

measure prevents similar things being done by others.

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: I move—

That the further consideration of Clause 29 be postponed until after consideration of the second schedule.

Motion put and passed.

Clauses 30 to 33—agreed to.

New clause:

Hon. J. W. KIRWAN: I move—

That a new clause, to stand as Clause 34, be added as follows: "The provisions of this Act shall apply only to the metropolitan area."

The need for such legislation may be felt in Perth and Fremantle, but not in the outside districts. At the present time, there are no architects on the eastern goldfields, so that the Bill is not required for their protection. If building operations are required in the outer parts, there is nothing to prevent architects in the metropolitan area being engaged to do the necessary work.

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: It would be a great mistake to agree to the new clause. It would mean that people connected with the architectural profession in the country districts would have no opportunity of qualifying to be a registered architect. There must be some such persons in the country districts.

Hon. A. J. H. Saw: There must be some in Bunbury and other places like that.

Hon. A. H. PANTON: I support the new clause, but I think "metropolitan area" should be clearly defined, because factories and other such buildings are extending out from the city areas, and provision should be made to cover them.

Hon. J. A. GREIG: The new clause is a reasonable one, and there is nothing to prevent people in the country districts interested in this profession from carrying out operations and finally becoming registered should they so desire.

New clause put and a division taken with the following result:—

Ayes	11
Noes	7

Majority for	...	4
--------------	-----	---

AYES.

Hon. J. Cornell	Hon. J. Mills
Hon. J. Cunningham	Hon. T. Moore
Hon. J. A. Greig	Hon. A. H. Panton
Hon. J. W. Hickey	Hon. H. Stewart
Hon. J. W. Kirwan	Hon. V. Hamersley
Hon. A. Lovekin	(Teller.)

NOES.

Hon. H. P. Colebatch	Hon. F. E. S. Willmott
Hon. J. Nicholson	Hon. Sir E. H. Wittenoom
Hon. E. Rose	Hon. C. McKenzie
Hon. A. J. H. Saw	(Teller.)

New Clause thus passed.

Schedules—agreed to.

Progress reported.

House adjourned 11-32 p.m.

Legislative Assembly,

Wednesday, 11th December, 1921.

	Page
Questions: Water Supply, Metropolitan Area ...	2384
Kurrawang Firewood Company, new Cutting Rights ...	2384
Select Committee: War Gratuity Bonds, report ...	2384
Bills: Permanent Reserves (No. 2), 3a. ...	2384
Land Agents, 3a. ...	2384
Closer Settlement, Com. ...	2385
Inspection of Machinery, Council's Amendments ...	2387
Agricultural Bank Act Amendment, 2a., Com. Recom. ...	2387
North Fremantle Rates Validation, returned ...	2393
Traffic Act Amendment, Com., report ...	2393
Nurses Registration, Com. ...	2400
Licensing Act Amendment, 2a. ...	2402

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

QUESTION—WATER SUPPLY, METROPOLITAN AREA.

Captain CARTER asked the Minister for Works: In view of the increasing and, in some cases, utter disability under which people living on the higher levels of the city are suffering in regard to water supply, when is it his intention to place restrictions upon the general supply of water to the city and suburbs?

The MINISTER FOR WORKS replied: As soon as the administration are satisfied it is necessary to do so.

QUESTION—KURRAWANG FIREWOOD COMPANY, NEW CUTTING RIGHTS.

Hon. P. COLLIER (without notice) asked the Premier: Will he lay on the Table of the House the file relating to the application of the Kurrawang Firewood Company for the cutting rights in the new area South-West of Coolgardie, and also the file dealing with the same company's application to construct a wood line to the locality in question.

The PREMIER replied: I have no objection to the production of these papers.

SELECT COMMITTEE—WAR GRATUITY BONDS.

Presentation of Report.

Mr. Wilson brought up the report of the select committee appointed to inquire into the transactions in connection with War Gratuity Bonds.

Report received and read and ordered to be printed.

BILLS (2)—THIRD READING.

1, Permanent Reserves (No. 2).

2, Land Agents.

Transmitted to the Council.

BILL—CLOSER SETTLEMENT.

In Committee.

Resumed from the previous day; Mr. Stubbs in the Chair, the Premier in charge of the Bill.

Postponed Clause 7—Acquisition of land:

The CHAIRMAN: At the previous sitting the Premier moved the following amendment—

Strike out all words after "based" in line 1 of Subclause (3) down to "1895," in line 5, and insert the following in lieu thereof:—"(a) On the unimproved value of the land which shall be deemed to be the amount at which the unimproved value is assessed for time being under the Land and Income Tax Assessment Act, 1907, with ten per centum added thereto; and (b) On the fair value of the improvements assessed at the added value given to the land for the time being by reason of such improvements; to be agreed upon between the owner and any mortgagee or any other person having any interest in the land and the Board, or determined by arbitration under the Arbitration Act, 1905."

Mr. A. THOMSON: I hope the Premier will accept a proviso as follows, which I propose to move as an amendment to paragraph (a) of his amendment—

Provided that this section shall not apply until due date of 1922 land tax return.

My object is to be fair and just to those people who may have been sending in a reasonable valuation for their land. It is quite possible that if some land owners had known that their property was likely to be taken at the valuation they showed on their returns, they would have put in a much higher valuation on which they would have been prepared to pay taxation. I hope the Premier will agree to add a proviso such as I suggest.

Mr. MUNSIE: What is the Premier's intention in connection with the proviso which is attached to the clause at the present time?

The PREMIER: The proviso referred to only applies to a distribution of the money. There may be claims against compensation, such as mortgages and so forth, and in the event of a dispute, the money will be paid into court and distributed in accordance with the Act.

Mr. PICKERING: Members should have some indication as to what it is proposed to insert in lieu of the words to be struck out. It may be that some other form of taxation is to be imposed. Information of that sort will help us to decide our attitude regarding the amendment. People have already put in their unimproved land values for taxation purposes, but when they did so they did not know that their returns would be used as a lever against them.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: I presume they put in a fair price.

Mr. PICKERING: But if they had known that such a proposal as this would have been made, they might have put in a higher valuation.

Hon. P. Collier: Are you charging all land owners with being dishonest?

Mr. Johnston: No, but there is a sentimental attachment to homes in the country which has to be taken into consideration.

Mr. PICKERING: Probably the great majority of people owning properties have not included in their returns a valuation representing the figure at which they would be prepared to sell their land. We should make provision for amended returns to be put in.

Hon. P. Collier: In order to protect dishonesty!

Mr. Johnston: Nothing of the kind.

Mr. PICKERING: I suppose the member for Boulder has put in a return at a figure which is not what he would expect to receive.

Hon. P. Collier: I put in more than the property is likely to yield.

Mr. PICKERING: The position of small properties is slightly different from that affecting large areas. In view of the passing of such a measure, an opportunity should be given to land owners to submit amended values which would represent the value upon which they were prepared to pay increased taxation, in view of the Bill. By that means, we would get something like the fair value of the properties. The Premier should agree to the insertion of a proviso to that effect.

Mr. JOHNSTON: The point that appeals to me is that unless the Premier is prepared to accept a proviso such as that outlined, some members might prefer the clause as it stands. I do not consider the position from the standpoint of whether or not a landowner has been paying taxation on what he has put in as a fair and reasonable valuation. I consider it from the standpoint of people who have been on their properties for 30 or 40 years and have developed a sentimental attachment for their homes. Particularly does this apply in the South-Western portions of the State, where people have been born on their properties and have no desire to go elsewhere. In some instances, this land was selected over 20 or 30 years ago, and for years they have worked to overcome the poison difficulty. I distrust any valuation which would be given for work done over a number of years in the eradication of poison.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: The valuation would be arrived at by arbitration.

Mr. JOHNSTON: That is the valuation I distrust. This provision will apply to land which is used for grazing purposes and the production of remarkably fine wool.

Mr. Munsie: Then the Bill will not apply to it.

Mr. JOHNSTON: But the board might say that the land could be put to better use for closer settlement purposes. Arbitration is not likely to give the settler a fair valuation for the work done in getting rid of poison over a period of 20 years or so.

Mr. WILLCOCK: The member for Williams-Narrogin has attacked the whole principle of the Bill, which is to take over estates which have been held up for years without being properly used. It seeks to attack the very land the hon. member has been speaking about, land where only a few sheep are run and which has been held up for 40 or 50 years.

The Premier: The Bill does not apply to improved land.

Mr. WILLCOCK: It can be construed to mean that it does apply, because of the very wide construction to be placed upon the term "partially improved." It has been suggested that a man should be allowed to retain his property for his children. Are we to hold up the development of Western Australia until such time as a man's family has grown up. Some of these people are not married yet; it is a ridiculous suggestion. Take the case of Kendenup. If the Hassell family liked to run a few sheep over their estate, because of sentimental reasons, Kendenup would not have been possible. Are the interests of the State to be sacrificed to that of the individual? I support the clause and object to the proviso suggested.

The PREMIER: The Bill applies to freehold land only and land which is unutilised and unproductive. It does not apply to land such as that suggested by the member for Williams-Narrogin. Land which is being fairly used cannot come under the Bill.

Mr. Mann: Will the Bill affect a property such as Edgar's at Gingin, where he goes in for stud stock?

The PREMIER: If the property is utilised, the Bill will not apply.

Hon. P. Collier: In that case, the land is being put to good use.

The PREMIER: Of course. The Bill only applies to the fair unimproved value of unutilised and unproductive land, for taxation purposes.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: Your friends are afraid they have not put in a fair value for their land.

The PREMIER: I do not see that there is any danger whatever about this clause. All that a man has to do is to bring his land into use.

Mr. Mann: Suppose a man came along and said that the Dandarragan estate, for instance, could be utilised for the purpose of growing wheat; would it be obligatory on the owner of the property to cut it up so that it might be used for wheat growing?

The PREMIER: This House does not expect a man to plough, sow and reap every acre he possesses. The House does expect that a man will deal fairly with the land which he holds.

The CHAIRMAN: I will put the amendment in sections. The first amendment is, That all the words after "based" in line 1 be struck out for the purpose of inserting other words.

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

Ayes	32
Noes	10
<hr/>			
Majority for	22
<hr/>			

AYES.

Mr. Angwin	Mr. Str James Mitchell
Mr. Boyland	Mr. Money
Mr. Broun	Mr. Munsie
Mr. Carter	Mr. Richardson
Mr. Chesson	Mr. Sampson
Mr. Collier	Mr. Simons
Mr. Corboy	Mr. J. H. Smith
Mrs. Cowan	Mr. J. M. Smith
Mr. Davies	Mr. Teesdale
Mr. Gibson	Mr. J. Thomson
Mr. Heron	Mr. Troy
Mr. Lambert	Mr. Underwood
Mr. Lutey	Mr. Walker
Mr. H. K. Maley	Mr. Willcock
Mr. Mann	Mr. Wilson
Mr. McCallum	Mr. Mullany

(Teller.)

NOES.

Mr. Angelo	Mr. Johnston
Mr. Denton	Mr. C. C. Maley
Mr. Durack	Mr. Pickering
Mr. Harrison	Mr. A. Thomson
Mr. Hickmott	Mr. Plesse

(Teller.)

Amendment thus passed.

The PREMIER: I move—

That the following paragraph be inserted in lieu of the words struck out:—

"(a) On the unimproved value of the land which shall be deemed to be the amount at which the unimproved value is assessed for time being under the Land and Income Tax Assessment Act, 1907, with ten per centum added thereto; and"

Mr. A. THOMSON: I move an amendment—

That the following proviso be added to the paragraph:—"Provided that this section shall not apply until the due date of the 1922 land tax returns."

The land and income tax returns have been sent in without any knowledge of the proposal to submit legislation of this description, and those of us who have a personal knowledge of taxation in the country districts are aware that road board valuations are taken, and that there is a great diversity of opinion as to what is the real value. The road board valuers have a system of their own, and it would only be fair and just to those people who may think their land is going to be confiscated under these provisions, to add the proviso I suggest. There are two outlets. A man may continue in possession of his land by paying three times the tax, or he may subdivide his land and sell it. But it is possible that there may be people on whom the imposi-

tion of the threefold tax would amount to a severe penalty.

Mr. Willcock: Not if it is under-valued.

Mr. A. THOMSON: The hon. member wants to get it under its value.

Mr. Willcock: Not at all.

Mr. A. THOMSON: All that we want is the value, but we must take into consideration that we place in the hands of the Government the power to take away from the people that which they regard as their own. A man may possibly have a large estate, in regard to which years of experience have proved that it contains portions which it will not pay to crop.

The Premier: Nor will anyone else, then, think of cropping it.

Mr. A. THOMSON: The board will have power to say that that land is not being properly utilised. It is a reasonable request to make that this legislation shall not apply until the people have had an opportunity, if necessary—I do not say it is necessary—of coming under this Act.

The PREMIER: The amendment on the amendment will mean that any land owner will be able to put what valuation he likes on his land in 1922. In New Zealand power is given to the land owner to have his assessment increased, and the Registrar has power to apply to have an assessment decreased.

Mr. A. Thomson: Why not adopt that provision?

The PREMIER: If we give to owners notice of this description to put up their valuations, they will do so and the measure will become a dead letter. If land is being put to reasonable use, it will not come under this measure. Nobody wishes owners to put more than a fair value on their land.

Hon. P. Collier: Are they really likely to err on the side of generosity?

The PREMIER: It would be necessary to further amend my proposal to meet cases in which the valuation is put up after this year.

Mr. A. Thomson: Adopt the New Zealand provision and I will be satisfied. Give the owner an opportunity to increase his valuation and the board power to decrease a valuation.

The PREMIER: I can see that that ought to be done—

Mr. A. Thomson: I will accept that.

The PREMIER: Otherwise the value of land will be put up, and we shall find unimproved land paying a very much higher tax than improved and better land alongside it. I ask that progress be reported to enable me to look further into the question.

Progress reported.

BILL—INSPECTION OF MACHINERY.

Council's amendments.

Report of Committee adopted.

Reasons for disagreeing to 12 amendments and for agreeing to six amendments subject to modifications adopted, and a Message accordingly returned to the Council.

BILL—AGRICULTURAL BANK ACT AMENDMENT.

Second Reading.

Debate resumed from the previous day.

Hon. P. COLLIER (Boulder) [5.30]: Since the Premier moved this Bill last night, I have looked into its provisions, and I see no objection to its being passed. After all, the proposal to give power to the Trustees of the Agricultural Bank to erect bank premises in different localities, and also to erect residences for officers of the bank, is one to which no exception could be taken. The trustees of the bank, by and large, have conserved its interests very well; and this power is a permissive one. I do not suppose there will be any considerable expenditure under the heading. As for the last clause of the Bill, now that we have embarked on a policy of group settlement in the South-West, I suppose that work will be assisted if the trustees are able to advance, prior to selection, for the purpose of preparing lands. Clause 4, therefore, certainly commends itself to my judgment; and no doubt it will be pleasing to the member for Sussex (Mr. Pickering), who has very often complained that Government assistance from either the Agricultural Bank or the Industries Assistance Board is seldom available for the development of the South-West. This group settlement would take place principally in the South-Western portion of the State, and the hon. member may look forward to the expenditure of increased amounts of the bank's funds in his district.

Mr. JOHNSTON (Williams-Narrogin) [5.33]: I support the Bill. At present there are Agricultural Bank inspectors carrying out very important duties, connected with the expenditure of thousands of pounds of the State's money, living in hessian houses. These inspectors are stationed all through new districts, where settlement is proceeding; and in most of those districts no houses are to let. The inspectors, owing to the meagre salaries paid them, have not the funds with which to buy residences, or build them, for themselves and their families.

Mr. Munsie: Why do they not come under the Workers' Homes Act?

Mr. JOHNSTON: They cannot do that; and, even if they could, why should an inspector take the responsibility of building a house which must be utilised by his departmental successor if he himself leaves the district? These inspectors are transferred from time to time. Their work is likely to go on for many years, because

part of their duty is to supervise the operations of returned soldiers who have been settled on the land. I am glad to know it is proposed that the bank's funds shall be available for group settlement. We saw something of that during our trip through the South-West, and I am sure all hon. members who made that trip will agree that it is necessary Agricultural Bank funds should be available for the furthering of group settlement.

Mr. PICKERING (Sussex) [5.36]: Clause 4 of the Bill has my cordial support and approval, because I have all along been a strong advocate of assistance to group settlement, more especially in the South-West. Accordingly, I welcome the clause in question, more especially because, as the Leader of the Opposition has said, the amount of Agricultural Bank funds so far advanced in the South-West is so small. Clause 2, however, proposing utilisation of the bank's funds for building purposes, seems to me a different proposition altogether. My impression is that to-day the bank's capital is not as large as it should be in order that operations may continue satisfactorily.

The Premier: I did not say that.

Mr. PICKERING: I have very good grounds for saying it. I have heard rumours of a contemplated increase in the bank's capital. If that is contemplated, it is proof that the funds now at the bank's disposal are not adequate for its operations. I agree that the capital should be increased; we want more and more money for the purposes for which the bank was established. It was not, however, established with a view to building bank premises, or premises for its officials; and I do not observe in Clause 4 any provision for the payment of rent by the inspectors. Is it proposed to give them dwellings in addition to the salaries already allocated to them?

The Premier: No.

Mr. Johnston: The clause says that the money so applied shall be chargeable with interest and with contributions towards redemption.

Mr. PICKERING: But that does not mean that the officers shall pay rent. My contention is that the Agricultural Bank could obtain accommodation for its officers by utilising, for instance, agricultural halls, and similar buildings.

The Premier: You are quite wrong there.

Mr. PICKERING: Many of these institutions have special rooms attached to them, and a portion of the building might be taken for this particular purpose. To me it seems inadvisable to start building elaborate agricultural bank offices throughout the various centres concerned; and doubtless Narrogin is one of them, which would explain the strong advocacy of this clause by the member for Williams-Narrogin (Mr. Johnston). I am quite out of sympathy with the clause, and I sincerely hope the Premier will not

divert the funds of which such good use can be made for the bank's special purposes into a direction which is, I submit, uncalled for. Personally, I fail to see why the bank's officers should not avail themselves of the provisions of the Workers' Homes Act. It is ridiculous to say that they cannot do so.

Mr. A. Thomson: They are very liable to be transferred.

Mr. PICKERING: I do not think so.

Mrs. Cowan: Yes, they are.

Mr. PICKERING: No doubt the member for West Perth has a wide knowledge of the operations of the Agricultural Bank, and is fully acquainted with the locale of the bank's various officers; but I have known officers of the Agricultural Bank to be in one particular town for many years. I could give personal instances.

Mr. A. Thomson: I could give many instances where these officers have been frequently transferred.

Mr. PICKERING: If these officers availed themselves of the provisions of the Workers' Homes Act, that might be an inducement to the Government to keep them in their particular localities.

Hon. P. Collier: It may serve the interests of the bank to transfer officers.

Mr. PICKERING: Possibly; but, generally speaking, an officer is likely to be most useful in the district with which he is most familiar.

Hon. P. Collier: The hon. member might argue that the bank should not erect homes for these officers; but he cannot reasonably contend that the officers should come in under the Workers' Homes Act, because a man must have a considerable degree of certainty for many years ahead before he is safe in establishing a home under that Act.

Mr. PICKERING: I have known officers to remain in the same district for many years; and I have no doubt that they carry on their duties quite satisfactorily. For instance, Mr. St. Barbe Moore was in Busselton for ten or twelve years.

Mr. Johnston: But there are plenty of empty houses in Busselton.

Mr. PICKERING: There is not one empty house in Busselton, and I defy the member for Williams-Narrogin to prove it. Let that hon. member try to get a house in Busselton during the summer, and see what chance he has. Whilst I endorse the proposal to extend Agricultural Bank advances on proper lines, I must oppose the clauses referring to building operations.

Mr. A. THOMSON (Katanning) [5.43]: I am rather surprised at the statements made by the last speaker. I do not think the hon. member can be conversant with the conditions under which numbers of our Agricultural Bank inspectors have to live. Those officers have no security of tenure, and therefore it is not a fair demand that they should establish homes for themselves under the provisions of the Workers' Homes Act. That Act is not available to a man who has no

knowledge to-day that he may not be transferred to-morrow. I sympathise with the wishes of the Agricultural Bank Trustees in this connection, and I appreciate the motive which actuated the Premier in bringing forward the proposal. He realises the difficulty of getting good officers to remain in a district where they cannot secure comfortable living conditions. It is a reasonable charge to place on the bank for its premises and also for the housing of its staff where deemed necessary. Of course, in places like Busselton, Geraldton or Katanning, men can get decent houses, and so the bank would not dream of erecting homes for them. When we go out into the new areas where there is no accommodation at all, it is very different. A bank inspector handling documents which mean thousands of pounds to the bank ought to be provided with decent office accommodation. Private banks furnish suitable accommodation for their managers.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: They are different altogether.

