

## AYES.

Hon. A. Burvill  
Hon. J. J. Holmes  
Hon. J. Mills

Hon. H. Stewart  
Hon. F. E. S. Willmott  
Hon. V. Hamersley  
(Teller.)

## NOES.

Hon. H. Boon  
Hon. H. P. Colebatch  
Hon. J. M. Macfarlane  
Hon. J. Nicholson

Hon. E. Rose  
Hon. A. J. H. Saw  
Hon. H. Seddon  
Hon. F. A. Baglin  
(Teller.)

Amendment as amended thus negatived.

The clause, as previously amended, put and passed.

Clause 7—Acquisition of land:

Hon. V. HAMERSLEY: I move an amendment—

That after "may," in line 2, the following be inserted:—"Within the next three months after such default."

The owner elects to do certain things. If he fails to carry them out, the Governor should have a limited time in which to take action.

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: I have no objection to the amendment.

Amendment put and passed.

Hon. H. STEWART: There are several important points in this clause. Mr. Baxter, who has an amendment to move, has been called away on account of illness. I suggest that the Minister report progress.

Progress reported.

House adjourned at 10.53 p.m.

## QUESTION—STORM-WATER DRAINS, FREMANTLE.

Mr. GIBSON asked the Minister for Water Supply: 1, What is the capital cost of each storm-water drain in the Fremantle municipality? 2, What is the amount of revenue received by the Government by way of storm-water rate for each of the above drains? 3, How long do the Government intend to place that charge on the ratepayers?

The MINISTER FOR WATER SUPPLY replied: 1, Howard Street, £6,599; Essex Street, £11,702; Cliff Street, £1,328; Lefroy Road, £5,332; Philimore and Market Streets, £2,603; James Street, £1,796; total, £29,360. 2, Separate accounts are not kept for each drain. Total revenue from storm-water rates from date rates were first levied to 30/6/22, £20,288. 3, Rates will be levied for at least 50 years, but it is not possible to indicate the position after this period has elapsed.

## QUESTION—RAILWAY EXCURSION FARES.

*Sundays and Holidays.*

Mr. MUNSIE (for Mr. Lutey) asked the Minister for Railways: 1, Why are Sundays and holidays excluded from the issue of cheap excursions in the metropolitan area? 2, Are tickets not to be issued from stations between Subiaco and Fremantle? 3, If so, why?

The MINISTER FOR RAILWAYS: 1, Because the Arbitration Court has prescribed penalty rates of pay for these days. 2, No. 3, Because the ordinary fare for this short distance is so low that reduction is not warranted.

## QUESTION—MABLE CASE.

Mr. JOHNSTON asked the Premier: 1, Will he, in accordance with his promise, state what decision was arrived at in the case of Thomas Mable? 2, Is it his intention to lay on the Table of the House the report of Mr. Grogan on his recent investigation into this case?

The PREMIER replied: 1, I made no such promise. I said the matter was receiving consideration and would be finalised in a day or two. 2, No.

## QUESTION—COPPER SEPARATION, NEVILLE PROCESS.

Mr. CORBOY asked the Minister for Mines: 1, In view of the successful experiments with the Neville copper separation process, are the Government doing anything to make that process available to ore producers in this State? 2, If not, what do the Government intend to do in the matter? 3, Is it intended to use the process to obtain the produce from ore at present stacked in the Phillips River District?

The MINISTER FOR MINES replied: 1, The Government are keeping in close touch

## Legislative Assembly,

Tuesday, 12th December, 1922.

	PAGE
Questions: Storm Water Drains, Fremantle ...	2135
Railway Excursion rates ...	2135
Mable case ...	2135
Copper separation, Neville process ...	2135
Railway, Pithara-Eastward ...	2136
Bills: Northampton Reserves, 1R. ...	2136
Land and Income Tax Assessment Amendment, recomittal ...	2136
Land Tax and Income Tax, Com. ...	2141
Licensing Act Amendment, Council's Amendments ...	2142
Annual Estimates: Vote discussed—Metropolitan Water Supply, Sewerage, and Drainage ...	2158

The DEPUTY SPEAKER took the Chair at 2.30 p.m., and read prayers.

with the company, which they have assisted with laboratory tests, and the company in turn are advising us of all matters of interest; but the point where a definite announcement can be made has not yet been reached in regard to the application of the process on a large scale. 2 and 3, Answered by No. 1.

## QUESTION—RAILWAY, PITHARA EASTWARD.

### *Advisory Board's Report.*

Mr. J. H. SMITH (for Mr. C. C. Maley) asked the Premier: Is it his intention to lay on the Table of the House the report of the Railway Advisory Board on a railway eastward from Pithara?

The PREMIER replied: Yes.

## BILL—NORTHAMPTON RESERVES.

Introduced by the Minister for Agriculture, and read a first time.

## BILL—LAND AND INCOME TAX ASSESSMENT AMENDMENT.

To Recommit.

Order read for consideration of the report of Committee.

The PREMIER (Hon. Sir James Mitchell—Northam) [2.38]: I move—

That the Bill be recommitted for the purpose of further considering Clauses 2 and 6.

The amendment carried in Clause 2 at the instance of the member for Murchison (Mr. Marshall) will have the effect of exempting every man over 65 years of age, no matter what his income, so long as he works for a day or two and earns a pound or two annually. If the Bill is recommitted, I desire to have Clause 2 amended so that it will apply only to men 65 years of age and upwards whose incomes are less than £250, which is the point at which, under the Bill, consideration with regard to income tax is to cease. Many of our richest men are over 65.

