mt. Hawthorn) [8.16]: It is true there is dissatisfaction on the goldfields in respect of Sunday trading, one section claiming there is undue restriction in obtaining intoxicating liquors on Sunday, and the other complaining that the law is not rigorously enforced. But as far as I am aware, there is no particular desire on the part of the goldfields people generally that we should amend the licensing law in order to provide for trading during certain

hours on Sunday. It cannot be said there is any body of public opinion behind this request. I have not yet heard members representing the North-West express an opinion, but I have the idea that if we were to permit hotels in the North-West to be opened during certain hours on Sunday it would mean they would have to be positively closed during the remaining hours. Ask any North-Wester whether that is the policy the people up there desire. I am sure there would soon be complaint if we positively closed North-West hotels during certain hours on Sunday, even if we allowed them to open at intervals. So I say the North-West people have not asked for this, and instead of overcoming a difficulty, the carrying of the motion would raise further trouble. It is not a crime to drink intoxicating liquors, but certainly it is essential that we regulate the sale; and one of the means of regulating it is that hotels shall close on Sundays. At all events, Parliament has declared that they shall be closed on Sundays, and it is left to the police to endeavour to see to it that the law is administered. It is doubtful whether any body of people would be pleased if we were so to amend the licensing law as to permit hotels to be opened during certain hours on Sunday. The very question of what hours they should be open would give rise to fierce argument. It would certainly stir up public opinion, and both sides would air their views, and in all probability nothing of a helpful character would be evolved. The only thing is to continue the present hours and leave Sunday closing to the discretion of the police force. Although the hotels are supposed to be closed throughout Sunday, I do not think that in the North-West, where hotels are hundreds of miles apart, and where people have to travel very long distances, those people find on arrival at any hour of the day or night that they cannot expect to be served. As a matter of fact they are served. If it were otherwise, instead of the few police we have in the North-West, we would require a policeman at each hotel to see to it that the Act was administered. So the North-West can be crossed off from this discussion. The people up there have not asked for the proposed reform, they do not need it and it would not suit them. So evidently there is no need for the House

to give a direction to the Government to amend the law as it affects the North-West. It is a simple matter to move such a motion, but it would be very difficult to carry out. Both the licensing law and the law regulating gambling are particularly difficult of administering. It is a simple matter to criticise departmental administration, but I have seldom noticed that the advice given is of a very helpful character. I think the police are getting through pretty well, considering we have a law which has to operate over an enormous area, in the various districts of which people live in entirely different conditions. Yet we have to make the one law operate. In the main, I think the general community are satisfied. They have very few complaints, and invariably the complaints come from extremists on one side or the other. The general public do not worry their heads about the matter. The difficulty in obtaining liquor is not limited to the Sunday. There are complaints received from the wheat-belt, and I suppose there will always be complaints. However, the view of the Government is that it would be very unwise to attempt to alter the law as suggested in the motion, seeing that there is no general demand, and even if there were we have not heard any adequate reason given for it. Consequently I may say it is not intended to agree to the motion.

MR. THORN (*Toodyay*) [8.25]: I cannot see the necessity for the motion. Generally speaking, the wants of the people on the goldfields and in outback areas are fairly well provided for and the police are not too hard on those who would have a drink on Sunday. It is all a matter of commonsense and discretion. I agree with the member for Murchison that where there are large numbers of toilers, many of whom finish work late at night, those men are entitled to some consideration. However, I think they get it. Compare the position on the goldfields with that in the metropolitan and suburban areas. The conditions are very different. Here great difficulty, I am told, is experienced in getting a drink on Sunday: in fact, it cannot be done.

Mr. Marshall: Nonsense! It is easier down here than it is at Wiluna or anywhere on the goldfields.

Mr. THORN: I cannot believe that.

Mr. Marshall: Come with me next Sunday and I will prove it to you.

Mr. THORN: No, I cannot; I will be at church. Take the position of hotels at holiday resorts, such as on our beaches and elsewhere. There are adjacent to the city, hotels which by road are 26 miles out, but because they are outside the 20-mile radius as the crow flies, they are not entitled to serve liquor on a Sunday. Take the great hardship imposed on the Mundaring Weir hotel, a holiday resort if ever there was one. The only hope that house has of doing business is when the visitors are there on a Sunday; yet those visitors are refused a drink. The Government might well give some consideration to hotels at holiday resorts. One can go to Rockingham and get as much drink as he likes, because it is beyond the prescribed distance. I earnestly appeal to the Government to give some consideration to those hotels which are just within the prescribed limit. I do not encourage Sunday drinking, or indeed drinking at all, but I think those hotels are due for some consideration and I hope the Government will have regard to that phase of the question.

HON. C. G. LATHAM (York) [8.28]: I cannot understand why we should pick out the goldfields for special treatment. I have never been able to understand it. People in country districts are entitled to exactly the same consideration, for they work hard and the climate in which they live is very trying. Yet unless they live beyond the ten-mile limit, they cannot get a drink after 9 o'clock on Saturday the day on which they go in to shop. I think the police do their work very well, and I disagree with the member for Murchison when he says the hotels here indulge in Sunday trading. I have often wondered why we should debar bona fide travellers from getting a drink in the metropolitan area on a Sunday, although one has only to travel 20 miles out of the city to be entitled to a drink. I agree with the member for Toodyay that we should stretch a point and give a special license to hotels at tourist resorts. People like to go out on Sunday. It is probably the only day on which they do go out. They may go to some place for a meal but find they cannot get a drink there. I have often wondered why that sort of thing was permitted. When we are discussing the licensing laws we should give consideration

to that subject. We may have to start upon them at no distant date.

The Minister for Justice: I think we shall have to make a start with portion of the licensing laws next year.

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: Consideration should certainly be given to that question. Why should we not have the 11 o'clock closing in the agricultural areas, as it exists on the goldfields? Country people are entitled to the same consideration as is meted out to goldfields people. I agree with the Minister that if we are going to tamper with the legislation, as suggested by the member for Murchison, we shall get into trouble. I hope the Government will give consideration to the views I have expressed. If we are going to amend the law, let us consider the claims of the people in the country, and of those places that are conducted purely for tourist purposes. I have sometimes wondered why people drink more than they should. No decent hotelkeeper wants them to do that. His greatest trouble is in dealing with clients who do not know when they have had enough. Liquor is an attractive beverage and is beneficial when taken in moderation.

The Minister for Police: If you have the 11 o'clock closing hour in the country, there will be people in the metropolitan area who will want to close at six.

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: In every part of the world there are different licensing laws for tourist houses. Tourists do not drink to excess. They generally merely take liquor as a refreshment.

Mr. Wansbrough: Let us all become tourists.

The Minister for Police: Will you guarantee that?

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: Yes. I noticed when I was in Canada that special conditions were allowed in the case of tourist houses, isolated places such as spas and the like. The bars were not thrown open, and the houses were well conducted. I hope the Government will consider the points of view that I have expressed.

HON. N. KEENAN (Nedlands) [8.34]: I do not think the real motive for the motion has been recognised, namely, that we should appreciate the fact that Western Australian presents even different problems in different parts from the point of view of our licen-

sing laws. That state of affairs will continue so long as these different problems are presented in this way. It is absurd to imagine that we can have one general law applicable to the whole State. The Minister says that the position is met by diplomacy.

Mr. Marshall: He is talking out of the back of his head. He does not know what is going on in goldfields towns.

Hon. N. KEENAN: In other words, the law is not being enforced. It is a bad advertisement for any Government, that the law is not being enforced. They call this diplomacy.

The Minister for Police: That is hypocrisy. In your time the law was not enforced in Kalgoorlie.

Hon. N. KEENAN: I know that. I did not get up in the House and say, "Let it go on; that is diplomacy."

Mr. Moloney: What do you suggest?

Hon. N. KEENAN: We should address ourselves to the framing of licensing laws to meet the requirements of the different parts of the State. There is no law on the statute-book that is more obsolete than the law relating to the liquor trade. It has been on the statute-book for so long that we have come to revere it because it is aged.

Mr. Moloney: It is like some men of to-day, obsolete.

Mr. Thorn: Are you referring to yourself?