Mr. A. THOMSON: It may be so, but I think this is a reasonable charge to make against the funds of the bank. Surely decent offices should be provided for those men located in outback districts. Men so situated should not be asked to erect workers' homes, for if they were transferred to another district and had to sell their homes, possibly they would not get anything like a fair value for them. I congratulate the Premier on Clause 4, which is a step in the right direction, particularly in respect of group settlement. I should like to see areas specially set aside, so that our immigration officers at Home, when addressing prospective emigrants, would be able to say that if 30 or 40 of them from one district decided to emigrate, they could be settled in a group in Western Australia. I commend the Premier for having brought down this provision, and I trust it will meet with the approval of the House.

Mr. TEESDALE (Roebourne) [5.48]: I will oppose Clause 2, for I see in it nothing but a loophole for the spending of money on buildings. No restriction is placed on the class of house to be erected.

Hon. P. Collier: If it is for a Government official, it will have to be palatial.

Mr. Munzie: And the first will be built in the Williams-Narrogin district.

Mr. TEESDALE: And the bank will have at Williams-Narrogin an expensive office, merely for a couple of fellows to sit in and write their letters. This is a time when we are supposed to be studying every shilling; yet, as I say, the clause will leave a wide loophole for increased expenditure. It is a slovenly sort of clause and will admit anything. We shall have costly places built, for we cannot expect a Government official to live in a four-roomed cottage. I have come in contact with a few of these men. Some of them are never at home. Why should we build an expensive house for a

man who is never near his base? For four months have I and some others been trying to get a message to a certain inspector. Apparently he has fallen through a crack, for we cannot find him. But even this man must have provided for him a magnificent home, because Bill Jones has one; and before we know where we are we shall have an expenditure of £20,000 under this clause. The member for Williams-Narrogin (Mr. Johnston) will have a good whack of it. So long as he can get a few more buildings in his pet town, he does not care a rap about the fact that the Government are pushed for money.

Mr. Johnston: I object to wild west shows!

Mr. TEESDALE: And I object to any more Government buildings being erected in Narrogin. We want to see that every shilling spent is spent on the men on the farms, and not on Government offices and houses for the staff.

Mr. TROY (Mt. Magnet) [5.50]: For once I find myself supporting the remarks of the member who has just sat down. I approve of the Bill so far as it provides for the funds of the bank being applied to group settlement in the South-West, but I am opposed to the provision sanctioning the expenditure of money on the erection of Government offices and homes for the staff. One could imagine the Premier of a prosperous State bringing in legislation of this character, but it is incomprehensible in the Premier of a hard-up State like this, with a deficit of nearly £6,000,000. The Premier says it is unfair that people should have to live in the bush. But the public servant has no more right to have a house provided for him than has a miner or a railway man.

Mr. Teesdale: Oh, yes, he is far superior!

Mr. Mann: The railway men have quarters all over the country.

Mr. TROY: Yes, quarters built of railway sleepers.

Mr. MacCallum Smith: Some of them are in fine stone houses.

Mr. TROY: This country had any amount of money to spend when those houses were erected. It is very different to-day. Take the man who goes into the bush to make a farm; how does he and his family live? Again, when a mine closes down, the miners have to tramp to another locality and start all over again. I am opposed to the spending of money on offices and homes for public servants. Where do those people reside now? Mr. Joshua Mills, a member of another place, was Government officer at Geraldton for many years, until he resigned. In my opinion the Government should make such positions permanent. Western Australia is a country of great distances, and its soils and farming conditions present many diversities. The more knowledge an officer has of his district, the more valuable are his services.

Mr. MacCallum Smith: He gets rusty if left in the one district.

Mr. TROY: Nothing of the sort. An officer living in a district for a long time has a better chance of knowing that district. It is to the interests of the department to retain each officer in the one district for a lengthy period, for then he gets to know, not only the soil and conditions of the district, but the residents themselves, which is important from the standpoint of the bank. However I will oppose this particular provision in the Bill, because this is not a time for the spending of money in this way.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN (North-East Fremantle) [5.55]: No doubt the reason why the Agricultural Bank trustees condescended to bring down a report this year was that they wanted an amendment of the Act. We have received their report this year for the first time in four years, and that report is not very satisfactory, because it shows there has been a considerable loss during the past year, and that a large number of farms are still on the bank's hands.

The Premier: Not farms.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: Yes, farms, and they are counted in as assets. The trustees have not shown that they are as careful with the State's money as in all probability they would be with the money of a private company. We require to be chary of extending the powers of the trustees. If I mistake not, the full amount which the Agricultural Bank is permitted to advance is £2,000. Yet I see that the trustees have been advancing to butter factories over three times the minimum amount provided for in the Act.

Mr. MacCallum Smith: To the Busselton butter factory?

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: No, not the factory at Busselton. Under the Act the Agricultural Bank trustees are not permitted to advance more than £2,000 to one borrower, no matter what the security. Yet in one instance they have advanced £5,000 and in another £7,000, to butter factories. I mention this in support of the contention that we require to be careful as to what powers we give these trustees, especially since they will not furnish a report until they are forced to do so. They have in their control nearly six millions of money, and they are ready to overstep the powers vested in them by Parliament.

Mr. A. Thomson: They have done good work.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: Anyone can do good work with plenty of money behind him. The trouble is to do good work without money. That is the difference between the Government and the Agricultural Bank: the bank has merely to draw as much as it requires, whereas the Government have to walk warily in respect of finance. Under the Bill the Agricultural Bank, without the consent of Parliament, would be able to purchase an elaborate building for offices in St. George's terrace.

The Premier: Oh, well, cut it out if that is what you think.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: The Premier need not get vexed. The Bill does not confine the expenditure to country homes. In the Estimates of the Agricultural Bank it is generally found that the expenditure is made to balance the revenue, and so there is nothing which Parliament can discuss. Members have to discuss the matter on the general discussion upon the Estimates, and they cannot touch the items. The Chairman of Committees will tell them there is no vote. This has been done before. We can criticise the trustees, but have no power to strike out any item because there is nothing to strike out. It is loan money that the trustees spend, and this is not on the Estimates. The funds provided by Parliament cannot be controlled by Parliament. Homes may be required in the country; I do not say they are not. We have no less than 68 inspectors who are all in the country.

Mr. Mann: Four or five of them are travelling inspectors. Only one of them is stationary, and four of them have districts.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: Does the hon. member mean that he wants to build for the man who does not do the work, and not to build for the man who does.

Mr. Mann: He is travelling, and does not sleep in a home.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: No doubt he carries a tent and sleeps in that. I am not objecting to the Bill because it contains such a provision. If buildings of any description are required for the bank they should appear on the Public Works Estimates and be charged up to the bank, so that members may have some control over the expenditure. If the authority to spend money is included in this Bill, we hand the control over to the trustees and have no voice in its expenditure.

The Premier: They have to pay interest.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: The charges will be passed on to those who borrow money from the bank. The member for Katanning (Mr. A. Thomson) would compare the Agricultural Bank with an ordinary bank, but there is as much difference between them as there is between chalk and cheese.

The Premier: I do not know so much about that.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: Not if they go on as they have been going during the last three years, advancing money without parliamentary authority.

The Premier: They do not do that.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: They do. Their report shows it. Perhaps that is the reason why they have kept it back for four years. They may desire to keep Parliament in ignorance of what they are doing.

The Premier: Not at all.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: If buildings are required in any part of the State they should appear on the Public Works Estimates, and if it is desired to charge the bank interest, rent or sinking fund, that charge should appear in the proper manner.

The Premier: I will let it go; anything to get it through.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: I welcome the Bill, and consider the last clause is necessary. I do object, however, to a Bill being brought down for a certain purpose, and finding some little clause squeezed in to protect powers that are not intended to be given. I suppose the Premier did not see the Bill until he introduced it.

The Premier: I did.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: He told us he wanted the Bill for the purpose of providing group settlement, in which he is deeply interested, and to assist him in regard to soldier settlement. His officers, however, put this clause in on their own account.

The Premier: No.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: The Premier wants land settlement, and the trustees of the bank want palatial buildings to work in.

Hon. P. Collier: They slid it in.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: Parliament should endeavour, as far as possible, not to permit the powers of members to be whittled away, and not to allow one or two bodies to control expenditure when they are not responsible for so doing.

Mr. MONEY (Bunbury) [6.5]: This is one of the most important measures we have had before us this session. We are told that our land settlement policy is to be the salvation of the finances of the country and will bring population here.

The Premier: You must house the people.

Mr. MONEY: Whatever expenditure is incurred by the trustees of the bank will be passed on to the selector. It is, therefore, important that we should avoid the over-capitalisation of the land, so as to make it possible for the selector to succeed when he gets there. I do not know whether the trustees have gone into the various items which make up the capitalisation of the settlers' land. We are dealing with the question of group settlement. Success depends very largely upon the distance of these settlements from the market, and the freight that has to be paid on the produce of those settlements. Much depends on the money that is laid out on every acre for the purpose of getting produce from the land. I doubt if any calculation has yet been made as to how much will actually be spent on each acre. For instance, an expenditure of from £10 to £20 an acre may be incurred on land 350 miles from Perth, whereas land 50 miles from Perth that is partially improved might be made productive for £2 or £3 an acre. There is plenty of land which has been looked upon as non-productive, such as sandy country or ironstone country, which, if properly worked, could be made very profitable. There is a good deal of such land within a reasonable distance of the city. If the capital expenditure on ordinary improvements and clearing runs into £10 an acre, by the time it is fully equipped for production, it may have cost £20 an acre, which is equal to £1 per acre per annum upon the shoulders of the settler. If the settler is remote from

the market, there is a still further charge per acre on the freight of his produce. A good deal of trouble arises because these matters are not thoroughly gone into beforehand. It is our duty not merely to invite people to come to this State, but to see that they get a fair chance of success when they arrive. Their land must not be over-capitalised. This Bill takes from Parliament the control of expenditure in this direction, and the expenditure is to be made as the trustees think fit. It will all, of course, be passed on to the settler. There might be a proposition to spend half a million of money, and it might turn out a failure. There are some departmental officers who might venture to spend this sum of money, and in many cases the proposition would turn out a rank failure. Where would the settler come in then? Unless the experience of members of this House is brought to bear upon this matter, I do not see how it is possible to ensure the successful settlement of the people. We must do all we can to avoid overloading our settlers. I want to see a success made of this scheme, and to avoid the failure which must eventually follow if the land of the settler is over-capitalised.

The PREMIER (Hon. Sir James Mitchell—Northam—in reply) [6.10]: I cannot let the remarks of the previous speaker pass without some comments upon them. It costs I suppose, about as much to settle a man in the South-West, house and all, as it costs to build a house for a man who lives in Perth. All in, the expenditure will not be more than, if as much as, that which would be required to provide a home for a man in Perth. The money is not being squandered. It is easy to find fault with anything. We can say that a tree should be pulled down in 20 seconds, and complain that it took 25 seconds to do so and cost so much more money. If the good land in the South-West is not worth clearing at the cost that will have to be incurred, we had better throw up the sponge. It will be no use staying in the country.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: It would be better to hand it over to the Federal Parliament.

The PREMIER: Yes, anything like that. The trustees of the Agricultural Bank are just as capable of managing the affairs of the bank as are members of Parliament. They are experienced men and have carried on this work for many years. It is true they have some blocks on their hands, but they have assisted in the development of the country in many ways.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: They have about 700 farms on their hands.

The PREMIER: The trustees are responsible for a great deal of that which has been done in the way of land settlement. I suppose that half the land now under cultivation has been cleared by means of the Agricultural Bank, and this work has been done cheaply. Indeed, complaints have been made that the bank would not advance sufficient money for this purpose. I am not going to waste any

time in argument. The bank inspectors are entitled to live in their own homes. I am going to stick out for that, but I am not going to argue about it. They are entitled to live in houses with their wives.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: Put the money on the Estimates.

The PREMIER: The bank requires to have officers in the various towns where there are district centres. I do not know whether the House will be willing to vote, say, £10,000 for this purpose. It is much better that the trustees should control these buildings, keep them in repair, and collect the rents than that any other department should do it. Members can do as they please in the matter, but I hope they will not want to discuss the matter at great length. I do not propose to do so myself, at any rate.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

Sitting suspended from 6.15 to 7.30 p.m.

In Committee.

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

Clause 1—agreed to.

Clause 2—Advances for offices, etc.

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

Ayes	21
Noes	19

Majority for .. 2

AYES.

Mr. Angelo	Mr. C. C. Maley
Mr. Broun	Mr. H. K. Maley
Mr. Carter	Mr. Mann
Mrs. Cowan	Sir James Mitchell
Mr. Denton	Mr. Piessie
Mr. Durack	Mr. Sampson
Mr. George	Mr. J. M. Smith
Mr. Gibson	Mr. A. Thomson
Mr. Harrison	Mr. Underwood
Mr. Hickmott	Mr. Mullany
Mr. Johnston	(Teller.)

NOES.

Mr. Angwin	Mr. Pickering
Mr. Chesson	Mr. Richardson
Mr. Collier	Mr. Simons
Mr. Davies	Mr. J. H. Smith
Mr. Heron	Mr. Teesdale
Mr. Lambert	Mr. Walker
Mr. Lutey	Mr. Willcock
Mr. McCallum	Mr. Wilson
Mr. Munsie	Mr. Corboy
Mr. O'Loghlen	(Teller.)

Clause thus passed.

Clauses 3 and 4—agreed to.

Title—agreed to.

Bill reported without amendment and the report adopted.

The PREMIER: I move—

That the Bill be now read a third time.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN (North-East Fremantle) [7.38]: I hope members will not agree to the third reading of the Bill, because it takes away powers from Parliament. I have no objection to anything being done which will further the convenience of public departments. At present, if the Police Department, the Works Department, the Education Department or any other department requires premises to be erected, the work is done by the Public Works Department and it is authorised by a vote of Parliament when the Estimates are passed. This even applies to our railways, which are under the control of a Commissioner. Members should consider whether or not Parliament should retain control over the expenditure of money in connection with the various public departments. The Bill takes away that power. The Agricultural Bank, with the approval of the Governor, which means with the approval of the Ministry, and even may mean with the approval of one Minister, will have power to purchase or provide premises for carrying on business. The Agricultural Bank will thus have a special privilege not enjoyed by any other department. We should reject the Bill because it takes away from the rights and privileges of the people. Under the Bill, it will be possible for the trustees of the Agricultural Bank to purchase a building in Perth, running into several thousands of pounds, without Parliament having a say regarding the expenditure. I regret having to oppose the third reading of the Bill because the measure contains clauses of which I am in favour. Never before have we given away such powers. In 1912 the Labour Government amended the Agricultural Bank Act by increasing the maximum amount to be loaned to £2,000, and they provided that that assistance could be extended to the encouragement of industries, such as the establishment of butter factories and so on. The fact remained that though this assistance could be rendered, the limitation was fixed at £2,000. If the Bill is passed, members should know that already, despite the limitation in the Act, the bank has granted a loan in one case representing three times that amount and in another instance the loan amounted to double the amount of the limitation.

Mr. Johnston: Anything done by the trustees, would be with the approval of the Government.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: We might have a Labour Government in power.

Mr. A. Thomson: We could trust them.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: It is not a question of trusting the Government at all.

The Premier: I am prepared to provide a limit for £10,000.

ilon. W. C. ANGWIN: The expenditure should be subject to the control of Parliament. The Premier realises that this is a bit too strong and is now willing to provide a limitation. A little time ago, the new A.M.P. buildings were erected at the corner of William-street and St. George's-terrace. The Government were approached at once with an offer to take over the vacated premises for the Agricultural Bank. Under the Bill there would be nothing to prohibit the Minister agreeing to the purchase of that building. This is the way in which we allow the powers of Parliament to be whittled away. If we keep on in this manner much longer the best thing to do will be to dissolve Parliament altogether.

Mr. PICKERING (Sussex) [7.47]: I regret that I am compelled to support the member for North-East Fremantle. It was an unwise provision to introduce a clause of this nature in the Bill. The Premier has led us to infer that the amount of expenditure will be limited, but it is not within the power of a private member to move an amendment of this nature. I therefore hope that the Premier will carry out the proposal he suggests. He might recommit the Bill.

Hon. P. Collier: That cannot be done now.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: Not unless the Premier withdraws the motion for the third reading.

Mr. SPEAKER: The motion before the House is that the Bill be read a third time. An amendment to recommit the Bill would supersede that motion.

Hon. P. Collier: After we have debated the third reading?

Hon. W. C. Angwin: There would be no objection to the Premier withdrawing his motion for the time being.

Mr. SPEAKER: Standing Order 298 provides that at the third reading stage a Bill may be recommitted without limitation. The fact of a debate having ensued does not, in my opinion, affect the position.

Recommittal.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: I move an amendment—

That the Bill be recommitted for the purpose of reconsidering Clause 2.

Amendment put and passed.

In Committee.

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

Clause 2—Advances for offices, etc.:

The PREMIER: I move an amendment—

That after "bank" in the first line, the words "not exceeding £10,000 in the aggregate" be inserted.

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

Bill again reported and the report adopted.

BILL—NORTH FREMANTLE RATES VALIDATION.

Returned from the Council without amendment.

BILL—TRAFFIC ACT AMENDMENT.

In Committee.

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

Clauses 1 to 3—agreed to.

Clause 4—Amendment of Section 41:

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: I move an amendment—

That at the end of paragraph (b) the following words be inserted:—"Provided that all vehicles licensed for the carriage of passengers shall have prescribed the same distinguishing colours and characters."

The Minister for Works: I agree to that.

Mr. MUNSIE: I take it the amendment is intended to provide for the same distinguishing mark for all cars plying for hire.

The Minister for Works: That is correct and that is the intention.

Mr. MUNSIE: What is wrong with the present system?

The Minister for Works: Only snobbery, as I explained the other night.

Mr. MUNSIE: I would not give any Minister the power to prescribe what signs he liked. I understand that a private car has a black plate with white letters and that a hire car has a white plate with black letters. Why are these not sufficient?

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: I am not seeking any extraordinary power. All I wish to do is to reconcile the difference which exists to-day, and which from my point of view is due to snobbery. There are certain people who like to assume an affluence of position higher than they have attained, and they think that if they are having a wedding or a funeral and have a car at their door, it looks better if it has the private mark and may lead some unthinking people to believe that they own a car. The taxi cars have a certain plate and the garage cars carry a plate similar to that used on private cars. The taxi people objected to the word "hire" being displayed on their plates and went to the Supreme Court and got a verdict, and so we expunged the word "hire." Their next grievance, and they were influentially supported—

Mr. Mann: They were entitled to be supported, too.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: Their next grievance was that private garages, having a clientele who could ring up, had an advantage over the man on the rank, be-

cause the private garage cars had a label similar to the private cars. We tried to remedy that, and we got the garages up against us. Now we want to do something to reconcile these differences and prevent trouble. Therefore, I say that both should carry the same class of label. Further, we provide that when on the rank cars shall exhibit a little sign bearing the words "for hire," and as soon as a car is engaged, the "for hire" sign will be lowered. Therefore, there will be nothing to distinguish a taxi car from a private garage car. The amendment moved by the member for North-East Fremantle is not necessary. I desire to achieve the same object, but as the words will make for clearness, I do not object to the amendment. I would not be ashamed if I had half a dozen hire cars at my door; I would only be ashamed if I could not pay for them. The people who are guilty of the snobbery to which I have referred are not always ready to pay when the account goes in.

Hon. P. Collier: The garage owners complain of this; they say it is unfair.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: We are trying to deal with the traffic for the comfort and convenience of the people. I understand that most of the garages in Perth belong to one gentleman. I do not know if that is correct.

Mr. TEESDALE: I support the amendment. Proprietors need to use a great amount of discretion in hiring cars out, and they should have the right to refuse to hire a car. If the car is displaying the "for hire" sign, however, I take it that the owner would not be able to refuse. A distinction should be made between the cars on the rank and the private garage cars. A private individual has a perfect right to hire a car from a garage without being accused of snobbery.

Mr. MacCallum SMITH: I hope the amendment will not be agreed to. The member for Roebourne does not understand the position.

Mr. Teesdale: I am against paragraph (b).

The CHAIRMAN: We are discussing the amendment to paragraph (b).

Mr. MacCallum SMITH: I see no reason for altering the present system.

The Minister for Works: I do not wish to alter it, but there will be incessant trouble if it is not altered.

Mr. MacCallum SMITH: The only trouble has arisen between the Minister and the taxi owners.

The Minister for Works: There is no trouble with me.

Mr. MacCallum SMITH: The public are satisfied and the taxi owners are satisfied.