Hon. P. Collier: Do you not think they are finding it pretty hard to get along?

The PREMIER: Does the hon. member think so? As regards the new clause inserted at the instance of the Leader of the Opposition, which provides in the case of married people for an exemption of £200 disappearing at the rate of £1 for every £3 of income above the £200, and thus disappearing entirely at £300, I think the provision goes too far. If that clause is allowed to remain in the Bill, the annual loss of revenue will be £73,000, as I have ascertained. The object of the House is to relieve people on the lower

rungs of the ladder. If the Bill is recommitted, I shall propose an exemption for married people of £200 a year, disappearing at the rate of £2 for every £1 of income above the £200, which means that the exemption will disappear at £250. I make this explanation because hon. members will naturally want to know what is the object of the Government in proposing that the Bill be recommitted. A man receiving an income of £800 a year should certainly pay something towards the taxation of the country, and the new clause, as it stands, would benefit a man on that financial level.

Hon. P. COLLIER (Boulder) [2.42]: I do not think the House would be justified in recommitting the Bill. The vote taken on the new clause last week was a deliberate one. It was taken in a full House, with 43 members accounted for; or, having regard to his Honour the Speaker and the Chairman of Committees, 45 accounted for. It is very rarely indeed that the House records a greater vote than 45. The position was clearly explained when the amendment was moved. In speaking to the first new clause, which was defeated by one or two votes, and also in speaking to the new clause which was carried, the Premier stated definitely what the loss of revenue would be, so that every member who took part in the two divisions did so with a clear understanding of the situation. I do not know that the Premier expects any member who recorded a vote on that occasion to reverse his decision to-day. It may be, of course, that there are members present now who were not here on the occasion of those divisions, and whose votes might influence the result; but even if the Premier feels dissatisfied, as naturally he might, with the result of the division on the second new clause, it would be open to the Government to attempt to have the Bill amended in another place.

The Premier: That cannot be done.

Hon. P. COLLIER: Yes, it can. This Bill has been ruled to be in order on the ground that it is not a money Bill, that it does not impose a tax. Even if it were a money Bill, another place could request amendments. That is a course which the other place has frequently adopted. Therefore the Premier could attempt to secure any amendments he desires by his Minister in the Council. If the other place at this stage is not prepared to agree to the Premier's amendment, the course I suggest will save the time of this House. In my opinion, if another Chamber is not prepared to agree to the amendments in their present form, it would not be likely to agree to them in the forms now suggested by the Premier. Therefore the time of this House would be saved, and the Government would be able to achieve their purpose just the same, if the Bill were allowed to go forward to another place in its present form. I do not think any member here is likely to reverse his previous vote, and therefore it seems to me that no good purpose would be served by recommitting the Bill.

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

Ayes	..	..	..	..	20
Noes	..	..	..	..	10

Majority for	..	10
		—

#### AYES.

Mr. Angelo	Mr. Mann
Mr. Carter	Sir James Mitchell
Mrs. Cowan	Mr. Piesse
Mr. Davies	Mr. Sampson
Mr. Durack	Mr. Scaddan
Mr. George	Mr. J. H. Smith
Mr. Gibson	Mr. J. Thomson
Mr. Harrison	Mr. Underwood
Mr. Hickmott	Mr. Mullaly
Mr. Johnston	(Teller.)
Mr. H. K. Maley	

#### NOES.

Mr. Angwin	Mr. Marshall
Mr. Chesson	Mr. McCallum
Mr. Collier	Mr. Wilson
Mr. Corboy	Mr. Munsie
Mr. Heron	(Teller.)
Mr. Hughes	

Question thus passed.

#### Recommittal.

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

#### Clause 2—Amendment of Section 16:

The PREMIER: I move an amendment—

That in line 3 of the proviso “£300” be struck out and “£250” inserted in lieu.

I do not think it was realised when the amendment was agreed to, that we were exempting so many people. I am advised by the Solicitor General that practically everyone, except those who have incomes from property or investments, would be brought under the clause as amended. That was not what was intended by the Committee. The idea was that we should exempt those old men who have been working hard for their living and who have no other source of income. Prospectors were specially mentioned as people who should receive that consideration. If the clause were allowed to stand as amended, it could apply to all sorts of people such as men who were running stations or managing estates. An exemption of £250 should be sufficient.

Hon. P. COLLIER: The proviso would not exempt everyone over 65 years of age, but only those with an income under £300.

The PREMIER: It does not mean that, for such a man might have an income from other sources, of £10,000 a year.

Mr. Munsie: But that would not be earned by personal exertion.

The PREMIER: The intention of the Committee was that if a person was 60 or 65 years of age and had an income up to £300 a year earned by means of personal exertion, he should be exempt from taxation. That would not guard against the position where

an individual would have other sources of income. I do not think that was desired by any member of the Committee, but the intention was that relief should be given to those old people who were working hard to earn a living by direct personal exertion. If we make the exemption up to £250, it should be sufficient, for that will apply to more than the working men I have mentioned.