Hon. N. KEENAN: I wonder if the hon. member can talk sense for a minute. Sometimes I think the licensing laws are outraged in his presence. The subject is an important one, too important for trivial remarks. Instead of saying he is prepared to allow things to go on as they are and rely upon the diplomacy of the police not to enforce the law, the Minister should have addressed himself to the subject of what reforms are necessary. I know the goldfields and the coast, but do not pretend to know the agricultural areas. The conditions are absolutely different in those different areas. No one can persuade me that a licensing law that would be just and proper for the agricultural areas is just and proper for some other part of the State. On the goldfields the men work until midnight on one shift and from mid-

night until morning on another shift, and sleep during the day. How can we expect the licensing laws to be enforced, as they are under ordinary industrial conditions when the hours of labour are such as I have indicated? Reference has been made to the licensing of special houses for special purposes, such as tourist houses, where they are established merely for that purpose. All these things have been dealt with by people in other parts of the world who do not possess more brains than we do, and have no more capacity than we have to meet the difficulties that arise.

Mr. Marshall: Courage is all that is necessary.

Hon. N. KEENAN: They have soon found a solution for these problems. Here we rely upon diplomacy and an obsolete law. Tourist licenses are of the greatest importance to this State. We should encourage the tourist traffic by making the law fit in with the necessities of business of that character. We should encourage tourist hotels so that accommodation may be provided for visitors. Possibly the regulations governing that traffic might take the form of not compelling the licensee to carry on throughout the year. In many parts of Europe there are magnificent hotels which remain open for five or six months of the year. That is when they are wanted, and when the tourists go to them. They are not obliged to remain open during the off-season, for if they did they would make a serious loss. Of course these hotels are conducted on lines that would not yet be followed here. All that is at our door to learn if we will address ourselves to it. The proper basis on which to discuss this motion is not to deal with the relative merits or demerits of the agricultural area, the goldfields area or the metropolitan area, but to recognise that our licensing laws are obsolete, and that at the earliest possible moment they should be put into the melting pot and entirely recast. We should address ourselves to the question of the direction in which this reform could best be put into effect. If we tackle the problem in a serious mood, we shall be doing something which, although not expressed in words, lies at the root of the motion moved by the member for Murchison. That is why I have risen to give it my support.

MR. MOLONEY (Subiaco) [8.40]: I appreciate the motive of the member for Murchison in bringing down this motion, and listened carefully to his speech. He made out an extremely good case, without importing any feeling into it. The Minister put the matter in a nutshell when he stressed the opinion that the people on the goldfields are not desirous of having this motion carried into effect. Other than the chaos which reigned during the riots in Kalgoorlie, I do not think anyone can take exception to the manner in which the licensing laws are being conducted on the goldfields. The member for Nedlands referred to the law as obsolete. There is something ironical about a statement of that sort coming from the hon. member. For many years he has been one of the pivots upon which the political life of this State has revolved. I have yet to learn whether he has cleansed the Augean stables in respect to many of the anomalies which in his high puritanism he has suggested exist. We are accused of hypocrisy in the dispensing of justice. That accusation savours of the ridiculous when it comes from one who has been the custodian of the law which we are told is not being carried out to the letter. The hon. member said we should remove these restrictions, these excrescences which surround the conditions applying to the liquor trade and do away with the transgressions of those engaged in it. I have travelled as much as most people. Nowhere have I seen the liquor trade better conducted, under more congenial conditions, with such an entire absence of graft, and so fairly and above board, as I have seen in this State. The boundary of 21 miles as applying to bona fide travellers is not new and is not peculiar to the present administration. If the motion were carried, that sort of thing would not be obviated. I have it on the authority of many reputable citizens that the goldfields people do not desire anything to be fixed arbitrarily, such as the motion suggests. If I thought those people had not a full knowledge of the position, I would agree that something specific should be fixed. If it is the desire of the member for Nedlands to have a complete rehabilitation of the licensing laws, it is competent for him to bring down legislation to that end. It is very easy to criticise or accuse the other fellow of acting the part of hypocrite. Possibly those people,

because they are not in the privacy of the club or the racecourse, transgress every day of the week. At the same time we hear it said, "Let us put the law into operation as far as it affects working people, those people who have very limited opportunities of taking advantage of opportunities enjoyed by the more privileged." I appreciate the desire of the member who introduced the motion, and I also appreciate the zeal he at all times displays when submitting any question to the House.

Mr. Stubbs: Then why do not you support him?

Mr. MOLONEY: I reserve to myself the right to discriminate in respect of any member's zeal. There are times when a person's zeal may be misdirected, but in this case I am fully seized with the position, because I have acquainted myself with what actually applies on the goldfields, though perhaps not at Wiluna, and I realise that the people of the goldfields do not desire that what is contained in the motion shall apply to them. What they do desire is that sanity shall at all time characterise the putting into operation of the licensing laws that exist. They have no wish that there should be anything extremely restrictive, and that if there should be any attempt to bring about an alteration of the law, that that alteration should not be piecemeal in effect. If, as the member for Nedlands tells us, the law is obsolete and out of joint, it demands that we shall give it consideration in no small way. There must be a complete overhaul, but I have yet to learn that there are all the anomalies to which reference has been made. Only the other day I accompanied a most influential deputation to the Acting Premier, and the principal complaint of that deputation was with regard to the method of obtaining licenses. That deputation admitted that the licensing laws were admirably carried out. Of course they desired certain improvements insofar as the referendum was concerned, but the members of it never made one-quarter of a thousandth part of the attack on the licensing laws or their administration that was made by the member for Nedlands who supported the motion. I consider no good purpose will be served by carrying the motion: as a matter of fact, it will do more harm than good. Even the members for the North-West, as I have learned by conversa-

tion, do not desire that there shall be any tampering with the licensing laws as they apply to that part of the State. They consider that the existing law suits them and will continue to do so until such time as there is an expression of opinion from that quarter. They, too, point out that not only are the goldfields not desirous of having any innovation put into force, but that the North-West itself expresses a hope that the licensing laws will be left alone.

MR. LAMBERT (Yilgarn-Coolgardie) [8.52]: We can appreciate the fact that since we have amended the Licensing Act in this State we have had a cleaning-up of some of the objectionable features which previously surrounded the liquor trade. At that time different courts were allowed to grant licenses, but when the present law came into force one board for the whole State was appointed, and that board has rendered good service in the cleaning-up of the trade. Everyone admits that if there is one Act we can be proud of, it is the Licensing Act passed in 1921. Since that time we have had reasonable commonsense administration of the licensing laws, not only in respect of Sunday trading, or the traffic generally, but with regard to new licenses. Notwithstanding the remarks of the member for Subiaco (Mr. Moloney), the Ministers who have been called upon to administer the Act have done so in a way that has been acceptable to all.

Mr. Moloney: I never said otherwise.

Mr. LAMBERT: From the extravagance of the hon. member's language I found it difficult to determine exactly what he really did desire.

Mr. Moloney: I am sorry.

Mr. LAMBERT: Whilst we should allow the Minister for Police to accept the responsibility for either relaxing or enforcing the Act, there is no occasion to permit the law to be waived, as was suggested. The member for Nedlands properly said that the time was ripe for a recasting or throwing into the melting pot of our present licensing laws.

Mr. Withers: A comprehensive alteration!

Mr. LAMBERT: I do not know that even that term has a sufficiently wide scope. There has been a rapid development of road transport. In the old days we had not motor cars, and a lot of other conveniences.

Mr. F. C. L. Smith: You are not allowed to drink when you drive a car.

Mr. LAMBERT: That is a matter on which my friend can speak more fluently than I. With the development of road transport there has been a growth of the ordinary roadside inn, which, some ten or 15 years ago, could hardly make a living. To-day hotels exist worth perhaps £5,000 or £10,000 which, a few years ago, were worth not more than a few hundred pounds.

Mr. Stubbs: I will sell you a few at Wagin for less than that.

Mr. LAMBERT: Probably there are some that could sell the member for Wagin at a discount, but I am not going to subscribe to that viewpoint. The administration of the licensing laws on the goldfields or in the North-West is the responsibility of Parliament, and if Parliament is going to continue to be hypocritical, then the present Minister for Police and the Ministers before him did a very good job in meeting many of the contingencies that arose out of the geographical position in which the goldfields are situated. The goldfields are at a geographical disadvantage, and I agree with the view that the hypocrisy as far as the administration of the licensing laws on the goldfields is concerned, should not continue.

The Minister for Police: They are very resourceful people.