The Minister for Works: No, they are not.

Mr. MacCallum SMITH: They do not want a distinguishing mark and the garages do not want a distinguishing mark.

Hon. P. Collier: But the garage owners have written asking for a distinguishing mark.

Mr. Munsie: They want the same mark as the private cars carry.

Mr. MacCallum SMITH: There is no distinction between the private car and the garage car.

The Minister for Agriculture: Should not there be a distinguishing mark so that people would know which cars could be hired?

Mr. MacCallum SMITH: If I wish to hire a car, I hire from a private garage, and the Minister says it is snobbery to do so. I see no snobbery about it. If I hire a car, why should it have to bear a label, "for hire"? Unless the Minister can show good reason, I am opposed to any departure from the present system. The amendment proposes to give the Minister power to decide what mark shall be used on any car plying for hire, and he will have the option of making that mark apply to garage cars.

The Minister for Works: Let the police attend to it.

Mr. MacCallum SMITH: The police have too much power already in many respects. I see no necessity whatever for the amendment.

Hon. T. WALKER: I hope the amendment will be carried. It is clear that a certain section of the community want to run a sort of aristocratic, class-distinction motor. They want to be above the man who has to hire a car from the rank. The object of the amendment is to abolish all distinctions. The garage aristocrats want to humiliate the taxi-driver. Hon. members have received letters from the Metropolitan Private Garage Owners' Association, under yesterday's date, repudiating the attempt to declare the garage owners' business and the taxi-car owners' business as on the same footing, and saying that a good comparison between the two businesses would be that of a person selling fruit from a shop and a hawker selling fruit from his barrow at the street corner. The difference between the money invested by the taxi-drivers and that invested by garage owners is something enormous. Really, there is only one big magnate in the garage business; and he wants an aristocratic monopoly, with the taxi-driver classed as hawker. There must be some distinction between private cars and cars that are for hire, because otherwise a man requiring to hire a car might hail, and try to stop, a private car. But all cars of an identical type should have identically the same plate of the same colour and with the same distinguishing marks.

Mr. MacCallum Smith: But we do not want to let the Minister go experimenting.

Hon. T. WALKER: The Minister's experimenting is limited by the amendment of the member for North-East Fremantle.

Mr. MacCallum Smith: But the design is at the will of the Minister.

Hon. T. WALKER: The Minister would not have anything very objectionable to propose. Really, there is nothing that can be objected to by the other side, though the garage owners may feel hurt. We are all equal in the eyes of the law, and I have found among the taxi-drivers better men than

the average of the owners of garages where motors are kept for hire. There are some of the latter whom I would not care to be companionable with.

Mr. MANN: The position to-day is that the owner of the private car is entitled to have a plate of a certain colour while the owner of a car plying for hire is compelled to have a plate of another colour.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: Not compelled.

Mr. MANN: That is the custom, anyhow; but there is this difference, that the owner of a garage car plying for hire has been using a number plate similar to that of the private car. Consequently there is a distinction between the car for hire that is kept in a garage, and the car for hire that is on the rank; and the men on the rank complain that the better class jobs, such as weddings, funerals, and long distance journeys, go to the garages where cars are kept for hire, because the customers do not desire to have the words "For hire," or the distinguishing hire mark, on the car. Thus the taxi-drivers' business is injured. For that reason they desire that all should be on the same level. Paragraph (b), subject to the amendment of the member for North-East Fremantle, will bring that position about.

Mr. SIMONS: I hope the Committee will register an opinion against any differentiation whatever. I fail to see that the distinction which the Minister has the power to adopt can be justified by any process of reasoning. For once in a way I am going to argue a question from the standpoint of vested interests, as Ministers invariably do. The taxi-drivers have about £70,000 worth of cars standing on hire points in this State, while the garage owners have less than £10,000 worth. And yet here we have a letter from an association which has sprung up in a night, comparing the £70,000 proprietors to a lot of fish hawkers. No Minister should be able to draw a line and say that those on the right shall have a blue badge as a mark of royalty, while those on the left of it shall have a red badge to declare their plebeian origin. We may not always have a Minister for Works with the same common sense as the present occupant of the office. Therefore I do not want to grant the power to make this differentiation.

Amendment put and passed.

Mr. SAMPSON: I hope paragraph (c) will be struck out. Although Perth is rapidly developing, we have not yet reached the stage when it should be competent for the traffic authorities to declare that the vehicular traffic on certain streets shall proceed in a prescribed direction. Perth is not yet ready for one-way traffic.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: This provision is put forward at the request of the police specifically to assist them in the handling of traffic in King-street when there is a large concourse of people assembled at His Majesty's theatre. The police say it is necessary in the interests of public safety. Also

they aver that King-street, which is generally crowded with merchant's lorries, frequently becomes congested in consequence of the traffic moving both ways. The member for Perth has complained that no pointsmen are provided in King-street. Already there is a big expenditure on pointsmen in other streets in Perth, and the necessary money is taken from taxation collected from all parts of the State, which I do not think is fair. I hope the provision will be agreed to.

Mr. SIMONS: I, too, hope the provision will be approved. As years go on, its necessity will become more manifest. Owing to the narrow streets in Perth, the handling of the traffic presents unusual difficulties. Such a provision as this has been found necessary in other Australian capitals, and it is gratifying to know that our traffic is increasing so rapidly as to justify special legislation to accommodate it.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: I move an amendment—

That in line 1 of paragraph (d) "any" be struck out, and "every" inserted in lieu; and that after the word "sign," in line 3, "whilst waiting for hire" be inserted.

I'veviously the Minister desired that a vehicle plying for hire should display some sign indicating that it is disengaged. But, as I pointed out on the second reading yesterday, when a vehicle is engaged it is not plying for hire, and therefore it should not have to carry a "for hire" sign. Under the provision as it stands, the words "for hire" would have to be exhibited at all times on vehicles usually open to engagement. The Minister now says that he only requires the sign to be shown while the vehicle is on the rank. The amendment will make his intention clear.

Mr. MUNSIE: Whether the provision be amended or not, I will vote against it, for I do not think it necessary. A vehicle goes on the rank only when it is plying for hire, and consequently, no "for hire" sign is then necessary. Why then should we involve the owners of those vehicles, some of whom secure only one engagement in a day, in the unnecessary expense of providing some special jump-jack sign capable of alteration on the pressing of a button?

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: Apparently hon. members have missed the essential point. It does not follow that because a car is on the rank it is open to any engagement. A man requiring a car goes to a driver on the rank and explains that he wishes to be taken to King's Park gate. In all probability the driver will declare that he is already engaged, is waiting for his passenger whom he expects to turn up any minute, and therefore cannot take the newcomer to King's Park gate. I have had that experience myself when I have wanted to go only a short distance. On one occasion four drivers declined to take me. If every car open to engagement were made to display a "for hire" sign while on the rank, any

man requiring a car, even for a short journey, could insist upon being accommodated. If the flag or sign, which would not be an expensive affair, is once put up, and the driver refuses to take a passenger, and the matter is reported to the police he runs a good chance of losing his license. People who take out these licenses must allow their cars to be used by anyone who desires to make use of them. Some members seem to think that we desire to injure people by freak legislation. The question of the labels was taken into serious consideration by the Commissioner of Police and his officer and by myself and my officers. We wanted to get out a system by which the charges would be made as low as possible, and the inconvenience of the people to pay for the licenses as small as possible. We have a label on which a number is affixed. This will work in a cycle of five years. The labels have to be handed in on the 1st July of the new year. The applicant for a license will get the same numbered plate, but there will be a mark on the corner. This mark would enable the police to see whether a new license has been taken out or not. If we handed out the same tablet many cars would doubtless continue to run on the old number without paying any license fee. When the police took this matter in hand they found that many people were doing this, and when they were obliged to stump up they were very angry, and no doubt used all the influence they could bring to bear to make the carrying out of the Act as unpleasant as possible to those concerned.

The CHAIRMAN: I would point out to the Minister that we are dealing with this amendment.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: I am doing so.

The CHAIRMAN: He is not dealing with the amendment before the Chair.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: That is a matter of opinion.

The CHAIRMAN: I do not think the principle is involved in this. The member for North-East Fremantle has moved an amendment to strike out a certain word with a view to inserting other words. Will the Minister confine himself to that question?

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: I was replying to the member for Hannans who apparently was under a misapprehension in regard to the effect of this clause. If you rule me out of order I will sit down.

Mr. SAMPSON: It is possible some of the motor drivers on the ranks will have cause for complaint. Cars that are standing in a garage awaiting a telephone call would not display this sign which is displayed when a car is available for hire.

The Minister for Works: It would have to be displayed if the car came out for hire.

Mr. SAMPSON: It would only come out when it came out for an engagement. Some heart burning might be caused to the drivers who come from the ranks.

Mr. Simons: They want this.

Mr. SAMPSON: If the semaphore is arranged on the taxis in the same way as

they are arranged in London, it would be easy to determine whether a car was for hire or not. That is the bone of contention. It would be better to strike out paragraph (d) altogether, and insert something like the following:—"To give to the driver or owner of any vehicle licensed to carry passengers or goods the right to exhibit a sign indicating that the vehicle is for hire." Provided the owner of a car on the ranks is not going to suffer, I would welcome the striking out of the paragraph.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: To-day I had a view put to me contrary to that expressed by the Minister for Works. The drivers say they may be engaged to go to a place at a certain time. They ask that while they are waiting for the time of their engagement they should show an indication that they are waiting for hire. These men are placed in an awkward position, and may wait half a day for the sake of a quarter of an hour's engagement. There is a difficulty both for the passenger and the driver.

Mr. SAMPSON: If the proprietor of a motor car on the ranks does not want a particular job he has a hundred ways of avoiding it.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: Not if the notice is up.

Mr. SAMPSON: That would not alter the position. Every owner should have the right to exhibit a sign that his car is under hire.

Mr. TEESDALE: I think some consideration should be extended to the owners of horse vehicles licensed for the carrying of passengers or goods. Take, for instance, the luggage carter who may have to stand about all day for a few shillings. Is it to be expected that he should lay out 30s. or £2 in order to affix to his cart some piece of mechanism?

Hon. W. C. Angwin: Make it apply to every vehicle.

Mr. TEESDALE: I ask the Minister to exempt those people who have carts for hire, and who already have signs attached to their vehicles, from the necessity for providing these mechanical contrivances.

The Minister for Works rose to speak.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: With the permission of the Committee, I ask leave to withdraw the first portion of the amendment.

The Minister for Works: I am the Minister in charge of the Bill and if I am not to be allowed to speak, I had better go out.

The CHAIRMAN: I do not like the Minister for Works speaking to the Chairman in such a way. I am here to keep order, and to see that hon. members exercise their rights. I do not like the Minister saying that if he cannot talk on the Bill he had better go out. That is not fair.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: I had no intention of being disrespectful to the Chair. I wished to speak in reply to absolutely wrong statements which had been made, and I was not permitted to do so.

The CHAIRMAN: I did not prevent the Minister from speaking at all. As soon as the member for Roebourne finished speaking, the member for North-East Fremantle asked leave to withdraw his amendment. I am entitled to ask the Committee whether they desire the amendment to be withdrawn before continuing the discussion.

Amendment by leave withdrawn.

The CHAIRMAN: The Minister for Works has the floor.

The Minister for Works: I have nothing to say.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: I move an amendment—

That in paragraph (d), after "sign" the words "while waiting for hire" be inserted.

Mr. SAMPSON: I desire to move a further amendment which will give the right to a motor car owner to put up a sign if he desires to do so but will not make it mandatory. I do not think the car owner on the rank should suffer from disabilities compared with owners of cars in a garage.

The Minister for Agriculture: We will require legislation to stop grasshoppers from jumping soon.

The CHAIRMAN: I cannot accept any such amendment as that suggested by the member for Swan, unless the member for North-East Fremantle is prepared to withdraw his amendment.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: It would be better to wipe out the clause altogether, and then the discretionary power will be left.

Mr. Sampson: But are you sure the municipal council has not power to make regulations to deal with this matter.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: The council will have no power under the Act, but the Minister will have discretionary power. The motor car owners say that so long as they are on the rank and are hailed by a member of the public, no matter whether cars are engaged or not, they must accept the job or be liable to a heavy penalty. The Minister has already admitted that they will be liable.

The Minister for Works: That is, unless they can prove they are engaged.

Mr. Sampson: At any rate it would leave the opportunity open for injury to be done to the drivers.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: If the sign were provided, the public would know that if the sign "For hire" were shown, the car was available, but if it was down, that car was engaged.

Mr. Underwood: Why have the clause at all?

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: These men have asked for it for their own protection.

The Minister for Works: They want the provision to apply equally to the car on the rank and the car in the garage.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: That is impossible. It is not necessary at all for the garage.

Mr. UNDERWOOD: In my opinion, the paragraph is not required at all. This House could be better engaged than discussing such rubbish. I do not know why the Minister has brought forward any such proposal.

The Minister for Works: Had you been here throughout the debate you would have known the reason.

Mr. UNDERWOOD: If the owner of a motor car desires to put up a sign for hire, let him put it up. If not, why should he be compelled to do so. Do not let us take up the time of 50 members of this Chamber asking whether a motor car owner shall be forced to put up a sign or not. I think the Minister must have a lot of time to spare to bring forward this rubbish.

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

The Minister for Works: Am I in order now? If not—

The CHAIRMAN: The Minister will be out of order if he goes on as he is proceeding now.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: I am sorry I have transgressed again. There has been a good deal said regarding the cars on the rank and the cars in the garage. Members seem to forget that they owe a duty to the person who hires a car. It is quite a common thing at the present time that if a car is situated near the head of the rank, the driver will refuse to accept an engagement for a short distance, realising that he may sacrifice a longer job. The man who is at the head of the rank has a better chance of getting a big job than the man whose position is 14th in the rank. The object of the provision is that when a man is engaged for a job, he may keep the sign down; if he is open for a job, and he is required, he should be made to take that job, whether it be for a long trip or a short trip. The clause will work for the greater convenience of the public.

Mr. SIMONS: The Committee should recognise that this is a very small matter, and I appeal to the Minister to withdraw the clause altogether, and let us get on with some real business. We have spent one and a half hours on discussing a matter which is not above the calibre of an ordinary roads board. It is like bringing a battle ship forward to destroy a mosquito.

The CHAIRMAN: Unless the member for North-East Fremantle withdraws his amendment so as to give the Committee an opportunity of voting on the whole clause, the Committee must recognise that the clause down to the word "sign" has been agreed to. The custom in this House has been that a member may discuss any clause or paragraph of the clause. We have amended one paragraph. The paragraph we are discussing may be amended and then the House can, if it please, delete the whole clause.

Mr. SIMONS: We have discussed this long enough. I move—

That the Committee do now divide.

Hon. T. Walker proceeded to debate the amendment.

Mr. DAVIES: If a member moves that the House do now divide, should not that motion take precedence of others?

The CHAIRMAN: Divide on what?

Mr. Simons: On the amendment before the Committee.

The CHAIRMAN: There is an amendment before the Chair and it is competent for an hon. member to move that progress be reported, not that the House do now divide.

Hon. T. Walker: The member for East Perth intended to apply the closure.

Mr. SIMONS: I have already moved, in accordance with Standing Order 160, "That the Committee do now divide."

The CHAIRMAN: Divide on the amendment before the Chair?

Mr. SIMONS: Yes, in order to get on with the business.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: That motion was not seconded.

Mr. Simons: Yes, it was seconded by the member for Sussex.

The CHAIRMAN: I will put the motion "That the Committee do now divide."

Motion put and passed.

Amendment put and passed.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: I move an amendment—

That at the beginning of paragraph (e) the words "require an" be inserted, and that "any" in the first line be struck out and "each" be inserted in lieu.

The paragraph deals with heavy carting in the Darling Ranges and from the tourist country to the railway stations. If this carting could be confined to the summer there would not be so much damage done or so much objection raised. Those who are engaged in the sleeper cutting industry are carting throughout the year. The weight of the carts causes ruts to form in the road and after rains the ruts become deeper and the roads are ruined. Then it is beyond the resources of the local authority to put these roads into good repair again for local traffic. Objection may be raised that this is interfering with the livelihood of men who have as much right to engage in that kind of carting, as others have in any other business they may choose to follow. The clause enables the local authorities to impose an extra fee on those engaged in this traffic, the object being not so much to restrict the traffic or attempt to interfere with the work these men perform, but to provide funds which may be applied to repair the damage done. It is not desirable to make the fee apply generally. In the metropolitan area the main roads are able to carry heavy traffic because they are built on solid foundations. That is not the case with country roads. It

is necessary too that there should be such power as is proposed, but there may be cases where it may not be necessary to charge the fee. There have been carters in Perth who have come in to Perth and obtained a license for 5s. or 10s. and have gone out to cart in those country districts, whereas if they had taken out the license locally they would have had to pay a good deal more. There has been considerable trouble in this respect. This clause will enable the local authority to demand to see the license and, if it is not of the full figure for heavy traffic in that district, to insist on the extra fee being paid. There is no desire to throw obstacles in the way of anyone earning his living, but if certain traffic creates damage, the people profiting by the work should have to pay for the repairs.

Mr. O'LOGHLEN: I am not objecting to the proposed amendment, but I intend to vote for the deletion of the clause. Notwithstanding the Minister's statement, there is no sense of proportion in the methods of administration either by the department or the local authorities. It is proposed to give the local authorities power to levy an additional wheel tax. Is it right to put £3 per wheel on a man on the hillsides who is trying to earn a living, while the primary producer is practically exempt? It is almost impossible for men engaged in timber, clay or gravel carting to pay the taxes levied. If an additional tax is required, the farmer should not escape his obligation. I questioned the Minister a couple of months ago about a man who was mulet to the extent of £14 1s. 3d. for rates and wheel tax in respect of two drays. The board over which the member for Swan (Mr. Sampson) presides has had a dispute and certain members have resigned, because of the methods of the board in levying such a heavy toll on men engaged in the stone industry.

Mr. Sampson: It is a regulation; the board had no option.

Mr. A. Thomson: Then the regulation should be blown out.

Mr. O'LOGHLEN: If the member for Swan adopted the attitude of the members who have resigned, the ratepayers would soon let the Minister know that an amendment was required.

Mr. Sampson: I think it a proper thing that the heavy traffic should pay the tax.

Mr. O'LOGHLEN: Then we can discuss it from the point of view of how it retards production. Is the heavy traffic so pronounced in the Kalamunda district that the roads are cut to pieces? I should not imagine that men carting gravel would cut the roads to pieces. These people are being taxed out of existence. They are being charged £3 a wheel, equal to £6 per dray. Is that a fair proposition?

The Minister for Works: They do more than £6 worth of damage in a week's carting.

Mr. O'LOGHLEN: Would the Minister say that applied in the Kalamunda district?

The Minister for Works: Yes, anywhere; but there is an appeal to the Minister.

Mr. O'LOGHLEN: The Minister proposes to levy another charge. If a proposition were put up to the Minister that these heavy fees be reduced, would he agree to it?

The Minister for Works: I do not understand that.

Mr. O'LOGHLEN: Three pounds per wheel is being charged men engaged in gravel carting, while a man carting fruit gets off with 5s. That is an example of the partiality shown to primary producers. During the past five months 5,800 tons of material has been carted by three or four drays to a particular siding, and the freight to the railways amounted to £1,100. If the local authorities are not patriotic enough to keep men in their district, a loss will result, not only to them, but to the revenue of the State. I agree that the people engaged in heavy traffic should pay more than a man carting a few cases of fruit, but the difference between 5s. and £3 a wheel is vindictive treatment of a class of people deserving of help.

Mr. PICKERING: I support the Minister's amendment. On the Ludlow-road £800 had to be expended for repairs to enable one man to cart tuart logs to the railway. It is quite impossible for the road boards to maintain their roads when traffic of that kind is passing over them. This road was impassable for months during the winter until we got £800 to repair it.

Mr. O'Loghlen: Were the jinkers responsible?

Mr. PICKERING: Yes. In 1917 the whole of the roads in the Capel district were ruined through the carting of tuart logs. If the boards are not protected in this way, carting during the winter should be prevented.

Mr. A. THOMSON: I trust that the Minister's suggestion will not be accepted. Under Section 49 of the Act, if damage to the tune of £800 were done to one road, the local authority would have power to recover the expenses.

Mr. Sampson: To prove it is another matter.

Mr. A. THOMSON: The hon. member said that one person had done the damage. I agree with the member for Forrest. Last week I questioned the Minister regarding the wheel tax as follows:—

Has his attention been drawn to the very heavy charge on carriers in the country districts carrying stone, bricks, lime, timber in bulk, earth, gravel, mineral, or other materials or liquid matter, the weight of the load being not less than 10 cwt. per wheel, by the recent addition in fees levied under regulation No. 149 under the Traffic Act, 1919, where the charge has been increased from ten shillings to £6 for two wheel vehicles and from £1 to £12 for four wheels?