Mr. CORBOY: The exemption of £300 should be retained, although I see no objection to the Premier's proposal to make it clear that it applies to no other income than that derived from personal exertion. The inclusion of the latter provision will make it clear that the exemption will be in favour of only those whose earnings do not exceed £300 from personal exertion. I cannot follow the Premier's reasoning however, when he advocates the reduction of the exemption to £250. His intention is to further amend the Bill by providing for a reduction of £2 for every £1 whereby the income exceeds £200 in the case of a married man, and that will cut out at £300. I think the proviso to Clause 2 should be retained. The Premier is right in making it apply only to incomes earned from personal exertion, but the amount should be left at the same figure as provided for by him in his later amendment.

Mr. CHESSON: We should retain the £300 exemption, although it is quite right to provide that the exemption shall apply to “no other income.” In my electorate many old men are prospecting and dryblowing, and while they have made as much as £300 in one year, they have battled along in other years without making anything. Those men have been plucked considerably by both the Federal and State taxation authorities. We should encourage these old men who desire to be independent and work for their living, rather than to accept old age or invalid pensions.

Amendment put and passed.

The PREMIER: I move an amendment—

That in line 4 after “exertion” the words “but no other income” be inserted. I have already explained why it is necessary to have these words inserted.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: This is not a fair proposition. There may be many persons over the ages of 60 and 65—

The Premier: They would be exempt from £200.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: I admit that, but many people over that age may not be physically capable of earning an income from personal exertion and they will be debarred from the same privileges as those who are healthy and strong and are able to earn for themselves. They may have lived a thrifty life, but they will be prevented from receiving the same benefits. The amendment differentiates between the two. A man who at 65 has health and strength with which to earn £250 pays no tax, while a man who is not so strong, but

has saved sufficient to return him an income of £250, will not be allowed the exemption.

Mr. Davies: Do you want to put them both on the one mark?

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: Certainly. The man with health and strength to work is in a better position than the man unable to work, but having a modest income.

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

Ayes	..	..	..	22
Noes	..	..	..	12

Majority for .. 10

#### AYES.

Mr. Brown	Sir James Mitchell
Mrs. Cowan	Mr. Plesse
Mr. Davies	Mr. Richardson
Mr. Durack	Mr. Sampson
Mr. George	Mr. Scaddan
Mr. Gibson	Mr. J. H. Smith
Mr. Harrison	Mr. Teesdale
Mr. Hickmott	Mr. A. Thomson
Mr. Johnston	Mr. J. Thomson
Mr. H. K. Maley	Mr. Underwood
Mr. Mann	Mr. Mullany

(Teller.)

#### NOES.

Mr. Angwin	Mr. Lutey
Mr. Chesson	Mr. Marshall
Mr. Collier	Mr. McCallum
Mr. Corbooy	Mr. O'Loghlen
Mr. Heron	Mr. Wilson
Mr. Hughes	Mr. Munzie

(Teller.)

Amendment thus passed; the clause, as amended, agreed to.

Clause 6—Principal Act to be re-printed as amended:

The PREMIER: I suggest that the clause be struck out. If it be negatived I will then move that the following be inserted in lieu:—

“Amendment of Section 16. 6. (1)

The second proviso to Subsection (1) of Section 16 of the principal Act is amended by omitting the words ‘one hundred and fifty-six’ and inserting ‘two hundred’ in place thereof. (2) Subsections are inserted in Section 16 of the principal Act as follows: ‘(1a) Where the income of any person who is unmarried and has no dependant, less the deductions allowed by this Act (except under this section) amounts in any year to one hundred and one pounds or over, there shall be deducted therefrom the sum of one hundred pounds less two pounds for every one pound whereby such income exceeds one hundred pounds, and the remainder shall be income chargeable. Provided that the minimum amount to be payable by any such person as tax shall be two shillings and sixpence. (1b) Where the income of any person who is married or has a dependant, less the deductions allowed by this Act (except under this

section) amounts in any year to two hundred and one pounds or over, there shall be deducted therefrom the sum of two hundred pounds less two pounds for every one pound whereby such income exceeds two hundred pounds, and the remainder shall be income chargeable: Provided that the minimum amount to be payable by any such person as tax shall be two shillings and sixpence.’”

The Leader of the Opposition the other night secured an amendment having for its object the exemption of married persons whose incomes did not exceed £200 and of single persons with incomes not exceeding £100. The hon. member proposed that the exemption should disappear by a reduction of £1 for every £3 of income over the exemption. That meant that the exemption would disappear altogether when the income reached £800. I pointed out that the amendment would be of considerable benefit to those drawing large incomes, and also that the cost to the Treasury would be £73,000. Under the hon. member's proposal a man with an income of £400 would benefit to the extent of £2 19s. 10d.; of £500 to the extent of £2 16s. 8d.; and of £600 to the extent of £2 5s. 1d. I now ask the Committee to strike out the clause as amended by the hon. member and insert in its place this provision allowing an exemption of £100 to a single man and of £200 for a married man, but prescribing that the exemption shall disappear at the rate of £1 for every £2 of income over and above the exemption. Under my amendment the exemption will disappear altogether when the income reaches £300. The amendment will achieve what the Committee wishes, and will cost the Treasury only £30,000 as against £73,000. the cost of the hon. member's proposal. Under the amendment of the Leader of the Opposition men drawing high incomes would have considerable advantage.

Mr. Munzie: Only so much as they have under the Federal Act.