Mr. LAMBERT: They are, and they are anything but orthodox. Under certain conditions the people on the goldfields have a right to obtain a drink when they require it. I hope it will never be within the scope of Parliament to prescribe laws which are not justifiable as far as the goldfields are concerned. The goldfields have always enjoyed certain privileges. At the same time I do not know that it is possible to find more law-abiding people anywhere than are those on the goldfields. If we do alter our licensing laws, we should remodel them upon lines that will bring them into conformity with modern legislation in other parts of the world. When we passed the Bill in 1921 giving certain people in the metropolis the right to get a drink and restricting others coming to the metropolis, we could not foresee the development that has occurred in road transport. I venture to say there was a greater abuse of the licensing laws in the metropolitan area at that time than ever occurred on the goldfields. We had the

five-mile limit under which a person could go to certain places, and hundreds of people congregated at those places each Sunday and absolutely debased the licensing laws. That applied also to the seaside resorts. The member for Murehison should be thanked for having brought the motion before the House. It is time that we faced the position squarely, and made an investigation to consider the conditions that could most usefully be adopted to meet present day needs. At this late hour of the session I do not think that any good purpose would be served by passing the motion, especially in its present form, but if the member for Nedlands is sincere in his wish to see the licensing laws remodelled, everyone will join with him in the effort to remove existing anomalies. We should not cast upon the Minister the responsibility of exercising elastic powers to grant immunity from prosecution to those who supply drink. Nor should we expect him harshly to interpret the licensing laws. I will support the motion in the hope that at a more opportune time, probably next session, there will be an opportunity to remodel the Act. As the member for Nedlands said, there are many good features in the laws of other countries. At Cottesloe during six months of the year, I suppose the trade would not take sufficient to pay for electric light, but during the other six months the best of accommodation is available for visitors, not only from the metropolitan area but from the goldfields. I have been to countries where one could sit in a lounge and order a drink that was brought from a store-room. In other countries there is no accommodation for guests on the premises where liquor is sold. Probably 200 feet away there is a hotel attache with living accommodation, but in that part no liquor is served. After listening to the considered and interesting statement of the member for Nedlands, I hope members realise that the responsibility should not be thrown upon the Minister, however ably this difficult Act may have been administered by him. It is for Parliament to do once more what was done in 1921, when an investigation was made to determine what amendments to the law were necessary. As a result of the investigation the trade was greatly improved. If that course were again adopted we could give satisfaction to those people who take a reasonable view of the licensing laws.

MR. SAMPSON (Swan) [9.7]: I support the motion, not that I am particularly well acquainted with the goldfields, but because I believe there should be a definite law.

Mr. Marshall: I will present you with another little steam engine.

Mr. SAMPSON: I believe that every Government is afraid of the Licensing Act. Successive Governments, unfortunately, have not done what they should have done in respect to many of the required amendments. Because of that the work of the Minister for Police has become increasingly difficult, and requires considerable tact, understanding and diplomacy to do what is necessary. I am strongly of opinion that the law relating to what is known as the dry area or the 20-mile radius from the Perth and Fremantle town halls should be amended. If it is wrong for a person in those areas to get drink on a Sunday, it is wrong in any circumstances. Personally I do not think it is wrong to drink in such circumstances. Within a radius of 20 miles of either of these town halls it is alleged to get a drink from 9 p.m. on Saturday to 9 a.m. on Monday. I believe that the wise person sips the pleasures of life, and that drinking in moderation is not harmful. Reference has been made to the Mundaring Weir hotel. It has been said that one must travel a little over 26 miles before that hotel can be reached, notwithstanding that the radius prescribed by the Act is 20 miles as the crow flies.

Mr. SPEAKER: The motion deals with the area north of the 27th parallel.

Mr. SAMPSON: Reference has been made to the matter of which I was speaking.

Mr. SPEAKER: If it was wrongly referred to, that is no reason why the hon. member should refer to it.

Mr. SAMPSON: There are a number of hotels—

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! There is too much conversation amongst members.

Mr. SAMPSON: That was a very happy suggestion.

Mr. SPEAKER: We are not discussing my suggestion. We are discussing an extension of the licensing laws for towns above the 27th parallel.

Mr. SAMPSON: Following your suggestion, Mr. Speaker, I propose to move an amendment.

Mr. SPEAKER: It is not my suggestion that you move an amendment.

Mr. Marshall: If you move an amendment the motion will have the same tragic ending that befell a previous motion of mine which you sought to amend.

Mr. SAMPSON: I saved that particular motion from ignominy.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! Which motion is the hon. member discussing now?

Mr. SAMPSON: The motion on the notice paper in the name of the member for Murchison. I hope the Government will decide that the Licensing Act should be overhauled. Undoubtedly there is need for amending it in various ways, and particularly in regard to what is known as the dry area or the 20-mile radius. In Norway—is that out of order Mr. Speaker?

Mr. SPEAKER: I am not sure whether that is north of the 27th parallel or not.

Mr. SAMPSON: It is. In that country consideration is given to drinking within certain hours, but I shall not dwell on that point. It is not often that I have an opportunity to congratulate the member for Murchison or support a motion tabled by him. To-night I propose to enjoy that novelty. It is a motion that should be carried, and although I question the need for amendments for the goldfields, I have his assurance that they are required. Undoubtedly the Act is due for amendment.

MR. MARSHALL (Murchison—in reply) [9.13]: I shall be brief in my reply because there is little that calls for comment apart from the remarks of the Minister, which seemed to me to be a hopeless, helpless and useless effort to do nothing. One or two other speakers touched on various aspects, apart from those referred to by the Minister. Anyone listening to the member for Subiaco, particularly if he had little experience of the vast extent of the State, would have imagined that the goldfields consisted of Boulder and Kalgoorlie.

Mr. Sampson: You gathered the wrong impression.

Mr. MARSHALL: That was the hon. member's conception of the goldfields, and indicates his conception of almost everything.

Mr. Moloney: Do not be too hard.

Mr. MARSHALL: Why should the hon. member oppose the motion because some

particular friend of his informed him that the goldfields people did not want the concessions? If a plebiscite were taken in Kalgoorlie to-morrow, the place to which the hon. member referred, it would be carried by an overwhelming majority, that we should amend the law so that it would be right for a man to walk into a hotel on a Sunday without risk of being grabbed by the police. How can the Minister take it upon himself to instruct the Boulder police to permit that practice, while he refuses to permit it on the Murchison? I accuse the Minister for Police of pandering to his colleagues in Cabinet. Here is the instruction given by the Minister to the goldfields police, and I take exception to it. The instruction shows what is happening. The law to-day lays down that no one, anywhere in this State, shall be served with intoxicating liquor during—

Mr. Raphael: One can go into any hotel in Perth and get liquor at any time of the night or day.

Mr. Sampson: You must be very industrious after nine o'clock!

Mr. MARSHALL: I am complaining of the administration of the liquor law. In moving the motion I stressed that point. The law says that no one shall be served with intoxicating liquor on Sunday or during prohibited hours, unless he has the bona fide qualification or is a lodger. The amendment suggested by the motion is that we should liberalise the law so as to permit of trading during certain hours on Sunday. Because the motion is worded along those lines, the Minister—I think, though I am not quite sure—and certainly the member for Subiaco (Mr. Moloney) and the member for Toodyay (Mr. Thorn) argue that the adoption of my suggestion would mean the practical abolition of the present system of liquor control, and that thereafter the operation of the liquor law would be confined to the scope of my amendment.

Mr. Moloney: Your imagination plays a striking part there!

Mr. MARSHALL: I maintain that what the hon. member calls my imagination represents the exact impression left upon my mind by his speech. The law to-day says that one shall not without either the bona fide or the residential qualification get a drink on Sunday or during prohibited hours. Here I have

the Minister's instructions on the subject, his instructions as divulged in a Kalgoorlie court during a recent prosecution, which was followed by other prosecutions. The Minister says that although the law to-day is as I have stated, one can get a drink. He adds that this is correct and should be so. He declares, "We have always used discretion in the administration of the liquor laws on the goldfields." I tell the Minister that nothing of the kind has been done. Even in Kalgoorlie and Boulder there have been limbs of the law who have interfered with the liberty of the miners as to securing liquor on Sunday and during prohibited hours, after finishing their shift. I know of cases where the Government have been asked to remove a police officer so that the law could again be liberally administered—or, not liberally administered but absolutely broken with the sanction of the Minister. The adoption of my suggested amendment would not prevent trading during such hours as the Minister says apply to-day at Boulder and Kalgoorlie. It would merely provide that no matter who was the limb of the law administering the Act, at least during certain hours he would not be able to interfere with the liberty of the subject in regard to obtaining intoxicants. If the administration of the law was as described by the Minister, people could get liquor outside the trading hours according to the generosity of the individual administering the Act at the place and at the time. That is not my proposal. I say, that practice is wrong according to law. I want to make the practice lawful. Again, there is the spectacle of certain hotel keepers, probably owing to independence of disposition, falling foul of the constable administering the law. In one town there is such a hotel keeper and there are other hotel keepers. The administrator of the law closed up the hotel of the first man for good and all. His competitors were not interfered with. Is that fair? My amendment merely suggests that even in defiance of such an officer the hotel keeper I have referred to would be able to hold his customers in competition with his opponents. Let me tell North-Western members—

Mr. Coverley: We know all about it. You are not an authority on the North.