Ir Katanning there are two carriers who do not go outside the town. The bulk of their work consists of shifting such lines as I have just mentioned from the station to various

parts of the town. The very items included in this regulation are carried at the cheapest possible rates by the Railway Department, and yet people doing the carting are penalised to the tune of £6 for wheel tax. These country carriers more often have loads of 3 cwt. or 4 cwt. than of two tons, and the wheel tax is nothing short of an imposition on these men.

Mr. O'Loghlen: If they get one heavy load a month, that is about the maximum.

Mr. A. THOMSON: If they get one heavy load a year, they have to pay £12 for their wheel tax. It is a distinct hardship. The desire of the road board conference was to deal with whims carrying timber and breaking up the roads in the timber areas. It was never intended to deal with districts like Katanning. I am opposed to this sort of legislation. It merely imposes a hardship on a deserving and hard-working section of the community.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: I would be willing to delete the words "in addition to," in line 4 of proposed paragraph (k), substituting the words "in lieu of." That will make some little difference, at any rate. If the member for Katanning refers to the Notice Paper, he will see that I propose to ask for power to enable those administering the Act to exempt certain parts of the State from the operation of the heavy fees. To the member for Forrest I have to point out that there are great differences between the people who use the roads. In connection with the fruitgrowing industry, for instance, cartage would be done really only a few times in the course of a year. But the sleeper carter and the firewood carter and the carter of road material are carting all the year round, and sometimes making more than one trip per day. Thus they cause heavy damage to the road, putting the cost of its upkeep beyond the finances of the road board. For such cases provision is made here. I ask for the exemption because of representations made to me—in one instance, a case submitted by Smith's Mill, only a few days ago.

Mr. O'Loghlen: Do you personally think the fees are too high?

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: If these clauses are passed, I shall be able to give consideration in the matter of fees. If the clauses are not passed, the fees will have to be paid.

Mr. SAMPSON: The Darling Range road board has been mentioned. The board have no option but to impose this heavy traffic tax, nor do they desire to do otherwise. Furthermore, every road board conference has always expressed itself unmistakably in favour of the heavy traffic tax. Settlers on the hills have at various times gone out to work on the roads gratuitously, while other settlers have contributed horses and labour in order that roads might be made. In the Karragullen portion of the Armadale-Kelmscott district the residents, in order to provide good roads, have rated themselves up

to 6d. in the pound, by the special permission of the Minister—the maximum rate allowed by the Act being 3d. in the pound. In another case the rating has been 4d. in the pound, or 33 per cent. above the maximum. The Kalamunda district has recently spent £140 in providing approaches to the Walliston siding. The road is still in good order, but the heavy traffic has done considerable damage to the approaches—far more damage than would have resulted from ordinary traffic. Again, stone, gravel, lumps, and gravel purchased by Perth and the neighbouring municipalities for road making purposes are carted over these roads. Why should the road board in question have their roads ruined so that Perth and neighbouring municipalities may have their road making material at less than a fair cost? The carters can pass on the heavy traffic fees to their municipal customers.

Amendment put and passed.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: I move a further amendment—

That in line 4 of paragraph (d) the words "in addition to" be struck out, and "in lieu of" inserted in lieu.

Amendment put and passed.

Mr. O'LOGHLEN: I wish to move an amendment to strike out paragraph (c).

The CHAIRMAN: I am afraid that cannot be done now.

Mr. O'LOGHLEN: I wish to draw attention to the fact that there is apparently no desire on the part of either the local authorities or the Government to reduce those exorbitant fees.

The Minister for Works: I have just reduced them by 5s. per wheel.

Mr. O'LOGHLEN: Further, I want to protest against the exorbitant charge of £3 per wheel imposed on a very deserving section of our people, a section providing the fruitgrowers with a market which they are very glad to have. The fees are such as tend to kill industry. In reply to the member for Swan, I say that the fees cannot be passed on.

The Minister for Works: What do you consider would be a fair thing?

Mr. O'LOGHLEN: Let us split the difference; say 30s. or £1. In any case, I want the Minister's assurance that he will considerably reduce the fees from what they are to-day.

The Minister for Works: I give you this assurance, that I will make what appears to me to be a fair reduction in the fees.

Mr. O'LOGHLEN: The Minister has never yet failed me when he gave a promise, and I will trust him again.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: I move an amendment—

That the following be inserted to stand as paragraph (1) in Subdivision VII. of Subsection 1:—"exempt from the opera-

tions of paragraph (k) such part or parts of the State as the Minister may decide."

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

Clause 5—Reprinting of the principal Act and amendments:

Mr. MacCallum SMITH: Why does this clause say that the words "and other" may be inserted between the words "motor" and "vehicle" in the headlines of Part IV. of the Act? Who is to insert them?

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: The Clerk of Parliament, I presume. The clause has been drafted by the Crown Solicitor, presumably as a matter of form. On reference to Part IV. it will be seen that the insertion of the words is quite proper, having regard to the amendments made by this Bill in the principal Act.

Mr. MacCallum SMITH: The clause does not say that the words in question shall be inserted, but that they may be inserted. I want to know why that is so, and by whom they would be inserted.

Clause put and passed.

Title—agreed to.

Bill reported with amendments, and the report adopted.

BILL—NURSES REGISTRATION.

In Committee.

Resumed from 18th October; Mr. Munsie in the Chair, the Colonial Secretary in charge of the Bill.

Clause 5—Who may be registered as nurses (partly considered):

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: When last the Bill was before us, I moved an amendment, that in line 4 of Subclause 2 "recognised by the board" be struck out. I do not wish to discuss the point any further.

Amendment put and passed.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: I move an amendment—

That in line 4 of Subclause 3 "recognised by the board" be struck out.

Amendment put and passed.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: I move an amendment—

That in line 3 of Subclause 4 "recognised by the board" be struck out.

Mr. SAMPSON: The principle here is entirely different. I am opposed to the amendment.

Amendment put and passed.

Mr. MacCallum SMITH: I move an amendment—

That the following be added to stand as Subclause (5):—"Every person who has attained the age of twenty-six years and who at the passing of this Act is prac-

tising as a nurse and has continuously done so for not less than five years before the passing of this Act in Western Australia may, until the 30th day of June, 1922, be registered as a trained nurse on payment of the prescribed fee."

My object is to provide for every person who has been practising as a nurse.

Mr. Mann: How are you to define "practising"?

Hon. P. Collier: Or "nurse"? A Sairey Gump might be qualified under this.

Mr. MacCallum SMITH: I think that most uncalled for. Many deserving women in the bush are performing excellent services amongst the sick. It would be an injustice to debar them from obtaining a certificate.

Mr. Mann: We are not debarring them from practising, only from being called trained nurses.

Mr. MacCallum SMITH: And it is most unfair. It means that nobody would engage them. We have made similar concessions in respect of chemists, dentists, veterinary surgeons, and managing clerks for legal firms. In each of those instances we have recognised that there are persons who could not pass the qualified examination, but who nevertheless are doing good work. This legislation will deprive some of those nurses of their livelihood, unless we make special provision for them.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: I scarcely think the hon. member is serious in his amendment. I hope the Committee will not agree to it. The Bill does not prevent any practising nurse from continuing to practice. I pointed that out on the second reading. The hon. member says it applies to registered nurses. But there is nothing in the amendment about registered nurses; it will include anybody who is practising and has been practising for five years. We have to-day nurses who are not competent to be registered, but who nevertheless have been practising for 10 years.

Mrs. COWAN: I do not quite understand the amendment. The hon. member refers to any person who at the passing of the Act is practising as a nurse. What kind of nurse does he mean? I might have had a nurse for my children for the past five years, and so, under the amendment, she would be entitled to apply to be registered as a trained nurse. We require a definition of "nurse."

Mr. CORBOY: I hope the new subclause will be added. Anyone who is qualified should be entitled to be registered and classed as a registered nurse. A similar provision applies to dentists. If the amendment is not made, we shall have registered nurses and nurses who are permitted to practise. This will be detrimental to the latter class.

Mr. PICKERING: We should afford the same facilities under this Bill as have been afforded under other Bills of a similar nature. A stigma may be cast upon those nurses who are not allowed to be registered but who have been practising. The Minister

might accept the amendment with some qualification with regard to "trained nurse."

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

Ayes	14
Noes	27

Majority against .. 13

AYES.

Mr. Chesson	Mr. Plesse
Mr. Davies	Mr. J. H. Smith
Mr. Heron	Mr. Stubbs
Mr. Johnston	Mr. Teesdale
Mr. Lambert	Mr. A. Thomson
Mr. O'Loughlin	Mr. Troy
Mr. Pickering	Mr. Corboy

(Teller.)

NOES.

Mr. Angelo	Mr. C. C. Maley
Mr. Angwin	Mr. H. K. Maley
Mr. Boyland	Mr. Mann
Mr. Broun	Mr. MacCallum
Mr. Clydesdale	Sir James Mitchell
Mr. Collier	Mr. Money
Mrs. Cowan	Mr. Richardson
Mr. Denton	Mr. Sampson
Mr. Durack	Mr. Simons
Mr. George	Mr. Underwood
Mr. Gibson	Mr. Willcock
Mr. Harrison	Mr. Wilson
Mr. Hickmott	Mr. Mullany
Mr. Lutey	

(Teller.)

Amendment thus negatived.

Clause, as amended, put and passed.

Clauses 6 to 10—agreed to.

Clause 12—Penalty for false pretences:

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: I move an amendment—

That in paragraph (b) the words "or uniform" be struck out.

Nurses who have been practising should not be required to wear the ordinary uniform.

The Colonial Secretary: I agree to the amendment so long as there is provision for badges.

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

Clause 12—Application of fees and fines:

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: I promised I would add some words to this clause to provide that the expenditure would not exceed the fees collected. I move an amendment—

That the following words be added to the clause, "and such expenditure shall not exceed the revenue derived from such fines and fees."

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: I hope the Minister will not persist in the amendment. It may mean that, through some unforeseen circumstances, the fees may be made very heavy in order to meet the expenditure.

The Colonial Secretary: The fees are fixed by regulations, which are laid on the Table of the House.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: The fees might be made almost prohibitive.

The Colonial Secretary: The House may disallow the regulations.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: There will be a number of nurses who will require to register during the first year and there may be very few for the second year. The result may be that fees are charged which will be far too high. I do not think the words are necessary.

Amendment put and negatived.

Clause put and passed.

Clause 13—Preference to be given to registered nurses:

Mr. PICKERING: Will the clause have any effect upon the nurses already appointed?

The Colonial Secretary: No, it will only apply to new appointments in the hospitals.

Mr. McCALLUM: I support the clause but at the same time I would ask members of the Committee to realise the fundamental principle underlying it. I hope that in future, Parliament will extend equal privileges to other sections of the community and not confine it to their particular pets. The principle underlying the clause is distinctly that of preference to unionists. We have applied that principle to various callings during this session and when the trades unionists ask for the same recognition, I trust hon. members will agree to their request.

The Premier: We cannot discuss that matter under the Bill.

Mr. McCALLUM: Up to the present, whatever the unionists have secured, they have got through their own strength.

Mr. Pickering: They are pretty muscular.

Mr. McCALLUM: And pretty brainy, too. In this case, Parliament is hedging the nursing profession with the protection workers have been seeking.

Clause put and passed.

Clause 14—Appointment of examiners, regulations:

Mr. JOHNSTON: The clause provides power for uniforms to be prescribed by regulation. Seeing that we have already struck out the reference to uniforms in Clause 11, I take it the elimination of "uniforms" in Clause 14 is consequential.

The Colonial Secretary: That is the position.

Mr. MONEY: The striking out of the reference in Clause 11 had reference to a penal provision in the Bill. Clause 14 is in a different category so that the amendment to Clause 11 is not consequential.

The Colonial Secretary: There will be no regulations regarding uniforms.

Hon. P. COLLIER: The amendment of Clause 14 is by no means consequential upon the amendment of Clause 11. The former clause merely gives power to the board to make regulations regarding the wearing of uniforms. I do not know that the board should not have that power. Nurses have always been dressed in a distinctive garb which has gained for them the respect and admiration of the community, which has been of great advantage. Unless some provision is made, as indicated in the clause, we will have each nurse choosing a garb to her own liking instead of retaining some distinctive uniform as at present.

Clause put and passed.

Title—agreed to.

Bill reported with amendments and the report adopted.

BILL—LICENSING ACT AMENDMENT.

Second Reading.

Debate resumed from the previous day.

Mr. A. THOMSON (Katanning) [10.37]: I do not intend to speak at great length regarding this Bill, as it is to a great extent one for consideration in Committee. Some members who have spoken contended that it was unfair to secure increased revenue by the means suggested. The member for Nelson (Mr. J. H. Smith) quoted from returns last night to show that the amount collected from the trade was £647,078, while some members have stated that, in their opinion, the percentage whatever it may be—I do not indicate at the present stage what percentage I shall support—should not be imposed on the amount of duty collected by the Commonwealth. I cannot agree with that contention. I do not know if hon. members have read the last annual report furnished by the Commissioner of Police. Although the Commonwealth Government collect revenue to the extent of £647,000 odd on liquor consumed in Western Australia, they do not contribute a penny piece for the domestic services required in connection with the trade in Western Australia. If hon. members will turn to the Estimates which we have passed they will see that the cost of the police force in Western Australia was £179,891. I will not go into the question of the merits or demerits of the liquor trade because it is one that has been with us from time immemorial and will, I believe, be with us for all time. Whether we shall have prohibition or not, is for the people themselves to decide. Reverting to the report by the Commissioner of Police, however, we find that a considerable number of the offences recorded have been directly attributable to the liquor trade. I think the Treasurer is justified in asking the trade to contribute a little more towards the revenue than in the past. On page 7 of the Commissioner's report members will find in

the classification of offences that those against the person which in the year ended 30th June, 1921, totalled 368. Of those offences 109 were attributable to drink, or 35.05 per cent. as against 41 per cent. in 1919 and 42.93 per cent. in 1918. Regarding the offences against the person and property, of the total of 34 recorded, six were attributable to drink, or 17.65 per cent. Regarding offences against property only, there were 1,179 offences of that description, of which 296 or 22.81 per cent. were attributable to drink. So it goes on right through the report. The offences against good order, which include drunkenness, disorderly conduct, indecent behaviour, vagrancy, offences against the police and so on, total 7,097, or 62 per cent. of offences in all classes which were brought to trial. Offences against by-laws which were attributable to drink totalled 17 per cent. I have no desire to labour this particular subject, but in practically all classes of offences, the same position is disclosed throughout the Commissioner's report. I am not quoting from woweristic statistics but from an official document, which points out that the liquor trade has been responsible for a considerable proportion of offences which have been brought before the various courts. The report dealing with offences attributable to drunkenness shows that, in addition to 3,630 charges of actual drunkenness, 1,792 charges brought to trial in other classes were attributable to drink, namely, against the person, 109; against the person and property, 6; against property only, 269; against currency, etc., 5; against good order, 1,313; against carrying out of laws, 17; against revenue, 12; against public welfare, 61; making the drink habit responsible for 47.67 per cent. of offences in all classes, compared with 44.73 per cent. in 1919 and 43.25 per cent. in 1918. From the Commissioner's report, I think the Government are justified in asking the liquor trade to contribute a little more than in the past. When we realise that the police force of Western Australia is costing the State £179,881 and, according to the Commissioner's report, 50 per cent. of that cost has been incurred in contending with crimes either directly or indirectly concerning people who have been imbibing in liquor, it goes to show that £89,940, which is directly chargeable against the State, could reasonably be a charge upon the liquor trade. I have travelled a good deal in my life. I can say from my experience that, taking the hotels of Western Australia as a whole, they are well conducted and compare favourably with hotels in other parts of the world. I think, however, that we should receive more from the publicans. We are receiving something like £37,000 from licenses at the present time, and I think we should reasonably expect to get in over £100,000. I was informed to-day that a wine shop, in Hay-street, where a very limited business was being done, and for which an annual license fee of £10 was paid, had recently been dis-

posed of and the goodwill had been sold for £3,000. So I think we can, with justice, say that this section of the trade, as well as the licensed victuallers, should contribute more. I will deal more fully with the various clauses when we reach the Committee stage. The Bill is a long one, and I do not propose to refer to it in detail just now. So far as I can gather, I believe a great majority of the people interested in the trade are willing to pay a reasonable and fair percentage. I wish to say also that I have always been in favour of compensation. From personal observation, I have learned that people in the country districts, and probably in the metropolitan area as well, have been compelled by the licensing bench to erect palatial structures far beyond requirements, and it would be a gross injustice to those people to have their places closed without some form of compensation. I have always been in favour of the Victorian legislation. In that State the trade contributes towards the fund from which compensation is paid to the owners of de-licensed properties. To my mind, our existing system is not effective. Assuming you have three hotels in a town like the one I represent, and the local option vote closes down one and allows the other two to remain, those two should be compelled to contribute towards the compensation paid to the third. That will be provided for in the Bill, and it is a just and equitable proposal. I intend to support the second reading, and in the Committee stage will suggest one or two amendments.

Mr. CHESON (Que) [10.50]: I intend to vote against the second reading of the Bill. If it is carried in its present form, the effect will be prohibition by taxation. If it is proposed to take 9 per cent. from the trade, it will mean that we will close a big proportion of the hotels, or licensed premises throughout the State.

Mr. A. Thomson: You will not close them; don't worry.

Mr. CHESON: With the imposts on these people already through excise and customs, it will be quite impossible for them to pass on the costs any further. Take a big business in Perth, and remember the rents which have to be paid and the big staffs which have to be maintained; it will mean that if the 9 per cent. is added, there will have to follow a reduction in the expenses, and the staffs will be the first to suffer. We know that a big proportion of this business is carried on in the metropolitan area at the present time. A big bottle trade is done, and the country trade as well is no small item. Indeed, there is very little profit in this branch of the trade, and if we are to add a further impost, the result will be the closing down of many of the establishments. With regard to country hotels, the holders of licenses have to pay heavy freights, in addition to the charges paid by the man in the metropolis. If we compel them to pay an additional 9 per cent., we must expect to

close down many businesses. We know that those people who indulge in smoking and drinking pay more than their just share of taxation at the present time, and it is hardly to be expected that the holders of licenses will pass on to those people the additional expenses that they will be obliged to meet if the Bill becomes law. That will mean that the Government, instead of getting the revenue they expect to receive, will find it shrink considerably. In the outback mining districts, we know that men engaged in this industry must have their glass of beer before and after work. If the passage of the Bill will result in these men being deprived of that refreshment, it will be a severe penalty. There is also a section of the mining community who are responsible for pioneering and prospecting work. These men may be out for six or 12 months and when they come to town for two or three days, that visit to the town is to them equivalent to a visit to the doctor. Then they return to the country and carry on more pioneering work. The Government seem to have forgotten the extent to which these men are severely penalised by the existing heavy railway freights.

The Premier: Those people are total abstainers.

Mr. CHESSON: Indeed, they are not, and they find that a couple of days' spree in a town, after having been buried in the bush for perhaps a year, acts like a tonic. The Premier is right when he says they are total abstainers, if he means that they are total abstainers while they are out in the back blocks. In that case they may remain total abstainers for perhaps 10 months if they are away from civilisation all that time. Reference has been made to trading in prohibited hours. How will the proposed legislation affect hotels in towns like Lawlers? The nearest hotel to the one in Lawlers is at Mt. Sir Samuel, 25 miles away. Then the nearest to that is at Kathleen Valley, 11 miles away, and then 60 miles further away is the next hotel at the town of Darlot. How can one officer administer the law in all those places? He has no possible chance of doing so. But, of course, a good deal of discretion is used in the back country, and I can assure the House that those hotels are run on good lines. With regard to the board for the establishment of which the Bill provides, I do not think there will be any need for it. At the present time, people themselves decide whether reductions are necessary, and the local bench determines which hotels shall go out. If we are to have a travelling board, what will be the expense attached to it? The existing arrangement is far simpler and more economical. The proposal to make the closing hours, 9 a.m. to 9 p.m., apply generally, will mean the shutting down of a number of clubs. At the present time the clubs pay as a licensing fee 2½ per cent. on their purchases, and some of the clubs pay a good deal more than the hotels do. If we are going to add

the 9 per cent., many must close down. I have no time for the gallon licenses. Experience has proved that these are the licenses which are responsible for the shanties in the back blocks. I remember when Day Dawn was going strong after the illicit Bill had been brought forward and it was thought to stop the supplies to the shanties, when the police came to examine the carts which were going around, they found the cart notes for the liquor made out to an Italian name, followed by "and Co." Likewise when they went into the store books they found the company comprised 20 or 30 Italians, and the police were unable to do anything in the matter. I have very little time for the gallon license. As regards the wine licenses, if there was better inspection to guard against adulteration, there would not be so many complaints against wine licenses. Seeing that the Bill can be dealt with in Committee, I have nothing further to say beyond contending that the measure as submitted will mean prohibition by taxation.