The PREMIER: They have been relieved under the Federal Act, and so are not in need of further relief. My amendment will give them some relief, but less than that proposed by the Leader of the Opposition. A man on £250 pays on the lot at present, but will gain some advantage under my amendment, and will get all his deductions just the same. The man on £200 will be in exactly the same position under my amendment as under that of the Leader of the Opposition; that is to say, he will pay no tax at all. People who pay taxation to the State get a direct benefit, but they do not get the same direct return in respect of the taxation paid to the Federal Government.

Hon. P. COLLIER: Under the Premier's proposal we shall be retaining the exemption of £200 for a married person and £100 for a single person without dependants. This was the object I set out to attain as regards the married person, but not so the unmarried person. I do not know that we shall be justified in striking out the clause. The Pre-

mier said it would involve a considerable loss of revenue, but I am unable to reconcile his figures. When my original amendment was under consideration the Premier said an exemption of £200 for married and single persons would mean a loss of £73,000. The Premier now says the loss will be £73,000; in other words it makes no difference whether the exemption is £100 or £200 for single or married persons.

The Premier: I should have said £10,000 less.

Hon. P. COLLIER: Under the Premier's proposal, the loss will be £30,000. I have no means of checking the figures.

The Premier: Neither have I. I must take the officers' figures.

Hon. P. COLLIER: The estimated loss appears to be very high. I am anxious to assist the Premier to obtain the necessary revenue consistent with doing justice to those who ought to have relief. Although the amendment is not on all fours with the Commonwealth Act, it is very near to it. It is precisely the same with regard to married persons, but not with regard to single persons. The Commonwealth Act gives a greater measure of relief to those receiving lower incomes. There is an exemption of £200 for all, diminishing until it entirely disappears at £300. While it is true the exemption does not disappear entirely until the income reaches £300, the deduction in the last £100 or so is very small indeed. We might still retain the amendment as carried although I am gratified that the Committee have agreed to lift the exemption from £156 to £200 for married persons. While I do not agree with the diminishing scale set out in the amendment on account of its being too rapid, it is an improvement on the existing Act. The principle of the exemption disappearing is sound, and we would do well to allow the diminishing scale to stand.

The MINISTER FOR MINES: The Committee have agreed that a person whose earnings do not exceed £200 per annum should be exempt from taxation. I am afraid members are confusing earnings with taxable income. That is what happened when we agreed to the amendment of the Leader of the Opposition. I do not believe that a majority of the wage and salary earners really ask that a man receiving over £200 should be exempt. We have considered total earnings instead of taxable earnings.

Hon. P. COLLIER: The amendment makes that clear.

The MINISTER FOR MINES: Quite so. A married man with no children would in some cases require to earn £265 per annum before he would have to pay income tax.

Hon. P. COLLIER: Why?

The MINISTER FOR MINES: He would be entitled to a deduction of £15 for travelling expenses, which would apply in most cases.

Hon. P. COLLIER: That works out at 1s. a day. Sixpence a day would be nearer to it.

The MINISTER FOR MINES: We can fairly claim that the amount would be £10 a year. Then I assume that such a man would pay £10 a year for insurance.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: Very few workers would pay that.

The MINISTER FOR MINES: But very few workers are getting £265 a year.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: Not one per cent would insure for an amount requiring a premium of £10 a year.

Hon. P. COLLIER: Take an average figure; £10 is too high.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: A shilling a week is as high as anyone would go.

The MINISTER FOR MINES: A married man without a family would spend £10 a year in insurance out of an income of £250 a year.

Mr. McCallum: Not two out of 100 would spend that. You are dealing with the impossible.

Hon. P. COLLIER: Well, the unlikely.

The MINISTER FOR MINES: I do not think it is unlikely.

Mr. McCallum: It is, because they cannot afford to pay £10 a year for insurance.

The MINISTER FOR MINES: There are very few working men who do not insure their children from birth for half-a-crown a week.

Mr. Heron: They pay for a little while and then drop it.

Mr. Munsie: Not two per cent. of them do it.

The MINISTER FOR MINES: A good many insurance agents are being kept by the commissions paid for industrial insurance.

Mr. Munsie: Yes, at 1s. a week. Not one in 20 would pay more.

The MINISTER FOR MINES: It would exceed 1s. a week when there were four or five in the family.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: Very few do it.

The MINISTER FOR MINES: Any number do it. However, I was instancing a married man without a family and in receipt of £265. That man should not be exempt. If a man obtained exemption of £15 for travelling and £10 for insurance, he would require to earn above £225 a year before he paid any tax at all, and then it would be the minimum of 2s. 6d. A man with one child, on the same basis, would require to earn £265 before he paid anything. If he had two children he would require to earn £305; if he had three children he would require to earn £345; if he had four children his earnings would require to be £385; and if he had five children the income would require to be £425 before he paid any tax. If a man had more than five children he ought to receive a bonus instead of paying a tax. I do not think the Leader of the Opposition would suggest that a person whose income exceeds £425 should be relieved of all taxation. Very few members of the House would pay any tax under the proposal passed last week. The cost to a member of earning his salary fre-

quently represents a debit at the end of the year and not a credit. We all desire that a man whose earnings do not exceed £200 a year should be exempt from taxation, but it is only right that a man earning more than that should pay something. The Premier's proposal will not be a burden upon anyone who is earning over £200 a year.

Clause put and negatived.