Mr. MARSHALL: I want to refer to what the Minister said about North-Western members. I want those hon. members and

the people of the North-West to understand that it is impossible to read into my motion anything that would prevent present-day practices from continuing, but that the adoption of my suggestion would have this effect, that during certain hours which are now prohibited hours it would be legal to obtain liquor, and that thus it would not be possible in any town on the goldfields or in the North-West for an administrator of the law to say to a hotel keeper, "For 24 hours you shall remain closed." The hotel keeper would be entitled to keep open during certain hours. That is all my motion contemplates. However, to hear some hon. members one would think I wanted certain hours fixed for trading and outside those hours to shut the hotels up altogether. The Minister may have seen yesterday a report of a prosecution at Wiluna, not a prosecution for trading during prohibited hours. The charge was dismissed, but the report shows how strict things are at Wiluna. During the last three or four years it has not been possible for a Wiluna miner to obtain a drink during prohibited hours. From the Minister's assertion, it would appear that in goldfields districts represented by Cabinet members one can get a drink as stated, whereas in goldfields districts represented by ordinary members one cannot get a drink during prohibited hours. Here I have the report of a Sunday-trading prosecution at Boulder or Kalgoorlie. I quote from the Press cutting—

Sergeant Clementson, who prosecuted, said that in accordance with instructions from Perth all hotel proprietors on the goldfields had been warned that they must keep their bar-doors locked on Sundays. "Why only the bar-doors?" asked the magistrate. "It puts me in rather an awkward position," replied Sergeant Clementson. "I do not believe in hypocrisy, but I have received instructions from Perth, and have to carry them out."

Who gave those instructions to break the law? If such instructions can be given for Boulder and Kalgoorlie, why cannot they be given for Wiluna, Meekatharra and Cue?

Mr. Hawke: And Kellerberrin, Northam and York?

Mr. MARSHALL: From what I gather from members who have spoken, those places are now experiencing a discretionary administration of the liquor law. There is not another gold mine in the State like that in Wiluna at present, though there soon

will be. Wiluna has reached the objectionable stage when arsenic fumes and gases percolate the atmosphere for miles around the mines and the habitations. To the hon. member who suggested that the Wiluna people growl because they cannot get beer on Sunday, my reply is that Wiluna residents are as much entitled to the enjoyment of such a right on Sunday as are the residents of Kalgoorlie and Boulder, to whom the Minister accords it. Had the administration of the liquor law been fair and honest and complete throughout the goldfields, my motion would never have been launched, because there would have been no necessity for it. In moving it I referred to men who competed in selection ballots for the right to be standard-bearers of Labour. The hon. gentleman advocated, on the Golden Mile, the legislation of Sunday trading on the goldfields 28 years ago. Why was not the agitation persevered with? Was the reason, as stated by the Minister, that we have shut our eyes to the law on the goldfields? I think that is correct. On the other hand, in other goldfields towns officers have come along and definitely and positively shut down all trading outside hours. Seemingly that has never occurred at Boulder and Kalgoorlie. In those towns, if the hotels merely close their doors everything is all right. Will the Minister guarantee me that Wiluna and the Murchison shall enjoy the same privilege? In that case, all right. If he will not, if the persecution now obtaining at Wiluna and on the Murchison is to continue, I shall stand up here on every possible occasion and voice my protest against the inconsistencies apparent in the administration of the liquor laws. One hon. member mentioned something about riots on the goldfields. Of course liquor is responsible for those riots, in his opinion.

Mr. Moloney: I never said anything of the kind. Speak for yourself.

Mr. MARSHALL: I am merely expressing an impression left upon my mind when the hon. member had finished his speech. I do not know whether the hon. member meant that.

Mr. Moloney: Imagination again! Be a little more reckless!

Mr. MARSHALL: One member did associate the riots at Kalgoorlie with the liquor traffic.

Mr. Hawke: Liquor precipitated the riots.

Mr. MARSHALL: That was the position. At any rate, I want to tell that hon. member, whoever he was, that he is not familiar with the position at all. The Minister knows that ever since the goldfields existed as such, racial hatred has prevailed. During the whole time I have been associated with the goldfields, I have known that to be so. I have seen men lying in the streets in Meekatharra. They have been knocked out and taken in the ambulance to the hospital. I know that the trouble on the Murchison never at any time reached the dimensions of the Kalgoorlie riots. You, Mr. Speaker, know from your experience in the Murchison district that on paynight after paynight you stood back out of the line of Irish gun-fodder. You stood aside from the shower of road metal, stones, fists and knives. They were used as they were in Kalgoorlie although not on such a scale.

Mr. Raphael: He was wise in standing back.

Mr. MARSHALL: Of course he was wise. In such circumstances, absence of body is better than presence of mind. I do not associate the liquor trade with what occurred on those occasions, for I do not think liquor had anything to do with it at all. I moved the motion, believing it to be the correct thing to do. I am not particularly concerned as to what form the administration of the liquor laws shall take, if my motion be agreed to. It is sheer hypocrisy for the Minister to say on behalf of the Government, "I know it is not the law, but I will instruct those administering the law to see that it is broken." It is hypocrisy to adopt that attitude and then apply those conditions in given areas only. The situation on the Murchison has been known to the Government for a long time, but there has been no effort on the part of the Perth authorities, whoever they may be, to see that any relaxation is authorised at Wiluna. I agree with the member for Nedlands (Hon. N. Keenan) and the member for Yilgarn-Coolgardie (Mr. Lambert) that there are many necessary amendments required in our licensing laws, and the sooner the Government have the temerity to amend the Act, the better it will be. I will not remain a member of this Chamber and allow one section of the goldfields to be permitted to flout the law in accordance with instructions from Perth, if equal treatment is not meted out to the Murchison

area. In that part of the State, the citizens are just as good as those who live in the Eastern Goldfields districts, and the former deserve equally considerate treatment. In my opinion the consideration extended to the Eastern Goldfields should apply throughout the whole State.

Mr. Wilson: So it should.

Mr. MARSHALL: I have no intention to discriminate, and the only reason I appeal to the Government on behalf of the people residing in the northern goldfields areas is that the conditions of employment under which the bulk of the people are working, plus the climatic conditions, warrant a different form of liquor laws from those applicable in the city. Anyone who knows the goldfields conditions will agree with me. As a matter of fact, those in authority have agreed that the licensing laws should be broken, seeing that they permit the legalisation of trading hours on Sunday as being essential and necessary. If that is not so, why do they permit the practice? Why not stop it at Kalgoorlie and Boulder? If the law is correct and proper—the Government say it is correct—they should enforce it. If it is not correct, then every centre on the goldfields should receive similar treatment. That is all I ask. I agree with those members who have contended that the Licensing Act is long overdue for drastic and urgent amendment. Irrespective of what the fate of my motion may be, I hope the Government will not close their eyes to what prevails on the goldfields and elsewhere. I can take members of this House to suburbs of the city and show them open trading on Sundays. They will be able to walk into the bars and if any member contends I am wrong, he can come with me next Sunday and I will take him into those bars, which are not too far away from the city.

Hon. C. G. Latham: It would be too risky to go with you on a Sunday.

Mr. MARSHALL: The Leader of the Opposition would be quite safe. I will demonstrate how easy it is to get liquor.

Mr. Moloney: Are you complaining that the law is not strict enough?

Mr. MARSHALL: My complaint is about the irregularities in the administration of the law, and its restrictive application in one part and its laxity in other parts. I disagree with the suggestion that the whole

of the Sabbath should be a prohibited day. If the Government admit it is right to permit the law to be broken at one centre, that condition should apply generally throughout the goldfields. I have done my best, for I conscientiously believe in the substance of my motion. I am convinced that there should not be total prohibition during the whole of the 24 hours on a Sunday in any part of the State, particularly on the goldfields.

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

Ayes	14
Noes	16
Majority against				2

AYES.	
Mr. Clothier	Mr. Sleeman
Mr. Keenan	Mr. P. C. L. Smith
Mr. Lambert	Mr. Stubbs
Mr. McDonald	Mr. Thorn
Mr. Marshall	Mr. Tonkin
Mr. North	Mr. Wilson
Mr. Sampson	Mr. Raphael

(Teller.)