Mr. DAVIES (Guildford) [11.1]: I intend to support the second reading. Liquor reform is one of the most pressing and insistent questions confronting us to-day. This is undeniable. Some people hold that the drinking of intoxicants is essential. I think it is largely a matter of habit, that so many to the customs of the people that so many of them to-day require intoxicants. In the attempt to break down this habit, we have been tightening up the laws for many years and imposing restrictions on the trade. The other night reference was made to the fact that years ago people used to drink beer by the gallon. I have to admit that I have seen this sort of thing in my younger days—a man who could drink quarts of beer when the snow was lying six feet deep on the ground. It was different beer from what is sold to-day. Notwithstanding that snow was six feet deep on the ground, that man was drinking quarts of beer, not hot spiced beer, but cold-drawn beer from the barrel. I have often seen men drink it by the quart and it has had no apparent effect on them. Shakespeare has written "Blessings on your heart, you brew good ale." There was another thing which could be said in Shakespeare's day but which cannot be said to-day, namely, that there was not a headache in a hogshead. I do not know that many people to-day can say that they do not have a headache on the morning after the night before, showing that a good deal of the reform brought about is due to the bad beer which is to-day brewed and dispensed to the people. I am informed on very good authority that, prior to the war particularly, dray-loads of grain used to be carted away from the brewery after having been used in the brewing of beer, but that to-day it is almost a rare thing to see any grain carted away, meaning that most of the beer consumed to-day is the work of the

chemist and not of the brewer brewing from malt and hops. Whether this is correct or not, I do not know, but I have been informed so on very reliable authority. I am not a prohibitionist, but I am regarded in some quarters as a very moderate drinker. I do not hold that we should bring in prohibition by legislation. If we do anything of a drastic nature in the matter of raising revenue, such as is proposed in this Bill, it will probably mean bringing in prohibition in another form and without the consent of a majority of the people. Any law enacted that has not a majority of the people behind it will be set at naught. There is not the slightest doubt about that. It is exemplified by the gambling laws to-day. Cabinet laid it down with the Commissioner of Police—I have seen the minute—that under no circumstances would the use of spinning jennies be permitted. Yet one can go into the heart of the city and see them every day, notwithstanding that the supreme authority in this State has definitely prohibited their use. I know it will be said that the use of the spinning jenny should be permitted in the sacred cause of charity.

Mr. Clydesdale: Quite right, too.

Mr. DAVIES: I admit that the somewhat wide use of the spinning jenny is largely justified by the fact that our spiritual leaders of to-day—the leaders of the churches—not only tolerate it, but permit similar practices at many of the church bazaars when they themselves wish to raise money. This proves to my mind that unless we have a majority of the people with us, it will be of no use bringing in a reform by legislation without the consent of the people. One of the most debated questions to-day is whether we should continue the three-fifths majority and the 30 per cent. of electors on the roll provision. Theoretically the principle of a bare majority is accepted all round. During the war, had a bare majority been secured in favour of national service, it would have been brought into operation throughout Australia. Therefore, logically, a bare majority ought to be accepted in this case. I am prepared to admit that if we attempted, especially in a democratic country like Australia, to bring into operation a law which would press heavily on a section of the people without having a preponderance of opinion behind us, we may as well not put that law on the statute-book as it would not be observed.

Mr. Lambert: Why not apply it to the election of Parliament?

Mr. DAVIES: I am not defending the provision; I am merely pointing out that logically a bare majority should be accepted and that, in the extreme case of conscripting human life, a bare majority would have carried the day. When we come to a question like this, one of the main points taken by liquor law reformers is that in the case of national service a bare majority was sufficient, and therefore, a bare majority should

be sufficient to carry any reform in the liquor trade. Logically these people are right in their demand for a bare majority, but I would point out to those who may be looking to me to support the absolute majority, that I cannot agree to it in a case like this. If we bring about a reform at all, we want to retain it and not have it swinging in the balance. If we got prohibition at any time on a bare majority vote, when the next local option poll was taken three years later, a bare majority would be able to swing back to the old position.

Mr. Lambert: A lot of people do that voluntarily; they drink for six months and keep sober for six months.

Mr. DAVIES: That shows that they do not absolutely need intoxicants. I have already mentioned that drinking is a habit and not a necessity. If once we got the reform by the three-fifths majority, it would be retained for good, because the liquor people would then be required to get a three-fifths majority and 30 per cent. of the electors in order to revert to the trade again. The day is not long past since intoxicants were sold comparatively ad lib. A reduction of hours was brought in as a temporary measure during the war and a majority of the people tolerated it. Again, hotels were closed by proclamation at varying periods during the war, and there was no very great outcry against this action. These instances reveal an earnest desire on the part of the people of Australia for liquor reform. These restrictions were accepted by the people during the war, owing to the exigencies of the times, and the fact that they were tolerated then is proof to me that the people, if they so desired, could do without the drinking of intoxicants. The evil of drink, I admit, has been lessened considerably by improving the surroundings where intoxicants are sold. Members will recollect the old gin-shops and beer dens of 20 years past, and in Australia, too.

Mr. Lambert: Where were the gin shops? You mean black gins.

Mr. DAVIES: When I came to this country they were known as shypoo shops. I admit that I have not seen gin-shops in Australia. But members will admit that there is need to go further than our immediate surroundings in order to see the evil effects of drink. Anyone who has been in the older countries of the world will know the effect on the people who consume beer, wine and spirits. Coming to the question of compensation, here again probably I shall be expected to say that compensation should not be given to the trade.

The Minister for Works: Hear, hear!

Mr. DAVIES: The Government have brought in a sort of hybrid measure. It is enacted that houses which are closed by virtue of a local option poll shall receive no compensation, but houses which are closed as a result of the operations of the licenses reduction board will, under this measure, receive compensation. I want to know from the

Government how they intend to apply this principle? How can it be applied? If the principle is to be adopted at all, it should be applied all round. I shall have more to say on this matter when the Bill reaches the Committee stage. At present I merely wish to urge that the compensation provision must apply either to the whole of the licenses or to none.

Mr. Lambert: Should the question be reopened after the ten years have expired?

Mr. DAVIES: It is true that the trade has been given 10 years' notice. I am as earnest as any member to bring about the desired reform of the liquor trade, but we must not close our eyes to the fact that while the trade has had 10 years' notice that certain houses would be closed, there have been a number of houses in the metropolitan area which have been compelled to effect improvements, although it was well known that sooner or later the vote of the people would result in the places being closed. Therefore they have been increasing the liability of the publican. To-night I hold no brief for the publican; I think he is well able to look after himself. However, I wish to be fair.

The SPEAKER: The Bill does not provide for compensation.

Mr. DAVIES: In certain cases it does, I think, Sir. That being so, even the liquor reform people should recognise the facts. We must be fair to the publicans, who are engaged in an honest trade recognised by the law, and the subject of special taxation. Notwithstanding the special opinions held by people who do not indulge in drink, it ought to be recognised that the owner of a public house is just as honest and decent a citizen as any other person in the community. We are now about to take away from him what for years has been his livelihood. I would not stress this question, but that, notwithstanding the 10 years' notice given to the trade—

Mr. Lambert: Immunity; not notice.

Mr. DAVIES: Notwithstanding that fact, our licensing courts have been continually forcing the publican to improve his premises.

Mr. Lambert: No; to keep them up to standard.

Mr. DAVIES: Keeping them up to standard included, in many cases, rebuilding at considerable expense.

Mr. Lambert: I know one hotel in my district which is so dirty that it is not fit to be burnt down. The place is at Karalee. It is the filthiest place in the country, and yet it is licensed.

Mr. DAVIES: I thought it was some 20 years ago, or more, since beer was sold in dens. However, the hon. member corrected me when I made that statement. Yet now he points out to me that the same conditions obtain to-day. Another matter dealt with in the Bill is the hours of trade. I am glad there is no suggestion to revert to the old closing hour of 11 p.m. In fact, I am of

opinion that there is room for further improvement in this respect. By law, and by the Arbitration Court, the hours and duties in almost all business establishments, including hotels, have been regulated and restricted. We are even going further, and in connection with inoffensive drapery and grocery and ironmongery establishments the legislature imposes 6 p.m. as the closing hour.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: That is at their own request.

Mr. DAVIES: That may be, but let me tell the hon. member that, whether it were done at the request of the shopkeeper or not, the reform was bound to come about.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: I say nothing about that: I say merely it was done at their own request.

Mr. DAVIES: Logically again, if a similar demand were made for the closing of hotels at 6 p.m., we could hardly resist it. If I may be allowed to digress a little, a claim was recently advanced that such responsible people as engine-drivers of passenger trains should not be permitted to work over a certain number of hours per day. These engine-drivers have hundreds of lives in their hands. We say to the shopkeeper that he must not work his employees more than 8½ hours a day. The same thing applies in the case of hotels. However, at this juncture I am not advocating a further reduction of hours. Still, I do wish to express my pleasure at the fact that no attempt has been made, at least up to to-night, to revert to 11 p.m. closing. Let me state another phase of the question of hours. Tobaccoists are now compelled by law to close their shops at 8 p.m., because they sell cigars, cigarettes, and tobacco. Yet we allow the hotels to remain open until 9 p.m. Thus while it is illegal for a tobaccoist to deal in his particular goods after 8 p.m., hotels may deal later in tobacco goods, which is to the disadvantage of the small shop-keeper. If any attempt is going to be made to extend the closing hour for hotels to 11 p.m., I shall certainly endeavour to induce hon. members to vote for the closing of hotels at 8 p.m. so far as regards the sale of tobacco and certain other goods. Another important question is the bona fide traveller clause. I have observed some peculiar happenings in that connection. I lived in a county where there was no bona fide section, whilst the county just across the river had such a provision. The consequence was that people used to troop across from the one county to the other, where the hotels were open under the bona fide traveller law. The hotel-keepers themselves are to blame for the fact that that section is here sought to be eliminated. I do not say all the hotel-keepers are to blame, of course. I have seen 6 p.m. closing in the Eastern States; and there, notwithstanding that one is living in the hotel, one cannot possibly obtain a drink after 6 p.m.

Mr. Glydesdale: One can get a drink in Victoria almost anywhere after 6 p.m.

Mr. DAVIES: What I have stated is correct. I speak not from hearsay, but from first-hand knowledge, from my own experience. If as regards the bona fide section the hotel-keepers generally had but taken reasonable precautions, that section would be safe to-day. I am prepared to admit that owing to the elimination of a certain feature of his trade, the hotel-keeper now is not so concerned as he used to be about the bona fide traveller section. There was a time when beer was sold at 3d. per glass and 4d. per pint; but in those days, if one desired to consume some beer on the Sunday in an hotel, one had to pay twice the ordinary charge. To-day the charge is alike on Sundays and week days. At one time the publican used to make twice as much profit from a barrel of beer sold on Sunday as from one sold on Saturday night. The consequence was the abuse of the bona fide traveller section. Many hotel-keepers, let me add, observe the section fairly. Personally, I do not care whether the section is deleted or retained. For the majority of people it is better off the statute-book. Those who go picnicking can easily carry a bottle of beer with them.

Mr. Lambert: Beer is very heavy to carry.

Mr. DAVIES: It is for the benefit of the liquor trade that the bona fide section should be out of the Act. I am delighted to know that clubs are to be under the same conditions as hotels. Some question was raised as to workers' clubs being under the same conditions as residential clubs. I hope all clubs will be placed on the same footing as hotels. Clubs ought to be subject to the same restrictions as hotels. As for the worker, I personally fail to see why he wants a club at all. I do not see why any person with a home should want a club. His home should be his club, and his club should be his home. I do not know what the member for North Perth (Mr. MacCallum Smith) would say if women had exclusive clubs.

Mr. Clydesdale: Why should not they have them?

Mrs. Cowan: There is the Karrakatta Club.

Mr. DAVIES: Men consider the absence of women's clubs right, simply because there are no women's clubs to-day. I know men who, while indulging in tobacco themselves, raise objection to a young lady smoking a cigarette occasionally. If women's clubs, with consumption of liquor were brought into existence, I do not know what would be said by husbands concerning wives frequenting such clubs. What would those husbands think of such "homes from home" for women?

Hon. P. Collier: This is our home from home lately, and you are contributing a little towards making it more so.

Mr. DAVIES: The last point I wish to touch on at the second reading stage is the question of revenue. Much objection has been raised to this measure because of an idea, and a well-founded idea, that the

Government are looking for extra revenue under this Bill. But there is nothing in the Bill to show that the Government are looking for revenue.

Mr. Richardson: That is only a passing thought.

Mr. DAVIES: Though I am willing to assist the Government to get revenue, I do not think we should step from the sublime to the ridiculous. I have heard references from various speakers, including I think the Premier, to features of this Bill having been copied from Victorian legislation. The Bill suggests that the extra amount to be collected from the liquor traffic should be, not as in Victoria six per cent., but eight per cent. If we are to follow the Victorian Act in other respects, I suggest we might follow it in that respect too, and make the extra taxation six per cent., and not eight. I understood the Premier to say that in the past he has been getting from £35,000 to £40,000 a year from the liquor trade, and that it is intended to raise, under this measure, something like £110,000.

Hon. P. Collier: No; £140,000.

Mr. DAVIES: That is including the amount formerly raised.

Mr. Lambert: You know who will pay for that?

Mr. DAVIES: The consumers.

Mr. Lambert: Yes; the people you represent.

Mr. DAVIES: It may be said that the hotelkeeper, or the brewer, will pay it. But, it will be the consumer who will pay, despite the protestation of the trade that they will not pass it on. I ask that toleration shall be shown, and that those in the House regarded as liquor law reformers will remember that the only way to bring about any real reform is to be moderate in our demands. From personal observation, I can say that immense improvement has taken place in the liquor trade during the last 20 years, and that while the quality of beer has degenerated—

Mr. Underwood: Beer is still good.

Mr. DAVIES: But not one-fiftieth part as good as it was some years ago.

Mr. Underwood: How do you know?

Mr. DAVIES: I am assured that it is so. While the quality of the beer has degenerated, the surroundings have been improved out of all knowledge. I will support the second reading.

Mr. McCALLUM (South Fremantle) [11.32]: I hope the House will reject the second reading. I cannot see in the Bill any suggestion of reform. It is purely a taxation measure, framed exclusively with the object of raising money. It will only delay reform, for it will give the idea that the Government have attempted to initiate reform, and so people will be prone to rest, thinking that some effort has been made to

effect reform in the law. Nobody has attempted to point out where the Bill even endeavours to secure reform. Perhaps I am in error. Perhaps there is one clause claiming merit, the clause which creates intoxicating liquors by proclamation. In the whole Bill that is about the only attempt at reform. There is in the Bill a number of ridiculous propositions. Instead of trying to create democratic control, it is taking control out of the hands of the people and putting it into the hands of a board. It goes further, and denies recognition of the vote the people gave a few months ago. The Government have told us that they propose to give effect to the decision of the people in reference to State control of the liquor traffic. But the Bill proposes to eliminate from the parent Act all opportunities for expressions of opinion by the people on the question of State control of the liquor trade. It takes from the people the small voice which they now have in the conduct of the business. They are not to be consulted as to new licenses; that is to be in the hands of three men holding office as a board.

Mr. Mann: Is it not in the hands of three men, the licensing bench, now?

Mr. McCALLUM: No, the licensing bench have no power to create new licenses. That has been the position for a number of years past.

Mr. Mann: But if a licensing district did not vote reduction, the bench has power to create new licenses. That was demonstrated at Toodyay the other day.

Mr. McCALLUM: Because the hotel for which the new license was issued was distant 15 miles from the nearest existing hotel. Apart from that qualification, no new licenses have been created for a number of years past. I protest against taking from the people the control of this traffic. It is essentially a business about which the people themselves should be consulted. It should be democratised, instead of which the Bill proposes giving the control into the hands of two or three men. For a number of years I was one of the members of the Perth licensing bench. I regret very much that the Bill makes no effort at providing some of the required reform. I am disappointed with the measure insofar as it applies to clubs, because here we had a sure way to give the control necessary. I have sat on the licensing bench in Perth when every member of the bench and the inspector also have been opposed to the granting of a new club license, notwithstanding which we had no power to refuse it. The court is stripped of all power of opposition to the granting of a new club license if the premises are suitable. There is in the Bill no improvement in that respect.

Mr. Pickering: We could make the clause dealing with the premises restrictive.

Mr. McCALLUM: But should there be any distinction between the granting of a license for an hotel and the granting of a

license for a club? The bench has to be satisfied with the building, but apart from that they are stripped of discretion, and unless they set themselves up as absolute partisans there is no power under the existing law for the bench to refuse a club license, provided the building is suitable. I know it is generally held that great quantities of liquor are consumed in the club. Generally speaking, that is a mistaken idea. In most of the clubs there is not nearly so much liquor consumed as is generally supposed. I have here the figures giving the quantity of liquor consumed in the various clubs in the Perth district. The Celtic Club, with a membership of 351, consumes liquor to the value of £9 per member per annum; the City Club, with 418 members, consumes £12 worth per member per annum; the Commercial Travellers' Club, with 1,587 members, consumes £3 worth; the Freemasons' Club, with 358 members, consumes £8 worth. Other clubs are as follows:—Perth Club, 233 members, £8 per head; Perth Bowling Club, 60 members, £3; Perth Flying Squadron, 199 members, £9; Perth Royal Yacht Club, 189 members, £5; Amateur Sports Club, 293 members, £8; West Australian Club, 467 members, £10; Cricket Association, 693 members, £1—this club is not open all the week round; Tattersall's Club, 457 members, £9; Weld Club, 322 members, £5; Civil Service Club, 286 members, £9; Naval and Military Club, 365 members, £2; Buffalo Club, 190 members, £7; Mt. Lawley Bowling Club, 114 members, £3.

Mr. Teesdale: Does not the Fremantle Club average £32 per head?

Mr. McCALLUM: I believe that the Fremantle Club created a record. However, Fremantle holds records in most things, so we should hardly expect it to be behind in this.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: But Fremantle is situated quite differently.

Mr. McCALLUM: Many men work on night shift, and pass to and fro at all hours of the night, and to this fact Fremantle's high average is doubtless largely due. When we consider that the highest figures for any of the Perth clubs is £12 per member per annum, which works out at less than 5s. a week, it cannot be said that there is a heavy consumption of liquor in the clubs. But for the life of me I cannot see why clubs should not be open to the same inspection as are hotels. At the present time, the clubs are surrounded with an armour of legislative protection which it is impossible to pierce. Before a policeman can enter club premises for the purpose of making an inspection, he has to get a warrant signed by the chairman or a member of the licensing bench. There might be a riot in one of the clubs. We know what happened in Broome. There is a possibility that the Chinese at the Weld Club may run amok, and a policeman may desire to enter in order to save the lives of some of the members, but before he would have a right to enter the premises, he would have to find the

chairman or a member of the licensing bench and get a warrant.

Mr. MacCallum Smith: Did not Don Cameron get into the Weld Club without a warrant?

Mr. McCALLUM: He only got into the meat safe, and a search warrant was not required to find him. I cannot see why a policeman should not be permitted to inspect a club if it is deemed necessary, in the event of misbehaviour, to make such inspection.

Mr. Pickering: Can a policeman make an inspection of a private house without a warrant?

Mr. McCALLUM: If the hon. member can compare a private house with a club, he has a higher flight of imagination than I have. I do not see how a club can be compared with a private house.

Mr. Pickering: You have been comparing a club with a hotel.

Mr. McCALLUM: And I maintain that the two should be precisely on the same footing. At present, however, one is open to the public, while the other is open to members only. This Bill makes no alteration in the direction of compelling licensed victuallers to carry out the conditions of their licenses. It is common knowledge that a number of licensees in the city are boasting that they have closed their dining rooms. Some of them have closed up everything except the bars; they are not catering for meals or accommodation; they are merely doing a bar trade. These licensees are not licensed wine, beer or spirit merchants. They are licensed victuallers, and under their licenses they are required to provide not only drink, but food and accommodation. Yet they are being permitted now to boast of having closed their dining rooms and dismissed their staff, and of having no intention of re-opening their dining rooms. If they are challenged, they tell one straight out that there is nothing in the existing law they cannot get around.

Mr. Teesdale: They blame you for that.

Mr. McCALLUM: I am prepared to take all the responsibility for my work, and I hope to have the responsibility of bringing this omission home to them during the next few days.