New clause:

The PREMIER: I move—

That a new clause be inserted to stand as Clause 6, as follows:—Amendment of Section 16: (1.) The second proviso to subsection (1) of section sixteen of the principal Act is amended by omitting the words "one hundred and fifty-six" and inserting "two hundred" in place thereof. (2.) Subsections are inserted in section sixteen of the principal Act as follows:— (1a.) Where the income of any person who is unmarried and has no dependant, less the deductions allowed by this Act (except under this section) amounts in any year to one hundred and one pounds or over, there shall be deducted therefrom the sum of one hundred pounds less two pounds for every one pound whereby such income exceeds one hundred pounds, and the remainder shall be "income chargeable." Provided that the minimum amount to be payable by any such person as tax shall be two shillings and sixpence. (1b.) Where the income of any person who is married or has a dependant, less the deductions allowed by this Act (except under this section) amounts in any year to two hundred and one pounds or over, there shall be deducted therefrom the sum of two hundred pounds less two pounds for every one pound whereby such income exceeds two hundred pounds, and the remainder shall be "income chargeable." Provided that the minimum amount to be payable by any such person as tax shall be two shillings and sixpence.

Hon. P. COLLIER: I move an amendment—

That in paragraph (1b), the last "two" in line 6, be struck out, and "one" inserted in lieu.

The effect of the amendment would be that the total exemption would disappear at £400 instead of £300. The Premier's scale advances rather too rapidly, for it makes the exemption disappear at £300. The exemption in the case of a £250 income will be very small. The figures quoted by the Minister for Mines are exceptional and extreme.

The Minister for Mines: Last year 4.4 per cent. of the total was represented by rates and taxes, and I did not include that.

Hon. P. COLLIER: Most of that money would be paid by the higher incomes. A person on £300 a year cannot afford to pay more than £3 or £4 for insurance. My amendment will make the scale far more equitable.

The PREMIER: The amendment would mean a great loss to the Treasury. Our exemptions have been very liberal because no general exemption has been proposed until now. In view of the general deductions already allowed, the Committee should not entertain any further reductions for the purpose of arriving at the taxable income. We give to the people of this country in free services every penny we receive by way of direct taxation. That fact should be remembered by the people now seeking this relief.

Mr. Hughes: A man on £400 will pay more if your amendment is carried.

The PREMIER: Very little more. I do not think the majority of the people of this country object to reasonable taxation.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: Legislation of this kind is not always applied as Parliament anticipates. It is sometimes applied as the Commissioner of Taxation decides. A case in point is the deduction of medical expenses. Does the £200 here referred to mean £200 after the deductions have been made?

The Minister for Mines: Yes.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: The words "except under this section" are not too clear. Are the deductions which are allowed under other sections of the Act applicable in regard to this £200?

The Premier: Of course they are.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: It is not too clear to me. Then a person earning £300 a year would pay on £100 after all deductions?

The Minister for Mines: No; he would get exemption on £100.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: The total amount of taxation represented by the difference between the £100 and the £200 would be very small. Few of the people affected would pay rates and taxes. These are usually paid by the landlord. Most properties to-day are let clear of rates and taxes, although the occupier is responsible.

The Minister for Mines: On not 5 per cent. of rented dwellings does the owner pay the water rates.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: Yes, except as regards excess water. The Municipal Corporations Act allows the tenant to pay the rates and taxes and deduct them from the rent if the owner does not pay them. The concession asked for by the Opposition leader is a small one, and could well be agreed to by the Premier.

Mr. CHESON: I hope the Premier will accept the amendment. The scale of reduction proposed by the hon. gentleman acts too suddenly. As regards insurance, the average worker would not pay more than £5 yearly, and the rates and taxes on the house he rents are paid by the landlord, being passed on to the worker in the form of rent. The worker's only other deduction would be travelling expenses. There should be a general exemption of £200, which amount represents the living wage.

The Minister for Mines: And all other deductions should be knocked out?

Mr. CHESON: No. I would make an allowance of £40 for each child.

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

Ayes	..	..	..	14
Noes	..	..	..	21

Majority against .. 7

#### AYES.

Mr. Angwin	Mr. Lutey
Mr. Chesson	Mr. Marshall
Mr. Clydesdale	Mr. McCallum
Mr. Collier	Mr. O'Loughlin
Mr. Corboy	Mr. Wilson
Mr. Heron	Mr. Munsie
Mr. Hughes	(Teller.)
Mr. Lambert	

#### NOES.

Mr. Broun	Sir James Mitchell
Mrs. Cowan	Mr. Piessie
Mr. Davies	Mr. Richardson
Mr. Durack	Mr. Sampson
Mr. George	Mr. Scaddan
Mr. Gibson	Mr. J. H. Smith
Mr. Harrison	Mr. Teesdale
	Mr. J. Thomson
	Mr. Underwood
Mr. H. K. Maley	Mr. Mullany
Mr. Mann	(Teller.)

Amendment thus negatived.

Hon. P. COLLIER: The wording of the new clause is not clear. The principle involved in my amendment, which was agreed to last week, and in that now suggested by the Premier is the same. The Solicitor General, Mr. Sayer, drafted my amendment, yet the one he has drafted for the Premier is quite different. Under my proposal, there would be a total exemption of £200 disappearing at £800, whereas the Premier's proposal is that the exemption of £200 shall disappear at £300. Seeing that the principle is identical, only a slight variation in the wording would have met the case, yet, as framed by the Solicitor General, the Premier's amendment is entirely different. It is involved and I want to be clear as to whether all the deductions provided for in the Act are to be allowed before the general deduction of £200 is made.