NOES.	
Mr. Coverley	Mr. Patrick
Mr. Ferguson	Mr. Rodoreda
Mr. Hawke	Mr. Wansbrough
Mr. McCallum	Mr. Warner
Mr. McLarty	Mr. Willcock
Mr. Millington	Mr. Wise
Mr. Moloney	Mr. Withers
Mr. Nulsen	Mr. Doney

(Teller.)

Question thus negatived.

MOTION—BULK HANDLING SITES.

Departmental Committee's Report.

Debate resumed from the 7th November on the following motion moved by Mr. Sleeman:—

“That the report of the recent departmental committee appointed to inquire into railway sites for bulk handling be laid upon the Table of the House.”

THE MINISTER FOR JUSTICE (Hon. J. C. Willcock—Geraldton) [9.43]: The Government have no objection to the motion. With regard to such motions, however, very often the Government require to secure information of a confidential nature and it is not always desirable, in the interests of other people, not of the Government, that the information should be made public. Because of the fact that a departmental inquiry has been held into some matter, it is

often considered that the information should be made available, and accordingly motions are moved in this House. There may be instances in which departmental officers, who are called upon to conduct inquiries on behalf of the Government, may feel disinclined, if they think the information will be made public, to express their opinions freely or to give all the information that is available. It might be that publication would be detrimental to the people in respect of which the inquiries were conducted. In that event, it would not be advisable for the information to be made available. That does not apply in this instance. I have the report here.

Question put and passed.

The MINISTER FOR RAILWAYS: As I said, I have here the report, and in accordance with the resolution I lay it on the Table.

MOTION—HORSE-RACING, BETTING CONTROL.

Debate resumed from the 7th November on the following motion moved by Mr. Marshall:—

That, in the opinion of this House, immediate steps should be taken to introduce legislation for the purpose of legalising and controlling betting on horse-racing, along the lines of the South Australian Act.

MR. WISE (Gascoyne) [9.47]: I agree with some of the sentiments conveyed by the motion, and I think there is urgent need for some means of controlling or regulating the system of betting operating in this State. But I think perhaps the motion goes too far, that there is nothing in it to say that the South Australian Act is suited to the conditions applying in this State, there is nothing to show that within the confines of the South Australian Act there are provisions applicable to the conditions obtaining in this State. In addition, that Act may not provide at all for matters which are relevant to betting transactions on or off racecourses in Western Australia. For the good of all ages and all people interested in betting, whether they bet or not, some control should be exercised. Everyone will agree it is impossible to abolish betting on horseracing, and I think most will agree that some sys-

tem of control is desirable. There are in the community many people who oppose all forms of gambling. They cannot tolerate gambling and cannot conceive of any good coming from any form of gambling. But even those folk would welcome some definite supervision of the betting transactions in this State; even to those to whom gambling is abhorrent, a scheme of registration or licensing would be welcome. I move an amendment—

That all words after "horseracing," in line 4, be struck out, and the following inserted in lieu:—"in connection with betting transactions made on or off licensed racecourses."

It may be that by the registration of a certain number of shops within the State, and by licensing the men operating them, and further by the imposition of a tax on winning bets this matter might well be controlled to suit the conditions applying to betting.

Amendment put and passed.

[The Deputy Speaker took the Chair.]

MR. MARSHALL (Murchison—in reply) [9.52]: Most members have agreed that some form of control should be instituted. The only objector was the Minister, and his contribution in opposition to the motion was very brief and left but little to reply to. His chief point was that no request had been made for this. It is true there has not been any direct request made, for the reason that the bookmakers licensed by the W.A.T.C. and having a monopoly of betting under the law, are satisfied to let things remain as they are. The legalising of betting off the course would only rob those gentlemen of a great deal of patronage, and it is fear of that loss which makes them content with the existing state of affairs. On the other hand, those who have been betting off the course are so intimidated that they fear to make any request for legality because they would have to admit their guilt, their breaking of the law. And those unfortunates who cannot afford to go on the course, conscientious individuals who have, say, only 5s. to invest, prefer to invest it in a little bet at some obscure shop rather than spend their only 5s. in seeking admission to the racecourse. Such men are cowed by the knowledge they are breaking the law, and the police have got them in such a funk that they do not dare make a re-

quest to the Government. So the Minister was right in saying that no one had demanded the reform. In moving my motion I went to the trouble to show that for hundreds of years on the Continent this evil has continued to grow, notwithstanding all efforts to abolish it. Shop betting was extensively practised in England 200 years ago, and as it was reduced by the legalising of it, so it produced another evil, namely that of street betting. If there is anything more objectionable than the state of affairs prevailing in this city on Saturday afternoons—if what we see does not call for control, then nothing will induce the Government to introduce control. To such an extent is shop betting growing in this State that unless some control is immediately adopted, other evils will grow up and get out of hand. We talk of our desire to protect our youth while the existing state of affairs tempts them into quiet byways to indulge in betting off the course. And immediately those who are betting are chased out of one dark alley, they seek another. We shall never stop street betting or shop betting while horse racing exists. The gambling spirit is inherent in the Australian race to perhaps a greater extent than it is in any other race, and the majority of Australians will have a bet in defiance of any law. Yet the Minister said it does not matter, and he went on to speak of the existing regulation and control of betting. But we have no control, no regulation whatever. Is it fair that because a person is licensed by a racing club, he should be allowed to have an office in the city in which to settle his wagers on Monday morning, while another person, not licensed to bet, is haled before a court and heavily fined? Why should that be? What control has the Minister that such things can happen? There is no control. It is only hypocrisy to pretend otherwise. The feeling is growing that it would be better to control the evil, have registered premises that are strictly supervised, keep the young people away from them, and make provision for those who desire to bet so that they may do so within the law. The fear of the cancellation of their licenses would force the people in charge of the premises to comply with the law, whereas to-day women and children can bet if they desire to do so without the law being able to prevent them. The Minister says there has been no request

for a tightening up. True, no deputation has waited upon the Government to legalise street or shop betting, but I suggest that since this motion was moved any number of quiet requests have been made to the Government not to consider it. I know the influence of the racing fraternity. It is pretty powerful. John Wren and P. A. Connolly are not wanting representatives when anything that may be injurious to their financial welfare is on the political horizon. For the well-being of the community the law should be made effective, and all betting should be controlled. The Minister said the South Australian Act had not been in force long enough to be of value. I do not think he has ever seen it. It was I who first said it had not been enforced long enough to be given a fair test. I would not endorse that Act holus bolus, and only referred to it as I had no other guide. I wish to read a condensed statement founded on the last report of the Commissioner of Police in South Australia, Brigadier General R. L. Leane. In his report to Parliament he said—

A public need appears to have been filled with the advent of licensed bookmakers and betting shops. It was certainly a vast improvement over the old system from the point of view of contamination of youth. A licensed bookmaker would not knowingly bet with a minor for fear of losing his license, whereas previously a bookmaker would bet with anyone. Betting had been taken away from hotels, billiard saloons, shops, and many other places where youth had congregated for the purpose of betting, and where their morals had been corrupted.

Anyone can bet in this State.

Previously the large majority of otherwise law-abiding citizens broke the law with impunity, simply because they did not believe in the restrictions placed upon them. In his opinion the whole atmosphere in regard to betting had changed for the better. At present illegal betting had diminished to an extent to be almost negligible compared with previous times, but there were still some prepared to indulge in illicit operations both at hotels and at dwellings.

The Commissioner of Police in South Australia should know something about this matter. I suggest to the Minister, who knows the goldfields, that if betting is an evil there, we have a number of evil-doers. Most miners have an inherent desire to bet. A big percentage of our people could never attend the racecourse under present conditions because they are too far away. The

only way in which they can bet is to punt locally, which is prohibited by law. The Minister seems to think that does not matter because the delinquents are brought up before the court and fined, and go on again. No one likes to appear before a court, even on such a charge. The principle is either right or wrong. If it is right it should be made law; if it is wrong it should be stopped at once. The only course open to us is to control the business, and I suggest the Government should favourably consider that aspect.

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

Ayes	14
Noes	14
					—
A tie	0
					—

AYES.

Mr. Clothier	Mr. F. C. L. Smith
Mr. Coverley	Mr. Tonkin
Mr. Hawke	Mr. Wansbrough
Mr. Marshall	Mr. Wilson
Mr. Moloney	Mr. Wise
Mr. Nulsen	Mr. Withers
Mr. Rodoreda	Mr. Raphael

(Teller.)

NOES.