Mr. Pickering: The licenses reduction board could deal with that.

Mr. McCALLUM: There is nothing in the Bill to give either the bench or the board any more control over licensed victuallers than is possessed at present. If one asks for a meal now, the licensee tries to find excuses for not supplying it, but if one insists on being supplied, he is shown into the dining room and is informed—"We will get you a meal." The licensee then sends to the restaurant next door or across the road and keeps the customer waiting as long as he likes. He can supply biscuits and cheese and call that a meal, and then charge anything he likes for it. There is no definition of what constitutes a meal or of what may be charged for a meal. The licensee can charge anything

from £1 to £10 for a dinner, and yet not have any provision whatever for catering on the premises.

Mr. Pickering: That did not hold with the King Edward Hostel.

Mr. McCALLUM: The hon. member is referring to the practice of giving drink away with the meal. The premises were not licensed at that particular time, and the drink was being supplied ostensibly free, so long as one purchased a meal. I hope the Bill will not reach the Committee stage, but if it does, some provision should be inserted to compel licensed victuallers to carry out the contract under their licenses. There are palatial hotels in the city catering merely for a bar trade. They employ no kitchen staff and no dining room staff. They merely have one or two girls looking after the bedrooms, and they discourage anyone who goes there seeking lodgings. Further, this is the only line of business trading with the public that can employ Asiatics without the public knowing of it. If a furniture manufacturer employs Asiatics, he has to brand his furniture accordingly, but in Perth a great number of hotels employ Asiatic cooks, and no one is any the wiser. Asiatics are freely employed in kitchens in the city, but unless one goes to the back premises and makes an investigation, he does not become cognisant of the fact that coloured labour is employed.

Mr. Pickering: The cooking is generally good.

Mr. McCALLUM: Immediately I sit down to a meal, I can tell by the smell if it has been cooked by a Chinaman; there is no need for me to go to the kitchen. I hope the House will resolve that if these people employ Asiatic labour, there will be some indication of the fact to the public just as a furniture maker has to show if he employs Asiatic labour. In Committee I propose to make a novel suggestion which will have the effect of letting the public know where Asiatics are employed. If a licensee cares to employ them, let it be known, but I would say for the information of the member for Roebourne, who a little while back made an interjection regarding Fremantle, that there is not a licensed victualler at the chief seaport who employs an Asiatic. If they continue to employ them this should be made known to the public. I shall have a proposal to make in that regard when the Bill is in Committee. I disagree with the idea of registering bar attendants. I do not know what good purpose would be served by such a proposal. If an attendant serves an intoxicated person he will lose his position. Notices to that effect are posted up in every bar in the city. If a barman refuses to serve liquor to an intoxicated person he will probably lose his job, or if he does serve it in similar cases, he will lose his license and not be able to continue on in his job. Why should he be made the butt? Who is going to judge as to when a man is drunk or sober?

Mr. Teesdale: That provision is ridiculous, and will not go through.

Mr. McCALLUM: Other members have commended it, and say it is desirable that bar attendants should be registered.

Mr. Angelo: It has acted well elsewhere.

Mr. McCALLUM: There is no place in Australia where that system is in vogue.

Mr. Angelo: Yes, it is in South Australia.

Mr. McCALLUM: In South Australia the further employment of barmaids was abolished, and no new barmaids are allowed to come into the trade. The barmaids employed at the passing of that law were registered for checking purposes. Nowhere do we find that people who are earning their living in this way have to be registered, like a dog with a disc round its neck.

Mr. MacCallum Smith: Why do you register nurses?

Mr. McCALLUM: In that case it is desired to raise the standard of the profession. Is anything contained in the Nurses Bill to the effect that they shall be deprived of an opportunity of following their calling if they do certain things?

Mr. MacCallum Smith: Yes.

Mr. McCALLUM: That is in the event of their proving incompetent or failing in their duty. The Bill provides that if a man is ordered by his employer to do a certain thing and he does it he will be sacked, and again, if he refuses to do certain things he will be sacked. I agree that there has been considerable improvement in the trade of latter years. There was a time when there was not the same standard of labour employed in the trade as we see to-day. Since the wages and conditions were improved we find a splendid type of men and women working in that calling.

Hon. P. Collier: The best in Australia.

Mr. McCALLUM: It would be difficult to find a better class of people anywhere. Very few of them would serve drink to an intoxicated person, or do anything to encourage drunkenness. The question will also arise as to who is to say when a man is intoxicated.

The Colonial Secretary: A man is drunk if he can neither walk nor talk.

Mr. McCALLUM: I have a good definition of a drunken man, and I think perhaps we might include it in the Bill—

He is not drunk that from the floor
Can rise again and drink some more,
But he is drunk who prostrate lies
Without the power to drink or rise.

I hope the obligation of policing the trade, for that is what it amounts to, will not be cast upon barmen and barmaids. The responsibility should attach to those who own the business. The statement has been made that the Licensing Court has been insisting upon certain improvements to licensed premises, that licensees have had to enter into contracts for new buildings, for extension, and improvements, and that on those grounds some consideration should be shown to them. I believe this has happened in some districts, but not in the Perth district. No order has been issued in Perth for any al-

terations or improvements since I have been connected with the licensing bench.

Mr. Mann: What about the Savoy Hotel?

Mr. McCALLUM: That was before any such provision as this was made. I have been on the bench for eight years, and no order has been issued for improvements during my term of office.

Mr. Davies: Two hotels in Guildford have been rebuilt.

Mr. McCALLUM: This may have occurred in other districts, and did occur in Fremantle last week, but it has not occurred in the metropolitan area. The Bill does not commend itself to me. It is a measure entirely for raising money, and contains no attempt at reform. I am not going to help the Government to raise money through a Bill of this kind. If they want a taxation measure let them bring one down for that purpose only, not under the guise of a reform Bill, the object of which is to put money into their coffers. The suggested tax is ridiculous in the extreme. It will not affect the parties the Government have in view. Instead of bringing about anything in the nature of a reform in the trade it will only delay reform, because it will lull people into the belief that something has been done, whereas nothing is being done. The Bill is an absolute farce.

Mr. MANN (Perth) [11.58]: I will support the Bill for the reasons that I will now relate. The Government are making an earnest attempt to reform the liquor trade. I have been in a position to form an opinion concerning it. The liquor trade in this State is as well conducted as it is in any other State of the Commonwealth, probably better than in most States, and better than in any other part of the world. The class of hotel we have in the State, particularly in the metropolitan area, will compare more than favourably with the hotels in the other centres of the Commonwealth, both on the score of structure and accommodation, and of the class of liquor sold. With few exceptions there are no hotels in the city at which people cannot stay and know that they are free from molestation and where the surroundings are not thoroughly respectable. There may be one or two exceptions to this rule, but latterly this type of hotel has practically been driven out of existence. Some hon. members who spoke on the Bill last night, especially the member for Kanowna (Hon. T. Walker), would lead the House to believe that we are practically on the verge of decay and ruination through liquor and the liquor trade. I have looked up some statistics bearing on the point, and I find that from 1914 to 1918 convictions for drunkenness within the Commonwealth fell from 141 per thousand to 86 per thousand. In the Commonwealth generally, and especially in this State, the tendency has been towards sobriety. There is not now the same amount of drinking as there was some years ago. What is needed, and what this Bill aims at, is uniformity of

administration throughout Western Australia. At present we have in the metropolitan area a licensing bench which looks after its business, sees that the Act is properly complied with, and keeps the trade in order. In some other portion of the State another licensing bench functions, and is not so strict as the metropolitan bench. There have been cases of a publican whose application for a license had been successfully resisted in one district, going away to another district and through the medium of a dummy securing a license there. Under this Bill that kind of thing would not be possible.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: Why not?

Mr. MANN: Because there would be only one licensing board.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: The Bill does not say there shall be only one board.

Mr. MANN: The one board can make one district, or as many districts as it chooses.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: But the Bill does not say that there shall be only one board.

Mr. McCallum: The board would not know the dummy was up.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: The Bill says that a person may be appointed a member of two or more licensing boards.

Mr. MANN: In Victoria the board system undoubtedly has produced great reforms. Convictions for drunkenness are lower per thousand in Victoria than in any other Australian State. The annual total of convictions for drunkenness in Victoria is down to 3,000, as against 21,000 in New South Wales, 11,000 in Queensland, 3,000 in South Australia, and 4,000 in Western Australia. I suggest that the good conduct of the trade in Victoria is due to the manner in which the licensing boards there carry out their duties, and in my opinion the trade here will be much better looked after by one board controlling the whole of the State.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: But the Bill does not say there shall be only one board.

Mr. MANN: That is the way I read the measure. It practically says there shall be one board. That board will have the power to say what hotels shall exist, and—

Hon. W. C. Angwin: It is the reduction board you are speaking of.

Mr. MANN: The reduction board will take the place of the licensing bench.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: Not under this Bill.

Mr. MANN: The reduction board will have the power to refuse licenses and to grant licenses.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: No; not under this measure. Read Clause 4.

Mr. MANN: I will discuss Clause 4 with the hon. member directly.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: You are mixing up the two boards—the reduction board and the licensing board.

Mr. MANN: Under our present system, the vote of the people in one district is for

reduction, and in another district for continuance. Let me take the cases of Midland Junction and Guildford. They are in the one licensing district, but they are two distinct towns. Midland Junction voted for continuance, while Guildford voted for reduction. The licensing bench thereupon interfered with no hotels at Guildford, but closed two at Midland Junction. I hold that the present system is inadequate to meet the requirements of the control of the liquor trade. Therefore I favour the proposed board under this Bill. The measure will, in my opinion, need certain amendments. I have placed on the Notice Paper amendments relating to Clauses 15 and 21. Further I intend to move in the direction of preventing an hotel being shifted from, say, the Ocean Beach into the centre of Perth, as might possibly result from the power of the board to make any number of districts into one district. I shall move an amendment providing that there can be no new license in any district, even though several districts may be joined into one. Clause 47, I think, also requires amendment; and I intend to move accordingly. Under the clause as it stands there is no appeal from the board's decision, even though that decision should conflict with all our ideas of equity and of justice. Further, I regard the revenue clause as too high, and in Committee I shall move for a reduction in that respect, and also for payment of part of the compensation by the landlord, instead of the whole being paid by the licensee. Subject to these reservations I support the second reading, and hope it will be carried.

[The Deputy Speaker took the Chair.]

Mr. HICKMOTT (Pingelly) [12.8 a.m.]: I have listened carefully to the various speeches delivered on this Bill, and I agree with the opinion expressed by many members that the measure is not what we expected. It seems really a taxation Bill; but money has to be raised somewhere, and perhaps drink is a luxury that is as well able to stand taxation as anything else is. However, the proposed percentage of taxation is possibly rather high. I was pleased to learn from the last speaker that throughout Australia there is a tendency towards increased sobriety. I was glad also to learn from the member for South Fremantle that the percentages in the various clubs are not what we might have expected them to be. Still, we are told that the drink bill of Western Australia is higher than that of any other Australian State.

Mr. Mann: That is not correct.

Mr. HICKMOTT: If the drink bill of Western Australia runs into about two and a half millions per annum, it is a tremendous amount. I am one of those who hold that higher efficiency is attainable in the absence of drink. Though not a pledged teetotaler,

I think better results would be achieved if we used no intoxicating liquors whatever. Although I am not fully in accord with the Bill, I shall support the second reading, believing that the measure will receive considerable amendment in Committee. To the three-fifths majority I am absolutely opposed. If a simple majority suffices to elect a man or a woman to this honourable House, or suffices to impose conscription, or for an alteration of the constitution, it should also be good enough for the amendment of the licensing law of this State. I am in favour of the absolute majority being sufficient for the decision of such a question, and then the people themselves can deal with the matter. We should do away with the provision regarding the 30 per cent. majority. We call ourselves a democratic people. The alterations I suggest regarding the voting would be a step along the lines of democracy. I will not detain the House at this late hour, but simply content myself with stating the attitude I intend to adopt. We would have more efficiency if we did away with the drink. I do not hold with the member for Cue (Mr. Chesson) that drink is necessary or beneficial for men working in mines.

Mr. Chesson: Because you have never worked down a mine.

Mr. HICKMOTT: I believe there are many ways in which men can improve their health without the aid of drink. We have an example before us in the member for North-East Fremantle (Hon. W. C. Angwin), who is a total abstainer. Some hon. members contend that if he did drink, it would make him better, but I think it would make him worse. I intend to support the second reading of the Bill, but I trust amendments will be agreed to in Committee to make the measure more reasonable and acceptable to people than it is at present.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN (North-East Fremantle) [12.12]: I rise to say a few words with a certain amount of diffidence in regard to the Bill. I do not suppose that any person in Western Australia has received more abuse regarding the Licensing Act than I have during the past 11 years. It has been said that there are some reasons for it and if the reasons given in some instances were based on facts, it would be all right. If prohibition were given effect to, it would not affect me personally because at the present time the Federal law protects me against prohibition. Under the Federal laws, brewers' licenses and 2-gallon licenses are dealt with, and as I am supposed to be affected by fumes from a brewery every morning, Parliament can rest assured that the 2-gallon license will remain, in consequence of which I shall be immune from the effects of any prohibition law. By way of interjection, I said that prohibition could not be introduced in Western Australia until it had been introduced in other parts of the Commonwealth as well, because the Federal law overrides State legislation. It is useless for

us to insert anything in a Bill to prohibit any brewery, or any person holding a 2-gallon license, from carrying on their business, so long as the Federal law is in existence. As a matter of fact, all 2-gallon licenses and brewery licenses are governed by the Federal Excise Act; consequently, we cannot interfere with that law. There are many directions in which we can improve the position. Like others of my colleagues on the Opposition side of the House, I maintain that the Bill is a step backwards. Instead of making for the improvement of our licensing laws, the reverse will be achieved if the Bill is passed. Perhaps there is some reason for that. Most hon. members are aware that I was responsible for the introduction of the time compensation clause, instead of monetary compensation, over a period of 10 years. There was no doubt in my mind that under the law as it existed, any person who received a license got no guarantee that his license would be extended after a period of 12 months. That being so, I was convinced that we were morally bound to renew that person's license so long as the licensee carried out the provisions of the Licensing Act. Further than that, the holder of the license was compelled by law to provide certain money in the erection of buildings before licenses could be granted. Therefore, while legally the license held was only good for 12 months, we were morally bound, in the face of such conditions, to renew it. There was considerable diversity of opinion on the point. At the request of some of my temperance friends, particularly in Fremantle where the Church Temperance Society, comprising representatives of the various churches, approached me in the matter, I introduced a clause to wipe out any doubt that existed in the minds of some people regarding the renewal of licenses. An amending Bill was introduced in 1911, and provision was made for a reduction board on somewhat similar lines to that suggested in the Bill. Those clauses were struck out, however, and considerable attention was given to the question of whether there should be a time limit fixed over a period of 15 years or 10 years or monetary compensation paid. We succeeded finally, with an almost unanimous vote of Parliament in deciding upon a 10 years' compensation clause. Since then every person who has erected an hotel has known from the start the position in which he stood: that after the expiration of 10 years, if he had to close up, he would not get monetary compensation.

Mr. Davies: The licensing board can deal with hotels despite that provision.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: Under the Licensing Act, provision is made for certain things to be done and the board can close up hotels if licensees do not comply with the conditions under which they hold their licenses. If, however, the licensees complied with those conditions, they could take advantage of that 10 years' provision. Now what is the posi-

tion? This law had not been in existence more than two or three years before certain persons connected with the temperance party advocated a repeal of the honourable contract entered into with those engaged in the trade. And a Bill with that object was introduced in this Chamber. I then predicted that, before the end of the 10 years, there would be an agitation from the other side for extension of the time, or for compensation. In the Bill before us, we have the fulfilment of that prediction. When arrangements were entered into with regard to compensation, each side should have endeavoured to keep the compact. Although I was a member of the Government which brought down the Bill to break that compact, I opposed the Bill. For that I have been roundly condemned. Possibly from this time forward I shall be relieved from having to accept responsibility for all murders and suicides and for the fate of all those who have got into difficulties through drink. When I opposed that Bill, the leaders of the temperance movement wrote me a letter, in the course of which they placed on me exclusive responsibility for all murders, suicides, and convictions, the result of drunkenness. My time has now expired, and to-day I suppose I can regard myself as free once more.

Mr. Mann: You have served your time.

Mr. Boyland: Were they good Christian people?

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: They were supposed to be. If I had got home from the House earlier than 2 o'clock this morning, or if I had not had to leave my home again very early this morning, I would have brought here a letter containing a resolution carried against me and those associated with me by the Methodist Church. I do not care whom I may offend or please in respect of this question. I agree with the member for Guildford (Mr. Davies) that we must take a fair and just view of the position. What has been the effect of the Licensing Act during the last few years? For years have I canvassed the East Fremantle district every three months in order to oppose the granting of licenses. And not only have I thus canvassed the district four times in each year, but I have attended at the licensing court day after day at my own expense so that I might scrutinise and swear to the signatures on petitions opposed to the granting of licenses. Those who condemned me have never done that, but have contented themselves with getting on the platform and making speeches. Since the passing of the Licensing Act in 1911 not one new license has been granted in the metropolitan area; nor has there been necessity for any person to go around the district in order to induce a majority of the ratepayers to oppose the issue of new licenses. If we have not gained in anything else, we have certainly gained to the extent that there has been no increase in the number of licenses in the metropolitan area.

Mr. Pickering: On the contrary, there have been decreases.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: Only within the last few weeks. Can anybody honestly say that the Licensing Act in force during the past 11 years has not been beneficial to the State? If it has done nothing else it has served to keep in check the number of licenses; yet in face of that and other benefits conferred by the Act, we find men ready to abuse those who framed the Act which enables the people to vote against increased licenses. The Bill represents a retrograde step, in that it wipes out that provision. When the vote has been carried against increases, no licenses can be granted within 15 miles of an existing license. So, in the metropolitan area, we have had no new licenses. That is the law to-day. It is true that a license can be transferred. Times without number before the passing of the Act, did we have demands made for a license in the populous district of Leederville. Under the Bill that license could be granted against the wish of the people.

Mr. Munsie: And will be.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: Only to-day have I received a letter from a Mr. Grove, who advocates that the petition should be taken of the majority of the residents within a 10-mile radius of the site of a proposed new hotel. Why, if I had my way, I would restrict the radius to half a mile! A man who advocates the extension of such a radius to 10 miles does not know what he is talking about, has never canvassed a district. With the voting spread over a radius of 10 miles, it would be impossible to defeat the issue of a new license in any district. Those most likely to oppose the granting of a new license are those living nearest to the site of the proposed new hotel. Under Mr. Grove's proposition, a person living at Cottesloe Beach would have a vote in respect of a new license in either Fremantle or in Perth. In a big area it is the easiest thing imaginable to get signatures in support of a new license. My experience is that the smaller the area fixed, the easier it was to oppose a license, because very few people wish to have a licensed house established near to them. The provision that any person within a radius of five miles should have a right to say whether a license should be granted in a certain centre represents a backward step, and I am surprised at those representing the temperance party suggesting that the radius be increased to 10 miles. Those people do not know what they are talking about and I am satisfied they have not done any work in connection with licenses.

Mr. Davies: They have another point in view, namely that there may be a no-license majority in the surrounding district.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: But the people will not express their opinion by way of a vote. If it were so I would offer no objection. It is proposed that this be done by petition. Very often people will sign a petition in order to get rid of the individual who asks

them to sign, but if they had a vote, they would express themselves in the opposite direction. This provision is not for a vote, but for the signing of a petition. Scores of people will sign a petition without knowing what it is for, simply because it will not affect them. They will sign merely to get rid of those who ask them to sign.

Mr. McCallum Smith: Some of them would sign their own death warrant.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: If the Bill provided for the taking of a vote, I would offer no objection. However, the ballot box is to be removed and the power to present a petition is to be given to a majority of the residents, not electors, within a five miles radius of the proposed licensed house. At the court the Commissioner of Police will be represented, but so long as the petition bears a majority of the signatures, there can be no opposition to it. A majority is required in a certain area and the magistrate can then grant the license. That is all that is necessary.

Mr. McCallum: Cannot the magistrate ascertain how many there are in the district?

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: No, that would be impossible.

Mr. Mann: I understood you to say there would be no vote.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: That is so.

Mr. Mann: Have you read Sections 29 and 30?

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: The vote will be entirely on no-license. That will be the only matter submitted to a vote.