The Premier: That is quite clear.

Hon. P. COLLIER: It is not clear to my mind. Apparently the Solicitor General has no difficulty in expressing the same thing in entirely different words.

The Premier: He improves every time.

Hon. P. COLLIER: In this case he has deteriorated. I want to be sure that all deductions are to be made, and that it is only when the chargeable income exceeds £200 that a man will be called up to pay income tax.

The Premier: That is the intention.

Hon. P. COLLIER: The amendment commences with a reference to "income." To make it more clear, the reference should be to "chargeable income."

The Premier: That is clearly what is intended, but if it is not clear I will have it made so.

Hon. P. COLLIER: If the Premier says he will see that it is made clear, I shall be content.

The Minister for Mines: As the amendment stands, it means that in cases where the income, less the deductions allowed by the Act, amounts to £200, the tax shall be paid.

The PREMIER: The intention of the Committee was to make an exemption of £200, after all deductions allowed by the Act had been made. I will see the Solicitor General and make sure that the amendment expresses the wish of the Committee.

New clause put and passed.

Bill further reported with amendments.

## BILL—LAND TAX AND INCOME TAX.

In Committee.

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

Clauses 1 and 2—agreed to.

Clause 3—Rate of income tax:

The PREMIER: I move an amendment—

That in line 2 of Subclause 1 "£7,766" be struck out and "£6,672" be inserted in lieu.

In order to make up the loss in taxation caused by the increase in the exemptions approved by the Committee in connection with the Land and Income Tax Assessment Amendment Bill, it is necessary to increase the tax very slightly. The rate at the present time is 2d. on the first £100 and shall increase at the rate of .006d. per pound. I propose to make the rate .007d. In order to meet the circumstances that have arisen, it will be necessary to strike out the reference to £7,766 and insert £6,672.

Hon. P. Collier: No.

Mr. Corboy: Why not increase the maximum of 4s. in the pound rather than increase the rate?

The PREMIER: Because I think the maximum is sufficient.

Mr. Hughes: If you let it stand it will mean only an increase of 8d.

The PREMIER: The hon. member knows that the Federal tax is added to this tax. We must have some regard for what the taxpayer can reasonably be expected to pay.

Mr. Corboy: Yes, the class of taxpayers which you favour.

The PREMIER: If schoolboys had votes they would not be locked up for throwing stones.

Mr. McCallum: Why not say that where there is plenty of money there also is plenty of protection?

The PREMIER: These graduations are fairly steep, reaching to a good many pence pretty soon. All I am seeking to recover is what is to be taken away in the exemption.

Hon. P. COLLIER: I hope the Premier will agree to report progress in order to give us an opportunity to examine these figures. There are several amendments on the Notice Paper in respect of the rate of tax, and we did not get them until the House met.

The Premier: Some of them are consequential. There is but the one increase.

Mr. Corboy: But it affects the tax payable, right along the line.

The Premier: Naturally.

Hon. P. COLLIER: The Premier is *au fait* with the amendments, but the Committee are not.

The Premier: The system applies now.

Hon. P. COLLIER: But it is proposed to increase the tax.

Mr. Corboy: To some people.

The Premier: To everybody.

Mr. Hughes: No, not everybody.

Hon. P. COLLIER: That is why I want an opportunity to look into the amendment.

The Premier: The graduation will be on a higher basis.

Hon. P. COLLIER: But the Committee cannot grasp what the increases mean. We require opportunity to study them. I want to know what I am voting for.

The PREMIER: I do not mind reporting progress, but I do want these taxation Bills right through before Parliament adjourns over Xmas. If we cannot get the Bill through this House to-day, then to-morrow I must ask for the suspension of the Standing Orders to allow the Bill to pass through at one sitting.

Hon. P. Collier: But that will be necessary for only the one sitting.

The PREMIER: Yes, that will do. I thought that as this method of taxation had been in force for so long, and as the only change is to adopt .007d. instead of .006d. as a graduation, it would be simple enough.

Hon. P. Collier: But how much extra does that mean on the various grades of income?

The PREMIER: Of course it means something.

Hon. P. Collier: How much do you estimate the increased rates will bring in?

The PREMIER: Only £30,000.

Hon. P. Collier: You are making a good deal over my amendment. You will end up by getting more than you got before.

The PREMIER: I shall not get one penny more than has been taken away. I might reasonably ask for something to cover what was taken away last year, when we increased some of the deductions, and so lost certain revenue. However, I have not asked for that.

Mr. Hughes: Will you not get another £120,000 out of the Hospitals Bill?

The PREMIER: If the Leader of the Opposition really wishes to see how these figures will work out in the various grades, I will report progress and to-morrow will move the suspension of the Standing Orders so as to put the Bill through in one sitting.

Progress reported.

## BILL—LICENSING ACT AMENDMENT.

### Council's amendments.

Schedule of amendments made by the Council now considered.

### In Committee.

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

No. 1.—Insert a new clause to follow Clause 5, as follows:—"Section 13 of the principal Act is amended by inserting at the commencement thereof the following words:—"subject to the provisions of Section 20a." "

The PREMIER: The clause provides that when at a meeting of the Licensing Court there are but two members, the Chairman and another, present the Chairman's vote shall prevail. The Council's amendment provides that in those circumstances if the two members cannot agree, they shall adjourn. I think that perfectly right. I move—

That the amendment be agreed to.