Mr. Ferguson	Mr. Patrick
Mr. Latham	Mr. Piesse
Mr. McCallum	Mr. Sampson
Mr. McDonald	Mr. Stubbs
Mr. McLarty	Mr. Warner
Mr. Millington	Mr. Willcock
Mr. North	Mr. Doney

(Teller.)

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I give my casting vote with the ayes.

Question thus passed.

BILL—CREMATION ACT AMENDMENT.

Second Reading.

MR. HAWKE (Northam) [10.13] in moving the second reading said: By passing the Cremation Act in 1929, Parliament endorsed the principle of cremation in Western Australia. No doubt members constituting the present Parliament will also endorse it. It seems unnecessary to quote in detail the history of the movement that has been carried on in various countries in favour of cremation; neither does it seem necessary to place before the House the many solid reasons which led up to the cremation of human bodies instead of burying them. Some members, however, may be

interested to learn that the idea of cremation in its present form was introduced into England by Sir Henry Thompson in 1873. Earlier in that year that gentleman had visited Italy and witnessed several cremation services there. The first crematorium was erected at Woking in England in 1878, and was first used in 1882. In 1883 a Welsh doctor raised a storm of protest when he built a small crematorium on his own property, and cremated the dead body of his wife. He was arrested and tried before Mr. Justice Stephen. It was then decided that cremation was legal provided it was done without nuisance to other people. Since then the practice has spread rapidly in England and in other parts of the British Empire. Last year in Sydney 800 cremations were carried out, and in Adelaide, Melbourne and Brisbane, the practice is solidly established. To-day almost all opposition and prejudice against cremation have vanished. There have been many cases in the past where men and women have been strongly opposed to the practice of cremation. Many of those people have been prevailed upon to witness an actual cremation service and as a result of the experience their point of view has been entirely reversed. Unfortunately the 1929 Act has become a dead letter. No action of any kind has been taken by the authorities mentioned in that Act to make cremation possible in Western Australia. The 1929 Act limited the right to establish a crematorium to the trustees and controlling authorities of existing cemeteries. Those trustees and controlling authorities, if not opposed to the idea of cremation, at least are very cold towards it. It seems to me very unfair that those authorities should have failed to take the necessary action, especially when we remember that since the passing of the Act many people have died who were very earnest in their desire that their bodies should, after death, be cremated. At least two cases have occurred this year where relatives have gone to all the trouble and expense of sending the bodies to the Eastern States to be cremated. Except for the very great expense involved, many more than the two cases would have occurred this year, and many more cases than did occur might have occurred in previous years. The amending Bill proposes to amend Section 4 of the principal Act, so that it shall be made workable. It is proposed that Subsection 1

of Section 4 of the Act shall be deleted in order that a new and more workable subsection may be inserted. The new subsection proposes that a license to use and conduct a crematorium may be granted to those in charge of any cemetery or any association incorporated under the Associations Incorporation Act, 1895. Any such association must be established and constituted in connection with the cremation of human bodies after death. In addition such an association must hold a certificate signed by the Commissioner of Public Health showing that the association is one to which Section 4 of the principal Act may reasonably be extended. So that all the necessary safeguards are provided before an association constituted under the Associations Incorporation Act 1895 can in fact establish and conduct a crematorium in Western Australia. The proposed amendment still leaves the controlling authorities and trustees of existing cemeteries eligible to receive licenses. The vital part of the amendment, as I have already suggested, is that a license may also be granted to any properly incorporated association provided it is constituted for the purpose of carrying out the cremation service, and provided in addition the Commissioner of Public Health approves of such association. It is further proposed to give power to the authorities of any cemetery to set aside portion of the cemetery under their control as a site for a crematorium. Such site would be used only for the erection of a crematorium and for the burial of the ashes. The burial of bodies not cremated may be prohibited on such site. The controlling authorities or trustees of the cemetery may also grant a permit to any licensed association to erect and conduct a crematorium. The association would then become the trustee of the portion of land to which the permit applied, and the land would be regarded as a public cemetery for the burial of ashes of cremated bodies. A new section is proposed to the effect that a licensed association may be given power to establish a crematorium on land that is not part of a public cemetery. When such a crematorium is erected, the land would then become a public cemetery except that only the ashes of cremated bodies would be buried therein. So it will be seen that the amending Bill proposes to give any properly established association, provided it has received the ap-

proval of the Commissioner of Public Health, the right to establish a crematorium on land in the possession of the association. Another amendment proposes to give power to the Commissioner of Public Health to authorise any authority in charge of a crematorium to deliver the ashes of cremated bodies to the administrator who obtained a permit for the cremation of the bodies. That amendment is included because it will enable the remains of a body after cremation to be easily transported to any other State or country. There is no doubt that a provision of that kind would, in many cases, be availed of. We all know of men and women who have come to Western Australia from other States or other countries, and whose relatives may still reside in those places. The provision I have referred to would give the right to the Commissioner of Public Health to make available to the administrator the ashes of the cremated bodies so that they may be transported to where the relatives may be and there placed in an established crematorium. It is generally known by members that there exists in each State of Australia a cremation society, the officers and members of which are well respected. In Western Australia the society numbers amongst its members such well-known people as Mrs. Joyner, Mrs. Rischbieth, the Bishop of Bunbury (Dr. Wilson), Archdeacon Riley, Dr. Clement, Dr. Atkinson, and Messrs. C. W. Hawker, J. B. Hawkins and C. A. Davidson. Those are the names of some of the people actively and officially associated with the association in this State. When hon. members give consideration to the fact that the society has been able to attract men and women of standing, Parliament can, with every confidence, give its approval to the amendments contained in the Bill so that cremation shall indeed become practicable in Western Australia. There is no doubt that Parliament, when it passed the Act in 1929, did approve of the practice and expected or thought at that time that it was giving power to permit the practice of cremation to be carried out; but as I have pointed out, it has been found that the Act has not been used, probably not because it is not workable but because its provisions have been found to be too narrow. The amending Bill aims at giving to those people who believe in cremation the right to have the practice established and operated. It will give that right with-

out interfering in any way with the rights and beliefs of other people. Although there may still be some people in this State who are opposed on what they consider to be principle, to the practice of cremation, although they might never consider for one second allowing any of their relations or themselves to be cremated, nevertheless the amending Bill will in no way interfere with their rights and beliefs; it will only give to those people who believe in the practice of cremation the right to have the practice carried out if they so think fit. The amendments proposed are very simple and straight forward as well as easy to understand. The Bill is not contentious and I sincerely hope and trust that this Chamber will finalise it at the present sitting so that it may go to another place for consideration and so become law before the present session concludes, as it will do in the near future. I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

On motion by Hon. C. G. Latham, debate adjourned.

BILL—ROAD DISTRICTS ACT AMENDMENT (No. 4).

Second Reading.

MR. MARSHALL (Murchison) [10.27] in moving the second reading said: The object of the Bill is to make a small amendment to the Road Districts Act. It was the general opinion of most members and even of the Crown Law Department, that a road board could, if it so desired, establish ice works for the purpose of supplying ice to its town, but on a request for a ruling from the department it was explained that there was some doubt as to whether under the Act there was sufficient power to carry out the establishment of ice works. The town of Meekatharra is well established and has been in existence for over 35 years. It has seen periods of great prosperity and during the whole of that time never had its own ice works. The ice that has been consumed in the town has been conveyed from Geraldton, a distance of over 300 miles.

Mr. Sampson: They can get ice from Wiluna to-day.

Mr. MARSHALL: The Meekatharra Road Board have a gas plant installed, as well as a subsidiary power station, the mechan-

ism being driven by crude oil. It was their intention to start the manufacture of ice many years ago and they installed the initial unit. The history of the installation of the plant is unique. Not until Meekatharra was on the decline was the installation of electricity contemplated. The proposal aroused controversy amongst the ratepayers, quite a number arguing that as the town was declining and its future none too bright, to go to the expense of installing electricity would involve the few ratepayers who were left in the town in the cost of maintaining it. Fortunately that was not the experience. The town held its own for a number of years and to-day is experiencing the prosperity that most of the gold-fields towns are enjoying. However, a bitter fight was waged and a minority so intimidated the members of the road board that, though they won the battle for the installation of the lighting system, they were satisfied to let the ice-producing project go by the board. The plant has operated successfully and has paid for itself. I believe that the subsidiary unit has also paid for itself. The board do not intend to take advantage of this amendment if they can induce private enterprise to instal an ice-producing plant. The board would sooner supply the current to private enterprise. Still, they desire the amendment in order that, if private enterprise will not instal a plant, they may do so to oblige the ratepayers, but that will be done by the board only as a last resort. Needless to say the climatic conditions at Meekatharra warrant the use of ice in large quantities, particularly as the hot months extend over the greater part of the year. If the board find it necessary to instal the plant, they propose to supply small ice chests on time payment to ratepayers in order that life may be made a little more comfortable for them. In years gone by ice was hauled from Geraldton to Meekatharra and was then conveyed to Wiluna by road, an additional distance of 142 miles. The ratepayers rightly argue that as the town has taken a new lease of life, they should be permitted to provide their own ice. They could manufacture it more cheaply than they can get it at present, and they have the surplus current necessary for the purpose. If the plant were installed, the small towns adjacent could be supplied, towns such as Peak Hill, Olden's

Find, Nannine, Reidy's, Cue and Day Dawn. I suppose that Mt. Magnet will be enterprising enough to instal a plant of its own. At present that town has no ice-producing plant.