Mr. Mann: Or on the question whether a license shall be renewed or transferred.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: No, only one vote will be submitted under this measure; that of no-license. The hon. member will find that before a new license can be granted, a petition signed by a majority of the residents within a radius of five miles of the proposed new license must be presented. In a fairly well populated district, the application of the five-mile radius would make it a very easy matter to get the requisite number of signatures. If the applicant were restricted to a radius of a quarter of a mile, it would be impossible for him to get the required number. I am speaking from experience of the provision that required the signatures of ratepayers and not merely of residents. The Government have taken a backward step by submitting this proposal. They are taking another backward step by proposing to allow an increase of licenses to be granted by the board in any way whatever. When the Bill reaches the Committee stage, I would like to see the local option clauses of the present Act embodied in it. The public in any district should have a right to say whether there shall be any increase or decrease in licenses, and they are the only people who should be considered.

The Premier: The experience in Victoria is against you.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: I do not think so. I agree that the vote should apply to all

licenses, but surely no person should have a right to say whether a license should be granted in a particular district unless the people have, by a local option vote conducted by a Government official, signified their approval. We should not be satisfied merely with signatures on a petition. This is one clause of the Bill which I consider to be detrimental to the interests of the community. Now let us consider the compensation clause. We must remember that every person in the trade has had 10 years' notice. Now, however, the Premier provides in this Bill for the trade to compensate itself out of one per cent. on the purchase. If the Premier's estimate of £140,000 is correct, one per cent. will be equal to about £17,000 a year. We are to have a board of three members who must have a secretary, and in all probability will require a valuer as well as an office and a staff of three or four typists. Now I ask members: How much of that £17,000 will be left to devote to the closing of hotels?

The Premier: About £14,000.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: Never. I have never yet known of a board working continuously as the proposed board must work, who could manage their business at a cost of £3,000 a year. Suppose they succeeded in doing so, how many hotels could they close? Suppose the whole £17,000 were made available, how many hotels could they close?

The Premier: In Victoria they cost a little over £500.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: The Premier cannot compare Victoria with Western Australia. It is all very well to quote the position of Victoria, but a very large number of the hotels closed in that State were old and very small buildings which could well be done without. In Western Australia, however, the provisions of the Licensing Act have been such that a great majority of the hotels are far better than many of the hotels even in the city of Melbourne. The conditions are not comparable, but let us consider Bourke-street for a moment: Could the hotels of Bourke-street, Melbourne, be compared with those of High-street, Fremantle? Taking the size and population of the two places, it must be admitted that Bourke-street does not possess hotels of either the same size or standard as High-street, Fremantle. I mention this to show that the proposed licenses reduction board is a farce.

The Premier: It is not.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: No hotels will be closed except one or two in the back blocks where mines are closed down, and where the class of building is small and which would eventually be closed whether there was a reduction board or not. The reduction board will make no difference in the closing of hotels. The Premier proposes to take a vote once in three years. Why is there any necessity for this seeing that every three years the people will be voting on the question? Why should we build up a board with officers and staff and bring about increased taxation when the people themselves can do

the work required once in three years. The Bill is an ill-considered one, and is a retrograde step as compared with that of 1911.

Mr. Davies: Some explanation will be required about the reduction board and the local option poll.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: We want to bring about reform in the matter of drinking. It is useless for me to deal with hotels or clubs, because I am not fully acquainted with them.

The Premier: You are not an authority on them.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: I have scarcely ever been inside one. Two years ago I had the pleasure of spending a few weeks in England. One of the things that surprised me more than anything else was to see how little intoxication there was on the part of the people. The reason for this was that the strength of intoxicating liquors had been reduced. During the time I was there I only saw three men that appeared to be the worse for liquor. Here we can go into almost any shop of any note and can buy something in the way of an intoxicating drink, such as Sedna, which contains 37 per cent. of proof spirit. Intoxicating wines are also sold there as medicine. No license is required for these things. Many forms of intoxicant are being sold without a license. Some of our shops would scorn the idea of keeping a licensed house, and yet they sell these things and deceive the people. This is the cause of a good deal of the intoxication that is seen in our midst.

Mr. Money: We have inspectors to look after that.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: We should reduce the standard of the liquor that is sold.

Mr. Mann: Do you not think it is too high?

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: By reducing the standard in all probability we shall assist those who drink to excess, and prevent them from finding themselves in the position that they are too often in. What a farce it is to license a man to sell intoxicating drinks, and then to fine a man, and often imprison him, for drinking it!

Mr. McCallum: License the man who does the drinking.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: The Premier desires to see that the more a man drinks the more he contributes to the revenue. Does he also propose that the fines in the police court should be increased to the man who drinks? State hotels are eliminated so far as the local option is concerned. I should like to know why that is so. The majority of the votes that were recently passed were cast in favour of State hotels. In the face of this expression of opinion on the part of the public, why is this provision struck out? There will be great difficulty in this State in getting prohibition until our hotels become State hotels. Some people say "If we have State hotels the Treasurer will use them for the purpose of obtaining revenue, and once he gets hold of them he will strongly oppose the closing down of any State

hotel." Once we get State hotels we will wipe out the private institution. When we take a vote of the people we will not have the private hotels to fight. The people will not fight themselves. No Government dare fight the people. We shall therefore have a fair and just vote expressing the opinion of the people in regard to State hotels. If they wipe them out they will only be wiping out their own property. There will be no big funds gathered together for the purpose of fighting the question when the people as a whole have to decide it. I am, therefore, sorry that State hotels are struck out so far as our local option vote is concerned. I was surprised to hear the remarks of the member for Leederville (Capt. Carter) the other night. I trust there are not many members holding similar views. It is possible for any person to mend his ways, and I do not hold with the hon. member's argument that because a man has erred once he will always err, or that because a man breaks the law once he will always do so. According to the member for Leederville, once a man breaks the law—and it is purely a civil law—he must suffer for his crime for life. He said "If a barman did not carry out the provisions of the Act strictly, and is once fined for a breach of the Act, I would cancel his registration and never register him again." We were taught from our boyhood days to extend charity to every individual.

Mr. Troy: This is charity!

[The Speaker resumed the Chair.]

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: And yet we find the member for Leederville preaching a doctrine of that description. He would commit a man to penal servitude for life, because he once happened to break the law. It is a wrong argument to bring forward, and such action would be wrong to take. I hope not many members will support the member for Leederville. I am not going to say that a licensee is responsible for every breach of the licensing law committed in his hotel. Many men who are apparently licensees of hotels are really only the managers. They are neither owners nor the actual licensees. A case within my knowledge, which occurred not many years ago, was that of a manager who was told very straight that his returns had to be higher. He knew what that meant. It meant that if he did not make bigger returns, out he would go. To enable him to secure the larger returns, he had to take risks; and eventually he was caught. But the actual owner or licensee, as distinguished from the manager, had protected himself by including in the lease a provision that if there was a breach of the licensing law the lease could be terminated.

Mr. McCallum: The same thing would apply to barmen if they were licensed.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: Yes. The manager I refer to had to commit offences against the licensing law in order to secure bigger returns. I agree with the member for

South Fremantle (Mr. McCallum) that a barman, if licensed, would find himself subjected to exactly similar conditions. If he fails to sell liquor, he will be dismissed; if he sells it, and is caught, he will likewise be dismissed. Then, according to the member for Leederville, he should be forever debarred from following the occupation of barman. I observe that the member for Perth (Mr. Mann) is under misapprehension with regard to what I may term the appointment part of the Bill. He believes that there is to be one board for the whole of the State. But what the Bill provides is that one man may be a member of more licensing boards than one. The hon. member has mixed up the court and the board. I am not going to worry as regards the proclamation to be issued by the Government. At the same time, we can honestly declare that it is not equity to put a tax on a drink which a man thinks is beneficial to him—be it so or not—and let another man go free simply because he does not drink the same kind of drink. I hope that if the Bill goes through, the House will see that everybody is served alike.

Mr. Troy: But those who take liquor get more fun out of life than you and I do.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: Let the hon. member make no mistake about that. Those others get headaches; we do not. Perhaps the Premier, recognising that he has no power to put excise duties or special taxation on tea and various cordials, simply for that reason puts them on alcoholic liquors. I contend that those who abstain from intoxicating liquor should be subjected to additional taxation in the same proportion as those who take such liquor. It is true that the Commonwealth gets a very large sum annually from the sale of intoxicating liquor in Western Australia; some £600,000 or £700,000 a year, I think. But let me point out to the member for Kalamunda (Mr. A. Thomson) that the Commonwealth spends a large amount of money in Western Australia. Commonwealth old age and invalid pensions, for instance, are paid here and over £40,000 is paid annually as a maternity bonus. Thus some of this money comes back to the State. There must be some further revenue raised in Western Australia by the State Government; but, in my opinion, 8 per cent. is too large an increase. One can tax a man indirectly to the extent of 20s. without his remarking upon it; but if he is called upon to pay 2s. 6d. in direct taxation, he is inclined to kick up a row. Possibly the average man will not trouble much about this taxation, because it is to be taken from him in dribs and drabs. But, if we want reform of the liquor traffic, we must, firstly, introduce the necessary legislation to reduce the strength of intoxicants, and, secondly, refrain from giving to any body of men the power to increase the number of licenses, without the consent of the people, expressed by ballot, in the particular district concerned. This last is one of the principal provisions of our present liquor legislation. Otherwise we shall

be taking a backward step. For that reason I must vote against the second reading of the Bill.

Mr. STUBBS (Wagin) [12.53]: The most important measure that has come before Parliament during the present session is now under discussion. The Bill has been brought in at the eleventh hour, and hon. members are expected at this stage to go fully into the measure, applying to it all the intelligence they are possessed of, in order that a suitable means of dealing with an important question may be placed on the statute-book. Before embarking on a criticism of that measure, let me say to the Premier that it would be well, after the second reading has been carried—I understand from the expressions of opinion given by many members that the second reading will be passed—to refer the Bill to a select committee. I hope the hon. gentleman will accept that advice in the spirit in which it is tendered to him. I am confident there are members of this Chamber who will be prepared to afford the Government all possible assistance through a select committee which can become a Royal Commission after the session closes. There is absolutely no possibility of the measure receiving adequate consideration between now and the close of the session. To have the Bill carefully considered by a select committee would result in a measure of far greater value than that which the Premier is now seeking to pass into law. Eleven years ago, the present Licensing Act was under consideration for many weeks both in this Chamber and in the Upper House. One or two of the main principles of the Act are well worth remembering. A time limit was provided for hotelkeepers rather than monetary compensation. It was provided that in April 1921 a referendum of the people had to be taken, and if any district voted in favour of a reduction of licenses, it was competent for the licensing authorities to de-license the required number of hotels in the district affected. The present Bill contemplates the appointment of a board to control all licenses in the future, to decrease the number of licenses in existence, and to award monetary compensation to those hotelkeepers who will have to go out of business in consequence of the operation of the measure. I remember well the debates that took place regarding the Licensing Act and the controversy that raged through the columns of the Press. Various organisations “slang-wanged” all and sundry who did not see eye to eye with them regarding the fairness or otherwise of the legislation. At that time, I considered the legislation was effective. In my opinion, no law will ever be passed in Western Australia which will have the effect of prohibiting the sale of liquor here. I believe Western Australia should go in for a greater consumption of liquor than at present, more particularly in the direction of light wines. Far too much whisky is consumed in this State. One has only to go to the Continent and see what goes

on in Italy, France, and Spain where light wines are consumed to a greater extent to realise the almost total absence of drunkenness in the streets. It would be an eye-opener to anyone accustomed to what we see in Perth to observe the way the people drink in those countries. I feel confident that we can produce far better wines than are sold in France or Spain or Italy. Wine is a beverage that should be on everyone's table. So long as I am connected with public life in Western Australia, I will not advocate the abolition of drinks, such as light wines. I regret the system which has grown up under which so many adults prefer to drink whisky and other spirits, rather than the light wines, the consumption of which would assist our people who own vineyards in various parts of the State. I am in accord with many of the remarks of the member for Kanowna (Hon. T. Walker), particularly when he stated that over-indulgence in alcohol and spirits tended to decrease the will power of the individual. I hope the time is not far distant when these heavy alcoholic beverages, which are mostly obtainable in hotels, will be rejected in favour of light wines. It is useless to go into all the clauses of the Bill at such an early hour of the morning, but there are one or two points I desire to mention. During the many years I have been identified with public life in Western Australia, I was closely associated at one period with several clubs in the city. I remember that the membership of some of those clubs consisted largely of boys from 18 to 21 years of age, who were fond of yachting and aquatic sports on the Swan River. One thing that struck me at the time was that the boys used to make a habit of meeting on Saturday nights and indulging in not one or two glasses of ale, which would not have done them any harm, but they evidenced a tendency to take more than was good for them. I regret to state that some of them acquired the habit of taking too much liquor, and in after years this led to their downfall. As a member of several clubs now, I know that some are not conducted as they should be. Whatever form the legislation finally takes, I consider some measure of reform could be achieved in eliminating some of the objectionable features which characterise the conduct of some clubs in Western Australia. Clubs should close their strangers' rooms at the same time as the ordinary hotelkeeper has to close his premises, particularly seeing that the latter has to pay higher fees in respect of his privileges. Sunday trading in some clubs should be placed on the same footing as in the hotels. Such reform would be to the advantage of everyone concerned. I do not see eye to eye with the Premier when he says that he should receive from £140,000 to £160,000 in revenue from the trade. There is such a thing as killing the goose that lays the golden egg. Just as surely as the provision for 9 per cent. be-

comes law, will the publicans pass on the imposition on their business takings to the consuming public. Should that be so, instead of paying 9d. or 10d. for a nobbler of whisky, the consumer will have to pay 1s. or 1s. 2d. If the Premier would be satisfied with 5 per cent. or 6 per cent. on the liquor consumed, he would secure a much larger revenue, because if the enhanced prices rule as I predict, men will refrain from drinking. The hotelkeepers will not be game to raise their prices beyond the present scale, whereas if nine per cent. is imposed they will be compelled to charge more. In Committee some amendment ought to be made of the proposed fees. Another thing unfair in the Bill is the tax the hotelkeeper has to pay on the duty paid on spirits. That tax ought to be left out altogether. The imposition of six per cent. would bring in at least £100,000 per annum. I hope the Premier will not force the Bill through in its present form, because it contains a number of objectionable provisions which call for considerable discussion. I will support the second reading in the hope that the Premier will allow the Bill to go to a select committee. Then, at the beginning of the next session, aided by the report of that select committee, we shall be able to produce a really desirable measure.

Mr. RICHARDSON (Subiaco) [1.12]: After all the deputations that have waited on Ministers in respect of the liquor question, and the arguments indulged in at election time, one would have thought the Government would bring down a measure bristling with reform. I have searched the Bill, but I fail to see in it any great reform. I agree with the member for North-East Fremantle (Hon. W. C. Angwin) that there is discernible right through the Bill a distinctly retrograde tendency. There does not appear to be any desire on the part of the Premier for real reform. Therefore, I will vote against the second reading, for I believe a measure entirely suitable to the requirements of the people could have been brought down. Recently a poll on this question was taken throughout the State, as a result of which we are familiar with the views of the majority of the people. It is because of that, I say a suitable Bill could have been framed. In all probability the Bill will pass the second reading, but in Committee I will have a good deal more to say. The Premier could not have been sincere in urging reform. In my opinion he has introduced the Bill with the sole object of gaining revenue. It is a clumsy way of achieving that purpose, and I feel inclined to oppose any taxation in this direction, because there are other direct and more equitable means of raising revenue. I am prepared to help the Government get money in other directions but not through the Bill. The Bill provides for the taking of a local option poll, it is true, but provision is also made that a three-fifths

majority must be gained to carry a question. I am entirely opposed to anything but a simple majority. Those interested in the trade say that drink is a good thing for the State, while on the other hand temperance reformers declare that it is absolutely bad. I am not prepared to say whether it is good or bad. The Government, by providing for a poll, show that they do not feel themselves qualified to decide whether drink is good or bad, and so they prefer to leave it to the people. If the Government are prepared to allow the people to settle the question, then in my view it should be settled on a simple majority, as would be any other question. Again, the Bill provides that when a poll is taken 30 per cent. of the electors on the roll must vote in favour of a resolution before it can be carried. Why was this provision inserted? If the electors are so apathetic as to neglect to turn up and vote, surely it is their own fault, and not the fault of the Government. It is entirely wrong for the Government to say to those interested, whether the liquor trade or the temperance people, "You must provide a 30 per cent. vote or else no notice will be taken of the poll." It will be said that the three-fifths majority is insisted upon so that there shall be no necessity for taking the poll over again, in case some districts go dry in the first instance. If we are going to base our arguments on that, they will not hold good for a minute, because those who are interested in the liquor trade will not be prevented from endeavouring to take a poll as to whether the trade should be reinstated. It does not matter what the majority is. If we are going to have democratic government in Western Australia, questions of this kind referred to the people should be decided by a simple majority of the actual people voting at the poll. If the Government want to go further why do not they introduce compulsory voting?

Mr. Johnston: Subiaco would be dry on that basis.

Mr. RICHARDSON: Possibly, but that would not bother me. I do not care which way it goes. However, I contend that this is not a democratic measure; therefore I trust that if the Bill reaches Committee, there will be sufficient members democratic enough to say that the vote shall be decided by a simple majority. Practically the whole of the Bill has been discussed. I followed the remarks of the member for North-East Fremantle (Hon. W. C. Angwin) very carefully and, in a general way, I endorse what he said regarding this great question. This Bill has become so mixed and involved in various ways that it will take days and probably weeks of work in Committee before it can be straightened out, and before a majority of the members will be able to understand precisely what it aims at. Therefore, I trust the Premier will accept the suggestion of the member for Wagin (Mr. Stubbis) and refer the Bill to a select committee or Royal Commission with a view to framing a measure

to bring about reforms and give satisfaction to a majority of the people. After travelling through the whole of Australia. I have come to the conclusion that the hotels in Western Australia are as well if not better conducted than those in the other States, and the same applies to the clubs. However, it is not a question whether they are well conducted or otherwise. The question which is creating greatest interest at present is whether the liquor trade is to be continued or not. Evidently the Government recognise this, because they are prepared to take a poll. It is possible to bring about many reforms in the trade. Where a reduction is made and where prohibition is put on one side, many reforms which have been indicated by various speakers might be made. But I agree with other members that it is an impossible proposition to allow a new board to be created—call it a reduction board, a licensing bench or what we will.

Hon. P. Collier: As a matter of fact its work during the first three years will be increasing and not decreasing licenses, because they will have no money for reduction purposes.

Mr. RICHARDSON: I agree with the Leader of the Opposition. The member for Pilbara (Mr. Underwood) remarked the other night that there were still a few people in Western Australia who were not yet on a board. Perhaps the Premier has taken this point into consideration, and wants to provide seats on a board for a few more people. I am opposed to the creation of any new board under this measure. While I cannot hope that the Bill will be defeated on the second reading, I intend to vote against it by way of protest, because I believe it has been brought down, not with the idea of instituting any reform, but purely and simply as means for gaining further revenue.

Mr. BOYLAND (Kalgoorlie) [1.25]: The member for Subiaco (Mr. Richardson) has said there is no virtue in the Bill. From what I have heard, there seems to be a lot of virtue in it. The measure seems to have pleased a lot of people. The element who do not want the drink traffic at all are rather pleased that such high duty is to be placed upon it. There are publicans who are pleased regarding the bona fide traveller clause, and there is another element who are pleased because of the proposed constitution of a licenses reduction board. I am told that, generally speaking, the temperance party are highly satisfied with the measure; consequently there must be a good deal of virtue in the Bill.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: Did you get a letter from the temperance people to-day?

Mr. BOYLAND: No.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: I received two sheets of proposed amendments from them.

Mr. Richardson: Then evidently there is too much virtue in the Bill.

Mr. BOYLAND: Anything I say on this measure I say from conviction; I do not speak for any particular party. I quite agree with what the member for Kanowna (Hon. T. Walker) said. The high ideals of Labour will be consummated when sobriety is practised by labour. I thoroughly believe in that. When we look around the community and at the homes of the people in the higher social scale who are able to live on a better standard than the workers, we do not find a hotel near their doors, but when we go amongst the workers, we find a hotel in nearly every street. Why is this so? To drag them down and keep them down and get revenue from them; and, as a worker, who has lived amongst workers, I most strongly object to this kind of thing.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: This Bill will result in putting more in.

Mr. BOYLAND: It will be put on to the workers in this way: If they consume liquor to a greater extent than other sections of the community, they will have to pay to a greater extent.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: I mean that this Bill will result in putting more hotels among them.

Mr. BOYLAND: That is so.

Mr. Davies: Where do you get that from?