Question put and passed; the Council's amendment agreed to.

No. 2.—Clause 9, Subclause (3).—After "hotel license or" add "and the word 'respectively.' "

The PREMIER: This is merely a matter of grammar. I move—

That the amendment be agreed to.

Question put and passed; the Council's amendment agreed to.

No. 3.—Insert a new clause, to follow Clause 9, as follows:—"Subsection (1) of Section 32 of the principal Act is amended by omitting the words 'more than 35 per centum of proof spirit,' and inserting in place thereof 'any higher percentage proof spirit than is prescribed by the Food and Drug Regulations under the Health Act, 1911-1919.' "

The PREMIER: This amendment deals with wine. It can safely be agreed to, for the standard now prescribed by the food and drug regulations is 35 per cent. I move—

That the amendment be agreed to.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: I trust the Committee will not agree to the amendment. We have had the provision in the Act since 1911, and no complaints have been received. The amendment is not sufficiently definite.

The Premier: You do not object to the percentage being lower, do you?

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: But under this amendment it might be raised. One wine sold in the metropolitan area contains 37 per cent. proof spirit, which is contrary to the Act.

The Premier: Why didn't you take action against them?

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: I threatened to do so, and they withdrew it from sale.

The Minister for Mines: It must be a patent medicine.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: You can call it what you like.

The Minister for Mines: Sedna!



Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: Yes. Those persons are not licensed to sell intoxicating liquor, yet they can sell this. Immediately the Labour Party went out of office the wine was put up for sale again. With the provision in the Act so definite, people know where they are, but to leave it optional, as in the Council's amendment, means that the percentage might be lowered or it might be raised.

Question put and negatived; the Council's amendment not agreed to.

No. 4. Clause 10.—Strike out the words "Licensing Act Amendment Act, 1917," in line 1, and insert "Sale of Liquor and Tobacco Act, 1916."

The PREMIER: A wrong reference was made in this case and the Council have put it right. I move—

That the amendment be agreed to.

Question put and passed; the Council's amendment agreed to.

No. 5. Clause 13.—Strike out "two gallons" and insert "one gallon."

The PREMIER: This permits spirit merchants to sell in gallon lots, though I understand they can do so already. I move—

That the amendment be agreed to.

Mr. McCALLUM: It is not desirable to pass this amendment. It brings the spirit merchant into the retail business. At present he can only get there after the bench has examined the position, but this amendment will permit him to do so whether the bench approves or not.

The Premier: It would save a second license in a place like Broome.

Mr. McCALLUM: This amendment was made to meet the position of one man. A spirit merchant would be able to canvass from door to door for the sale of liquor by the gallon. The position should remain as it is.

Mr. MANN: Originally a wine and spirit merchant's license compelled the holder to sell spirits as they were imported and in the same vessel. Owing to liquor being bottled locally, this was not found practicable. To get over the difficulty, these merchants took out a one gallon license, but as this was brought under the local option poll, there was a chance that they would be closed down. They, therefore, kept to the two gallon license. The amendment made by the Council is not fair to licensed victuallers, because the merchants can sell six bottles to a customer but all of different brands.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: Why should they not do it?

Mr. MANN: It is not fair to the man who has to pay a heavy tax under this Bill.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: The merchant has to pay a tax, too.

Mr. MANN: Yes, on the liquor sold retail, but under this amendment they are entering into competition with the people to whom they sell spirits. The amendment is unreasonable.

Question put and negatived; the Council's amendment not agreed to.

No. 6. Clause 15.—After the words "being a person" insert "or a representative of a person."

In the last line strike out the words "made in Western Australia," and insert "the produce of the brewery."

The PREMIER: This allows a brewer's representative to hold a brewer's license. At present the license must be in the name of an individual. Furthermore, a brewery may not sell other than its own beer. I move—

That the amendment be agreed to.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: A brewery could sell Victorian beer if it liked under this amendment.

The PREMIER: That is not so.

Question put and passed; the Council's amendment agreed to.

No. 7. Clause 16.—Strike out "paragraphs are," and insert "subsection is."

Strike out Subclause (3).

The PREMIER: This deals with temporary licenses for race clubs, sports meetings, etc. Had we confined ourselves to sports meetings, no doubt the Council would not have amended the clause in this direction. If the amendment is agreed to, we will have to revert to the old order of things. If a racecourse wants to sell liquor under temporary license, the hotelkeeper in the district will have to be engaged for the purpose.

Mr. Clydesdale: It will have to be done under the lap.

The PREMIER: The hon. member knows more about that than I do. I cannot see why a race club should be placed at a disadvantage in this respect, and everything handed over to the local licensee.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: It would be necessary to grant a temporary license to the licensee for this purpose.

The PREMIER: People who run race meetings in the country should not be in the hands of the local publican. I move—

That the amendment be not agreed to.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: I am surprised the Premier has not accepted the amendment. If an hotelkeeper abuses his temporary license, it must tell against him when he applies for the renewal of his general license. If a racecourse is granted a temporary license, there is no one to supervise the sale of the liquor who is as responsible a person as an hotelkeeper.

The Minister for Mines: The very reverse is the position.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: I do not attend racecourses. A licensee, on the other hand, has to carry out all the provisions of the Act where they affect him.