The Minister for Justice: Did not Magnet have one?

Mr. MARSHALL: Only a small one which was costly to operate. The Bill will merely ensure that the road board have the power to instal an ice-producing plant and supply the ice chests to their ratepayers. Probably not many boards will take advantage of the provision, but no doubt some of the northern boards will avail themselves of it. I wish to emphasise the point that the Meekatharra board have no desire to instal a plant if private enterprise will do it. Meekatharra has a population of 2,000 or 3,000 people and it is ridiculous for them to have to haul their ice from Geraldton or Wiluna. Members know how rapidly ice frets and can realise the poor value that would be obtained for money spent on ice hauled over such a long distance. I trust that members will give the Bill favourable consideration and move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

The **MINISTER FOR JUSTICE** (Hon. J. C. Willcock—Geraldton) [10.39]: I have no objection to the Bill. The hon. member has made out a very good case. In the hot places inland the local authorities should be empowered to do such things for the benefit of the people. The provision of ice conduces almost as much to the comfort of people as does the provision of light. Ice is especially valuable in cases of sickness and may often prove a matter of life and death. The people should be able to get ice at a reasonable price and under reasonable conditions. To provide ice is probably more beneficial to the people in those parts than to provide recreation grounds. The passing of the Bill will not mean that a road board, by merely passing a motion, will be able to instal ice works. Safeguards are provided in the Road Districts Act necessitating the consent of the ratepayers being obtained before such undertakings are embarked upon. Therefore we might well give the power sought under the Bill.

HON. C. G. LATHAM (York) [10.41]: I see no reason why a general permit should not be given to road boards to utilise their money in this direction if they think fit. Some years ago Parliament passed a measure to enable the municipality of Northam to start ice works. Whether they have proved successful, I do not know. This Bill proposes to go further, though not further than the city of Perth goes by supplying gas stoves and electric cookers and entering into competition with private firms in that line of business. I do not suppose anyone could say that the City Council should be commended for engaging in that business. I remind the hon. member that a new type of refrigerating machine is coming into use in many homes where current is available, so the local authority will need to be careful not to spend money on ice works, only to find that the domestic installation of refrigerating plants has rendered the expenditure useless. I understand that the cheapest form of such machines is the Kelvinator, or machines of that type. I have no objection to road boards exercising this general power if they think it desirable. They already have power to establish gas works and electric light stations, and other undertakings which it is difficult to get private enterprise to provide. I was surprised to hear the hon. member say that Meekatharra has a population of 2,000 or 3,000 people.

Mr. Marshall: Men, women and children.

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: The town must have grown rapidly.

Mr. Marshall: It has seven mines working now, compared with one a few years ago.

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: Of course it is not altogether a question of the size of the district. The hon. member has made out a good case for the Bill.

MR. THORN (Toodyay) [10.45]: I also have pleasure in supporting the Bill. After all, if one realises the great benefit ice represents to the people in back areas where the climate at times is grilling, one can appreciate the object which the mover has in view. One can also appreciate that the long haulage of ice to Meekatharra, for example, must involve great wastage. Therefore one can confidently support the measure. I know the value of ice in sickness. The Minister mentioned its great value

in those circumstances. It soothes the sick; they appreciate it. Moreover, it has the effect of sterilising, to some extent, food which has been properly cooled off.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Mr. Sleeman in the Chair; Mr. Marshall in charge of the Bill.

Clause 1—agreed to.

Clause 2—Amendment of Section 162:

Mr. MARSHALL: I thank hon. members for their reception of the Bill. In reply to the Leader of the Opposition may I say that the latest inventions in the form of refrigerators are a little too expensive for use under the conditions contemplated by the Bill. Therefore the road boards desire to obtain ice chests and supply them on long terms to their ratepayers. The tenure of employment on the goldfields is too insecure to enable the average man to purchase expensive refrigerating machinery. One cannot take away a large machine over a long distance.

Mr. SAMPSON: I am thoroughly in accord with the clause. However, the Bill, which has the support of the Road Board Conference, will apply to localities of a more permanent character than some goldfields districts. Therefore I move an amendment—

That after "ice chests," in line 4 of proposed Subsection 28, there be inserted "or other refrigerating equipment."

I want the road boards to be empowered to provide not only ice chests but also other refrigerating equipment. In a district like Katanning, such equipment as my amendment suggests might be justified.

Mr. MARSHALL: I hope the amendment will not be pressed. Its adoption would endanger the passage of the Bill in another place. Its effect would be to bring road boards situated within reasonable distance of the city into competition with manufacturers. The Bill merely proposes to empower road boards to supply ratepayers with a convenience that is absolutely needed. Ice chests for, say, Meekatharra would be made locally. Under the amendment road boards would come into competition with local agents. A man who could

afford to buy the more expensive equipment could buy it through the agent instead of through the board.

Mr. WARNER: I see no need for the amendment. The Bill seeks means of supplying a convenience to residents of outlying road districts. The amendment would put the boards into competition with manufacturers of refrigerating machinery. Thus the Bill might be lost. It ought not to be lost.

Mr. SAMPSON: In view of the feeling which has been expressed, I ask leave to withdraw my amendment.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Clause put and passed.

Title—agreed to.

Remaining Stages.

Bill reported without amendment, and the report adopted.

Read a third time, and transmitted to the Council.

MOTION—UNION WHEAT POOL OF W.A.

To Inquire by Royal Commission.

Debate resumed from the 21st November on the following motion moved by the Hon. C. G. Latham—

That, in the opinion of this House, a Royal Commission should be appointed to inquire into and report upon the business, finances, and management of the Union Wheat Pool of W.A., and the system generally adopted in this State for the warehousing of wheat.

THE ACTING PREMIER (Hon. A. McCallum—South Fremantle) [10.56]: A good deal of the case made by the Leader of the Opposition undoubtedly goes to show that there is a difficulty in this respect, that pools really operate outside the law. For pools there is no law prescribing powers and functions and setting up responsibilities in the ordinary way. From that aspect there is not protection for those who do business with pools as there is for those who do business with limited liability companies. I thoroughly agree with the view that as pools seem to have come to stay and are being established in nearly every Australian State, it would be well to have a law governing their operations just as there is a

law governing the operations of incorporated companies. The Government propose to have the position thoroughly canvassed and examined during the recess, with a view to bringing down legislation next session; but we do not feel that we are called upon to appoint a Royal Commission to inquire into the transactions of one pool, where there may have been some transactions not too creditable to those responsible. The same thing obtains, unfortunately, in a good many business concerns. If we accept the proposition that when money has been lost and people have been defrauded through transactions that were not all one might desire, the Government are under an obligation to appoint a Royal Commission to investigate, it would mean the expenditure of a mint of money, and probably Royal Commissions would be sitting nearly all the year round.

Hon. C. G. Latham: Some Royal Commissions have been appointed for more trivial matters than this.

The ACTING PREMIER: I do not know of any.

Hon. C. G. Latham: I do.

The ACTING PREMIER: I know of none.

Hon. C. G. Latham: What about the Land and Homes Royal Commission?

The ACTING PREMIER: That is not operating now.

Hon. C. G. Latham: But there was a Royal Commission to inquire into the transactions of Land and Homes Limited.

The ACTING PREMIER: I know there was. I do not say there has not been a Royal Commission to inquire into a more trivial matter than this. However, we have not such a Royal Commission at the moment.

Hon. C. G. Latham: I said that we had had them.

The ACTING PREMIER: Only one Royal Commission is sitting at the moment, that inquiring into the aborigines question. A Royal Commission which is proposed will inquire into the question of bulk handling. Those are the only two Royal Commissions the Government have in mind for the moment, at any rate. We do not feel called upon to investigate the operations of the Union Wheat Pool any more than we feel called upon to investigate the operations of the other wheat pool. If we inquired into one case, we would in all fairness have to inquire into the other case as well.