Mr. BOYLAND: From Clause 39; residents may apply by petition and the number of licenses may be increased. A good deal has been said about the poor miner coming off shift and wanting his pot of beer. A strong healthy man coming off shift can stand that pot of beer, but when miners' complaint begins to affect that man, and he still takes his pot of beer, it is merely helping him to find an earlier grave. I speak with authority, for I can say that every medical man whom I have had to consult during my illnesses laid down as one of the first essentials that I should not touch the accursed drink, because it plays up so severely with the constitution of a man whose health is on the decline. On the goldfields, especially during war, we found that the efficiency of the men engaged in the mining industry was impaired as a result of drink, and as late as to-day I heard of men who were fond of their glass of whisky and soda and had voted for prohibition owing to the inefficiency produced by the consumption of alcohol. We had in the Gwalia district a mine which was just about closed down. The company threatened to close down for some period if the State hotel was not better controlled. That proves the want of efficiency, and that it was caused through the liquor traffic. My district voted for continuance. One has to consider that element in the vote which was put before the people. I do not say it was a democratic vote, but one has to consider the majority of the electors who vote. I am out to do that which democracy says should be done. So far as the three-fifths majority vote is concerned, during the election campaign in Kalgoorlie I stated that as a democrat I was

thoroughly opposed to that system. We are elected to this House on a simple majority vote. We should, therefore, carry out this principle in respect to other things. It is provided in the Bill that the manner of voting shall be similar to that followed in the election of members to serve in the Legislative Assembly. In another part of the Bill it provides that a bare majority of residents can present a petition to have an hotel or club license granted. I do not understand the anomaly in Clause 39. Why should a three-fifths majority be required for the closing down of hotels? It is not democratic, and should not appear in the Bill. I believe in compensation. By previous Acts and by this Bill we are countenancing the liquor traffic. If the majority of the people say they will have it, they shall get it so far as I am concerned. As a democrat, I must go with the majority of the people. Those who enter into the business and are put out of it by the vote of the people should be compensated for their loss, for the reason that the trade has been countenanced by the Government. With respect to the closing hours, opinions are rather mixed in my district. Some people want the hours from 9 till 11 and others from 9 to 9. Much depends on the conditions concerning the particular business. The 9 to 9 closing house would be preferable to the majority of the licensees on the Eastern Goldfields. Most of them have to run their business with the help of their families, and find those hours quite long enough for them. Medical men have told me that the less I have to do with drink, the better it will be for me and the longer I will live. I have seen men go down within a few months and die because they have been heavy drinkers. They would have their pots when they were ill. An illustration of this was afforded to us the other night by the member for Kanowna (Hon. T. Walker). It is no good members saying that a miner should have his pot of beer. He can have thousands of pots if he likes, but the drink will do him no good unless he is strong enough to stand up to it. If he is ailing it will have a bad effect upon him. This is a Committee Bill, and no doubt will be torn to pieces when it reaches that stage. In the meantime I intend to support the second reading.

Mr. SAMPSON (Swan) [1.35]: The 8 per cent. which it is proposed to charge to the trade is unreasonably high, especially when we remember that added to this there will be 1 per cent. for compensation. This will make it increasingly difficult for licensed houses to be conducted on good lines. I am pleased to see that provision is being made for a license reduction board. This is a step in the right direction, and will do more towards advancing the principles of temperance than anything else in the Bill. Local option has proved a failure. As we know, the result of the vote is that hotels in outlying districts are being closed, and those in more closely settled centres are remaining open. There

have been no reductions in congested areas. The clause which will have the effect of doing away with bona-fide travellers may be necessary so far as Perth, Fremantle and perhaps other closely settled centres are concerned, but it will create a hardship in many country districts. A traveller proceeding either to York, or Northam, for instance, should reasonably expect to be able to obtain some refreshments when he gets there. Under the Bill, unless he becomes a lodger, he cannot obtain such refreshment. No evil can arise if food and drink are taken in moderation. A lodger can have drink with his meals, and if a traveller becomes a lodger and is registered, he may also obtain a drink. Doctors assert that there is just as much injury caused to the human system by over-eating as by excessive drinking. I do not suggest there should be excessive drinking. The wise man is he who sips at the pleasures of life, and exercises temperance in all things. Under local option there is no provision with regard to giving the local wine growers the right to buy and sell wine and spirits for maturing and blending purposes in those districts where local option is carried. If provision is not made along these lines the industry concerned will be in danger of dying out. The local wine making industry is an important one. There is another phase of the matter which has been overlooked. A charge of 8 per cent. is to be made on purchases of wines and spirits for blending, and this has again to be paid by the purchaser when it is added to the wine sold to the consumer. I do not know how the difficulty regarding bona fide travellers is to be got over, but undoubtedly one duty which we owe to the people, and particularly the country residents and those who travel in the country, is to provide something in this respect, because the cutting out of the bona fide section will impose a hardship upon the two classes I have mentioned; and they, in effect, mean practically the whole of the community. I shall vote for the second reading.

Mr. MUNSIE (Hannans) [1.41 a.m.]: At this early hour of the morning I shall not detain the House very long, but I cannot let the second reading go without entering my protest against the introduction of so important a measure as this, either by the present Government or any other Government, within eight days of the close of the session. I ask the Premier, is it fair to call upon hon. members to consider the Bill at this stage of the session? At least a week will be required by this House to deal with the measure. I do not say that because I have any intention of stone-walling it. But even if half the members of this House never opened their mouths while the Bill was in Committee, it could not get to another place earlier than this day week. Then the other place would have to manage the first reading, the second reading, the Committee stage, and the third reading within two days. By such methods good legislation cannot be produced. De-

putations with reference to the licensing law of the country waited upon the Government weeks before Parliament met for this session, and I want to know why the Government have held back the Bill to this late stage. I cannot assign any genuine reason for the delay, except that it is due to pure neglect. And now the Government call upon members to pass the Bill without our having time to consider it, and without the people having time to realise what the Bill, if passed, will mean to them. A good deal has been said about the Victorian legislation of which this Bill is stated to be a copy. I have read the Bill right through twice or thrice, in addition to going through it once side by side with the principal Act in order to discover the divergencies. While I admit that several clauses of the Bill are like those of the Victorian measure, the principles of the Victorian Act are not to be found in this Bill at all. My honest opinion is many members are under a misconception regarding the real nature of the Victorian measure. I have heard hon. members here say that the reduction board of Victoria have done splendid work, inasmuch as they have reduced the number of licenses in small areas, where they are not required. But that statement is incorrect.

Mr. Davies: It was published in the Press.

Mr. MUNSIE: I do not care what was published in the Press. A member of the Victorian board was in Western Australia within the last three months, and I had the pleasure of a couple of hours' conversation with that gentleman. He told me that the Victorian system was out of date, and now absolutely useless, for the simple reason that at the last general election the Victorian people voted for continuance. Thus the board cannot reduce the number of hotels by even one. In a portion of Melbourne which is called the slum area, I suppose because members of the working classes reside there, not one license has been taken away. The Victorian people had the opportunity of voting either continuance, or reduction, or abolition; and they voted for continuance. The Victorian system is an absolute farce and failure. Let me give an illustration: In one licensing district there were only two hotels, and these were the two finest country hotels in the entire State of Victoria. They were admitted by the licensing bench to be two of the best conducted hotels in Victoria. On the other hand, in the city of Melbourne, there are numerous little hotels built 40 or 50 years ago, and by no means complying with the conditions of the licensing law of modern days. But there they are, with their licenses; and the people voted continuance, and so these hotels have to remain. But that Victorian country district with the two palatial hotels voted "no license," and those two hotels had to be closed. The present Victorian system means that there may be four different atmospheres in Bourke-street, Melbourne: dry on one side, and wet on the other side, in Bourke-street east; and wet on one side, and dry on the other side, in Bourke-street west. Under the Victorian Act, conditions are much worse than those now prevailing here.

Mr. Davies: Do you know how many hotels the Victorian board have closed in Melbourne?

Mr. MUNSIE: Yes; 330. Does the hon. member know how many hotels they have closed

in Port Melbourne? They have closed none there, because Port Melbourne voted continuance.

Mr. Davies: The board have closed 900 odd hotels.

Mr. MUNSIE: They closed them where it was not necessary to close them.

Mr. Davies: Do you contend that the board ought to be supreme over the people?

Mr. MUNSIE: Either there is no necessity for a board such as this Bill proposes to create, or there is no necessity for a board in a State like Victoria, the licensing districts in which consist of small areas. We must either have the board and give them power, or let the people have that power themselves. Even with the provisions as they stand now, the board could only close about 80 per cent. of the hotels. If they had full jurisdiction, they could do much better work than under the Victorian system. I mention this fact because so many hon. members have lauded the Government for introducing the system in Western Australia and copying that of Victoria. If I had the opportunity of deciding between the Victorian system or that which operates to-day in Western Australia, I would prefer our system, in the interests of the people themselves. Under the Bill the Government propose to create a board. That board cannot do anything but increase licenses for three years.

Mr. Davies: No; the Bill says the board cannot increase the number of licenses where the people voted for reduction or no license.

Mr. MUNSIE: Yes, I admit that, but how many districts around the metropolitan area are affected? The Leederville, Canning, and Claremont licensing districts voted for reduction. Continuance was favoured in every other licensing district in the metropolitan suburban area. It must be remembered that the greater portion of Leederville is not included in the Leederville licensing district, but is included in the Subiaco-Leederville district who voted for continuance. To that extent, the board cannot reduce licenses there within three years, but have only power to increase them.

Mr. Johnston: Unless "no license" were carried.

Mr. MUNSIE: And the people cannot vote on that question for another three years. Thus, the only right we are giving the board under the Bill is as I suggest. The people are only to have the right to vote on one question. We are not to give them the right to vote for continuance or reduction, but on the one question of no license.

Mr. Davies: You are wrong there again. If the people do not vote no-license, they vote continuance.

Mr. MUNSIE: That is so, but under the present conditions they can vote reduction and still have the licenses increased.

Hon. P. Collier: The people can vote continuance and the board can reduce.

Mr. MUNSIE: Of course they can.

Hon. P. Collier: The board can shut up every license in the district, although the people have voted continuance.

Mr. MUNSIE: The whole Bill wants re-drafting. The Premier may laugh, but that is the position.

The Minister for Agriculture: They want the Bill in Kalgoorlie.

Mr. MUNSIE: Why?

The Minister for Agriculture: To get compensation.

Mr. MUNSIE: Of course.

Mr. Heron: In any case, they do not want it there.

Mr. MUNSIE: They want compensation although they have had the ten years' provision in existence! It has been stated that the people voted for continuance in order to get greater reduction, but I cannot understand how that argument can be advanced.

Mr. Davies: They may have a good explanation.

Mr. MUNSIE: Reference has been made to the revenue to be obtained under the Bill. If we give the Premier the whole of his anticipations in that connection, he will only get £17,000 per annum on account of the one per cent. payment to the compensation fund. The whole of the expenses of the board constitute the first charge upon the fund. The Premier anticipates that those charges will not amount to more than £3,000. I think the Premier is as far out in that estimate, as he is regarding his estimate of what he will get in the aggregate from the Bill. As time goes on, he will naturally get less and less. Admitting the expenses will only reach £3,000, however, that leaves £14,000 on account of the one per cent. payment. Leaving Kalgoorlie and Boulder out of the question altogether, how many hotels will that amount provide for? If that amount were to be applied in the Kalgoorlie and Boulder districts, £14,000 would compensate for the closing of a considerable number of hotels there. Taking the metropolitan suburban area, however, how many hotels would that amount cover? It would not provide for more than two or three hotels.

Hon. P. Collier: They will be as much entitled to it as the licensees whose premises may be shut up next March.

Mr. MUNSIE: That is so. I have not heard any hon. member referring to the Victorian system draw attention to the fact that at the outset of the system in that State the Government provided a lump sum to inaugurate the system. By that means, the reduction board had money to work upon from the very outset.

Hon. P. Collier: Could we apply our deficit in that direction?

Mr. MUNSIE: That would not be a bad scheme. The Victorian Government provided that fund from either Consolidated Revenue or loan moneys.

Mr. Davies: You do not advocate that in connection with this Bill?

Mr. MUNSIE: No. In addition to that, the Victorian Government gave the board all the fines and fees collected in connection with the liquor trade.

Mr. Mann: They do not do that now.

Mr. MUNSIE: No, but they did so at the start. Then hon. members get up and praise the Government for introducing the Victorian system, when in fact it is being done only in name, and nothing can be effected for three years.

Mr. Davies: Distant fields look greenest.

Mr. MUNSIE: That is so. It is an anomaly to call the board a licenses reduction board when, as a matter of fact, all that the board can do for the next three

years will be to increase licenses. They cannot reduce licenses, because they have no money with which to pay compensation. I am not too keen on monetary compensation. For the nine years I have been in Parliament I have been a strong believer in time compensation.

Mr. Mann: It is never too late to mend.

Mr. MUNSIE: In my opinion it is a great pity compensation was not introduced 10 years ago, when the Licensing Act was passed. If the Bill gets into Committee I hope it will be possible to reduce the standard of liquor, which in this State is much too high. In England to-day the standard is 35 per cent. under proof, whereas we insist upon 25 per cent. A man in the trade has told me that no genuine business man with any respect for himself or his business would go below 22½ per cent. under proof, notwithstanding which the law says it must be 25 per cent. under proof and no further. I hope the Committee will be able to devise some means to reduce the strength of the liquor consumed in Western Australia.

Mr. Johnston: It is 35 per cent. under proof in South Australia.

Mr. MUNSIE: Yes, but there are conditions attached.

Mr. Mann: In South Australia it is the same as in England, namely 35 per cent. under proof.

Mr. MUNSIE: I realise the possibility of many of the whisky firms objecting to a reduction of the standard in Western Australia. However, their objection would make for the benefit of the people. There are one or two good provisions in the Bill. The best is that dealing with clubs, which I think ought to be brought under the conditions governing hotels. Men say "It is all very well proposing that clubs shall be brought under the conditions relating to hotels, but what is a single man to do, the man who has no home?" In my opinion, if we were to abolish clubs there would be fewer single men in Western Australia.

Mrs. Cowan: Hear, hear!

Mr. MUNSIE: And that would be a very good thing for the State. I hold no brief for the able-bodied single man. We have in this State plenty of young women capable of becoming the finest wives and mothers in the world. I have no time for the young man who remains single. Let him get married and, if possible, rear a family.

Mr. Johnston: It is not always the single man's fault.

Mrs. Cowan: Yes, it is.

Mr. MUNSIE: In 99 cases of every 100 it is. Either the man himself is too mean to keep a wife, or he is too bashful to propose to a maid. In some cases of course, he is too bad a character for any woman to accept.

Mr. SPEAKER: I do not know that this has anything to do with the Bill.

Mr. MUNSIE: No, other than it relates to single men congregating in clubs.

Mr. Johnston: Of the three classes you mention, I should prefer to be among the bashful.

Mr. MUNSIE: I can assure the hon. member that I do not class him with the bashful men. We can do more with this Bill in Committee than on the second reading. I hope the Bill will not become law during this session.

Mr. Mann: Why put off the evil day?

Mr. MUNSIE: Because we shall have an altogether better measure introduced next time. I do not think it possible to make a good Bill of this one, even in Committee. It is not really a reform Bill; it is purely a Bill for the purpose of raising extra revenue. There again, I want to enter a protest against a proposal to tax the excise and import duty on the liquor, as well as the liquor itself. That is entirely unfair. The Swan Brewery charges £4 12s. for a hogshead of beer. Added to that is the duty of £4 11s., or a total of £9 3s. The Premier proposes to collect 9 per cent. on the £9 3s.

Mr. Boyland: That is why some people like the Bill.

Mr. MUNSIE: Some of the temperance people would like the Bill for that reason, because if it became law, instead of the Premier deriving £110,000 extra revenue from it, he would scarcely get 110,000 shillings. I say this because we may raise the price of a luxury to such a figure that people will not buy it, and I take it that no one will argue that drink is not, to an extent, a luxury. If this 9 per cent. is added, the price will be increased, and I believe that less drink will then be consumed. This probably will be a good thing for the community. I endorse the remarks of the member for Kanowna. I am not a wowser; I have a drink when I feel so inclined and I know when to stop, but in the interests of the working class people, not only in this State but the world over, it would be a Godsend if drink were cut out altogether. I oppose the second reading.

Mr. HARRISON (Avon) [2.11]: I support the Bill.

Mr. MONEY (Bunbury) [2.12]: One cannot fail to feel rather perturbed when contemplating the volume of work which this House will be called upon to do before Christmas. We are now dealing with a Bill to amend an Act containing over 200 sections, and we have to consider numerous amendments to that amending Bill. This Bill contains no fewer than 74 clauses bearing on a contentious subject which, when it was before the House in 1911, occupied members' attention for some four or five weeks.

Mr. Munsie: The Licensing Bill and the Redistribution of Seats Bill on that occasion occupied over three months.

Mr. MONEY: Realising the impossibility of giving full consideration before Christmas to a subject embracing 15 or 16 different licenses, I suggest that the Bill be reduced to two clauses. One of these should provide to reduce the standard of liquor, and thereby reduce the drinking propensities of the community, because the very object of liquor legislation and reform is to reduce intoxication among the people. Therefore, if we reduce the standard of liquor, as has been done elsewhere, the outcome will be a more temperate people. The second object of the Bill is to raise revenue. In this House a dozen methods have been suggested as to what should be done, as to who is to pay and how much should be paid. I would balance the standard of liquor with the revenue required. As the standard of liquor was reduced, say from 25 to 35, I would impose on the profits a tax and make the two equal. I think it is impossible to deal with the measure this session, and I suggest that the Bill be reduced to two clauses in the way I have indicated.

Mr. LUTEY (Brownhill-Ivanhoe) [2.14]: I intend to vote against the second reading of the Bill. I regard it as a taxation measure and, as such, I object to it, because there are other ways in which the Premier could have raised additional revenue. In the Closer Settlement Bill the Premier could have provided for the taxation of unimproved land values as means of raising revenue. It is proposed to impose taxation of 8 per cent. on the whole of the purchases. When £600,000 represents taxation by the Federal authorities, it is absolutely wrong that this amount which goes to the Commonwealth Treasury should be taxed a second time. So long as the profits from the liquor traffic are paid into general revenue, we shall always be faced with the present position. I would support a measure providing that all profits from the liquor traffic be set apart for a specific purpose, instead of being paid into Consolidated Revenue as now. The desire for profits from the liquor consumed on the railway dining cars is probably responsible for much of the bad management of these cars. There was an attempt to set the Perth section against the Kalgoorlie section, and I was informed that on one occasion the profit was over 300 per cent. It is wrong that this should be so, and the wrong will continue so long as the profits are paid into general revenue instead of being earmarked for a particular purpose, thus preventing the Government from profiteering even more than business people. In a State like Western Australia, the liquor question is largely a geographical question. What may suit the metropolitan area or the South-West may not be suitable at Wyndham or on the goldfields. What may suit one particular section of the community may not suit the whole of the community. Special attention should be devoted to the class of liquor supplied. It has been said—I cannot vouch for

the truth of the statement—that a brewery in this State advertised for a brewer, who, after making inquiries, refused to take the appointment, remarking "What you want is a chemist, not a brewer."

Mr. Sampson: Which brewery was that?

Mr. LUTEY: I am not mentioning the name. Sometime ago the liquor manufactured in this State compared more than favourably with that manufactured in the Eastern States. The fact of this measure being brought before the House at such a late period of the session reminds one of the old saying that the sting of the scorpion is in the tail. There is a bad sting in this tail-end of the session legislation, and I only wish I could say something sufficiently stinging to cause the Premier to withdraw the Bill. If this were done, much fuller consideration could be given to this important question than will be possible at this stage of the session. Unlike the Leader of the Country Party, who contented himself by merely stating that he supported the Bill, I thought it advisable to express my views a little more fully.

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

Ayes	22
Noes	13
Majority for				9

AYES.

Mr. Angelo	Mr. Mann
Mr. Boyland	Sir James Mitchell
Mr. Broun	Mr. Money
Mr. Carter	Mr. Pickering
Mrs. Cowan	Mr. Plesse
Mr. Davles	Mr. Sampson
Mr. Durack	Mr. J. H. Smith
Mr. Gibson	Mr. Stubbs
Mr. Harrison	Mr. Teesdale
Mr. Hickmott	Mr. Mullany
Mr. Johnston	(Teller.)
Mr. H. K. Maley	

NOES.

Mr. Angwin	Mr. Munslie
Mr. Chesson	Mr. Richardson
Mr. Collier	Mr. J. M. Smith
Mr. Corboy	Mr. Troy
Mr. Heron	Mr. Wilson
Mr. Lutey	Mr. Willcock
Mr. McCallum	(Teller.)

PAIRS.

Mr. Denton	Mr. Clydesdale
Mr. George	Mr. Underwood
Mr. A. Thomson	Mr. Lambert

Question thus passed.

Bill read a second time.

House adjourned at 2.24 a.m. (Thursday).