Hon. C. G. Latham: There would be no objection to that on my part.

The ACTING PREMIER: There can be only one objective in holding such inquiries, and the hon. member told me so in reply to an interjection I made when he was speaking. He then said the objective was to frame legislation to govern the operations of pools. The Government do not think a Royal Commission is needed for that purpose. We propose to have investigations made and a report submitted during the recess. This will enable us to frame legislation which will guard against certain happenings of the past, give the pools a legal status, and afford protection to those doing business with them. That is the Government's view, and we do not favour the appointment of such a Royal Commission. On the other hand, we give the Leader of the Opposition and those who support him in this move an assurance that during the recess an investigation will be made, and if it is shown that legislation is necessary, we will be ready to introduce it next session. We cannot agree to the motion.

MR. WARNER (Mt. Marshall) [11.1]: I was not present when the Leader of the Opposition moved his motion for the appointment of a Royal Commission to inquire into the affairs of the Union Wheat Pool, but I have made myself acquainted with his remarks. The facts he presented, the accuracy of which I do not doubt, make me feel greatly concerned. I represent a large number of wheatgrowers, and on their behalf I will give every support to the Leader of the Opposition in his endeavour to have an inquiry conducted into the affairs of the Union Wheat Pool. If his statements are correct, there is every justification for the appointment of a Royal Commission. Too much money is taken all along the line from the pockets of the wheatgrower. Once his wheat gets to the siding, I am convinced that everyone who talks about handling it or, in fact, does handle it, makes something out of the farmer's consignments. The farmer himself is made a chopping block, and gets nothing out of it. I propose to go further even than the Leader of the Opposition suggested, and I will move an amendment, which I hope the Leader of the Opposition will accept. I move—

That in line 4 "the Union Wheat Pool of Western Australia" be struck out, and the

words "all wheat pools of Western Australia" inserted in lieu.

If the inquiry be conducted along the lines I suggest, we shall ascertain whether the wheatgrowers are being protected all along the line. I have no doubt from the manner in which the Wheat Pool of Western Australia has been conducted, those who are associated with it will not object to such an investigation. I believe members generally are prepared to assist the primary producers in every way possible. I agree with the terms of reference suggested by the Leader of the Opposition who said he would not object to an inquiry that covered all pools, as his object was to protect the interests of the growers, to secure the independence of each pool, and to ascertain whether anything improper had been done.

Amendment put and passed.

HON. C. G. LATHAM (York—in reply) [11.6]: I am sorry the Government have not seen fit to agree to the inquiry. I certainly have no objection to the investigation dealing with all pooling operations in the State. The Acting Premier contended that it was not the duty of the Government to conduct such an investigation, but Royal Commissions have been appointed to inquire into much more trivial matters. Parliament authorised an inquiry into the transactions of Land and Homes Ltd., and legislation resulted in that instance. Another inquiry was held into the warehousing of wheat, although the contracts clearly showed what the position was. There have been few results from that inquiry. It would appear that the Government do not appreciate what has happened to many farmers under the pooling system.

The Acting Premier: We cannot give them any redress.

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: The Government could ascertain what has taken place.

The Acting Premier: The Government could not take action.

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: I suggest to the Acting Premier that he cannot ascertain completely the ramifications of the pooling system unless there is some such inquiry. I do not mind the affairs of both pools being investigated. It is clear that the W.A. Wheat Pool must have been better managed because that organisation has paid 4d. a bushel more than the Union Wheat Pool, and anticipate paying another 2d. a bushel.

The Union Wheat Pool promised to pay on the 16th September an amount of 6½d. per bushel, less rail freight. That was not paid. The date for payment was fixed for the 8th October, but no money was paid. Then the date of payment was retarded to the end of November, but again no money was paid. There must be a reason for that. The Government stand to lose a large sum of money. Advances made to farmers under lien over crops will be lost. Are the Government indifferent to that? Not less than £5,000 or £6,000 will be lost in that direction to my knowledge. The Government should ascertain what is their position. The position is very difficult and of course there is no statutory power. But I am disappointed and I think after all there should be an inquiry made. Evidently it does not suit the Government to make an inquiry.

The Acting Premier: We cannot see any good likely to arise from it. We are not parties; we do not own the wheat.

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: But the lien the Government have over the wheat gives them some standing. The security was the wheat handed over to the Union Wheat Pool, a matter of over £5,000. Are the Government not going to make any attempt to recover that? Then there is £13,000 which I cannot account for.

Mr. Warner: And that is only one pool.

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: Yes, and that is 4½d. a bushel below another pool. I am disappointed that the Government cannot see their way to making an inquiry, just as they made an inquiry into Land and Homes.

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

Ayes	7
Noes	19

Majority against 12

AYES.

Mr. Ferguson
Mr. Marshall
Mr. Patrick
Mr. Sampson

Mr. Sleeman
Mr. Warner
Mr. Doney

(Teller.)

NOES.

Mr. Clothier
Mr. Coverley
Mr. Cross
Mr. Hawke
Mr. Kenneally
Mr. Lambert
Mr. McCallum
Mr. Millington
Mr. Moloney
Mr. Nulsen

Mr. Raphael
Mr. Rodoreda
Mr. F. C. L. Smith
Mr. Tonkin
Mr. Wansbrough
Mr. Willcock
Mr. Wilson
Mr. Withers
Mr. Wise

(Teller.)

Question thus negatived.

BILL—FREMANTLE MUNICIPAL TRAMWAYS AND ELECTRIC LIGHTING ACT AMENDMENT.

Second Reading.

MR. SLEEMAN (Fremantle) [11.16] i—moving the second reading said: There are only two phases of the Bill which I wish to bring before the House: one is to provide for the Fremantle Tramways Board to increase its overdraft in order to save floating a loan, while the other is to make it lawful for the board to provide the Rockingham Road Board with power and light. The Fremantle Municipal Tramways and Electric Lighting Undertakings completed their first 10 months' operations on the 31st August, 1906, with £100,000 owing in respect of loans and visible assets including stores to the value of £92,598. The present position is that the loan indebtedness is unprovided for by sinking fund, and after deducting £5,000 for which the Fremantle City Council is responsible, it amounts to only just over £33,000 with assets, including stores, amounting to over £330,000, and by the 31st August, 1938, provided the present policy of the board is maintained, the undertaking will be absolutely free of debt, with assets to the extent of approximately £350,000. It is with the object of achieving this desirable result that the board wishes to obtain the increased overdraft authority in preference to raising additional money by loan to carry out the work of extending the electric supply to Rockingham and relaying the tramway track in the Melville Road Board district. I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time

On motion by the Minister for Railways, debate adjourned.

House adjourned at 11.19 p.m.

Legislative Council,

Thursday, 6th December, 1934.

Bills: Public Dental Hospital Land, 2r.	1806
Land Act Amendment, 2r.	1807
Roads Act Amendment (No. 4), 1r.	1809
Inspection of Machinery Act Amendment, 2r.	1809
Administration Act (Estate and Succession Duties) Amendment, Com.	1810
Financial Emergency Tax Assessment Act Amendment, Assembly's message	1815
Financial Emergency Act Amendment, Assembly's message	1815
Mines Workers' Relief Act Amendment, 2r.	1815
Com. recon.	1815
Agricultural Bank, 2r.	1817
Resolution: State forests, to revoke dedication	1809

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

BILL—PUBLIC DENTAL HOSPITAL LAND.

Second Reading.

THE HONORARY MINISTER (Hon. W. H. Kitson—West) [4.36] in moving the second reading said: Some time ago the Perth Dental Hospital was granted Perth lot 654 situated in Pier-street for the purpose of a dental hospital. When the association desired to complete plans for the proposed hospital, it was found that the site was not as suitable as it should be. One of the essential requirements of a dental hospital is a permanent south light. Otherwise it is necessary to use artificial light to a great extent. In addition the block was found to be a little smaller than was desired, and that would have necessitated the erection of a building of at least three storeys and the provision of foundations to carry an additional storey at a later date. Those discoveries having been made, it was decided that a more suitable site should be secured. Another site has been offered to the association—a block in Murray-street which would permit of the building of a hospital of two storeys, give better facilities and possess the desired south light. In order to take advantage of the offer of the second site, it will be necessary for the association to dispose of the Pier-street block, and this Bill is intended to give the association the right to sell it and utilise the proceeds for the purchase of the other site. A building of two storeys would be more satisfactory in every way than would one of three storeys, more particularly from the view—