Mr. Clydesdale: Race clubs hold meetings at regular intervals, and have to accept responsibility.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: The sale of liquor is only a secondary consideration with race clubs, but it is the primary consideration with a licensee. A licensee would have to conduct the booths in a proper manner, for if he did not do so the authorities would see that he did not get the license in the following year. These booths should be controlled by holders of publicans' general licenses because they make their living out of the trade and they would require to be more careful in the sale of liquor than would be the holder of a temporary license. A licensee would know that he had to look after this business.

Mr. Clydesdale: The committee of a race club would be in the same position.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: No, because the selling of liquor on a racecourse is a secondary matter to them.

Mr. Clydesdale: You should not forget that the race clubs have to cater for the public.

The PREMIER: The trouble will be that any person who gets a temporary license may transgress the law, and the next year someone else may get the license and also transgress, and thus it would go on indefinitely. If the people in charge of sporting gatherings do not see that the liquor is sold under proper conditions, the license will be lost for all time. Under the present system transgression can go on from time to time, but if the holder of a license under the Bill transgresses twice, he will lose the license for all time. If the committee of a race club take over this responsibility, they will not take any risks.

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

No. 8. Clause 17.—Strike out the first three lines and insert the following: "Section forty-four of the principal Act is amended by substituting for paragraph (b) of Subsection (1) the following paragraphs: '(b) Being the occupier of a vineyard of not less than five acres of vines in full bearing, sells on such vineyard, in quantities of not less than one reputed quart bottle at any one time, wine manufactured by such person; or (c) Being the occupier of an orchard of not less than five acres, sells on such orchard, in quantities of not less than one reputed quart bottle at any one time, cider or perry manufactured by such person.'"

The PREMIER: The Council wish to provide that the occupier of a vineyard who is permitted to sell wine must have a holding of five acres of vines in full bearing. This is an improvement on the clause as it stood originally because it would be quite possible for a man to have half an acre and import or buy wine, and merely because he has a few vines there, he could be a seller of wine under the terms of the Bill. I move—

That the amendment be agreed to.

Question put and passed; the Council's amendment agreed to.

No. 9. Clause 18.—Insert the following provisos to Subclause (1): "Provided also

that premises for which a provisional certificate has been granted prior to the 31st day of December, 1922, shall be deemed to be licensed premises: Provided also that the words 'licensed premises' in this subsection shall not include premises for which a billiard table license is granted, if such premises are not licensed for the sale of liquor: Provided also that a brewer's license or a spirit merchant's license may be granted for premises not licensed prior to the 31st day of December, 1922, to authorise the sale of beer or liquor (as the case may be) to persons licensed to sell liquor, or to registered clubs or State hotels, but not to other persons or by retail'":

The PREMIER: I move—

That the amendment be agreed to.

The Council propose that the premises for which a provisional certificate has been granted prior to the end of the year, shall be added to the list of licensed premises. That is acceptable. It is also provided that "licensed premises" shall not include premises for which a billiard table license is granted, if such premises are not licensed for the sale of liquor. I hope the two provisos dealing with the matters I have indicated will be agreed to. As to the third proviso in the Council's amendment, I hope that some hon. members who know more about the position will give the Committee their views. It practically means that holders of new brewers' licenses will be able to sell wholesale only, while the holders of old brewers' licenses will be able to retail as well. I do not know that it is logical to say that such a provision should apply only to new brewers' licenses, those holding licenses granted at an earlier date being permitted to sell as retailers. I do not know if breweries do much retail business.

Mr. A. Thomson: That proviso should not be agreed to.

Mr. MANN: The Council's amendment will mean an interference with the export trade.

The PREMIER: I do not think it will have that effect.

Mr. MANN: That is how it appeals to me. There are only three avenues of sale for the holders of new brewers' licenses, namely, the registered clubs, State hotels, and other licensed persons.

The PREMIER: But it affects only the brewers.

Mr. MANN: The third proviso should not be agreed to. A firm like Dalgety's buys liquor for despatch to stations in the North-West, but under the Council's amendment, the brewers would not be able to supply the firm. I suggest that the words "but not to other persons" be struck out.

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

That in line 5 in the third proviso, the words "to persons licensed to sell liquor, or

to registered clubs or to State hotels, but not to other persons or by retail" be struck out.

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

No. 10.—Clause 18, Subclause (2), line 4. Strike out "adult residents" and insert "electors."

The PREMIER: The amendment deals with the petitions and suggests that the word "adult residents," should replace "electors" as provided for in the clause. I do not see much difference, but it is possible that the alteration will provide a check against the names appearing on petitions, because the names of adult persons will appear on the electoral rolls for the Legislative Assembly.

Mrs. Cowan: There are electors for the Legislative Council.

The PREMIER: But the names of all adult residents would not appear on the Council rolls. The alteration could be made with advantage if only for the reason that the signatories of petitions can be checked. I move—

That the amendment be agreed to.

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

That the words "whose names are on the Assembly roll" be added to the Council's amendment.

There is no definition of "elector" and a petition in such a case should be signed by those electors whose names are on the Assembly roll.

Mr. JOHNSTON: That is already provided for in the interpretation of "elector" in the original Licensing Act.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: As it is already provided for, I will withdraw my amendment.

Amendment by leave withdrawn.

Question put and passed; the Council's amendment agreed to.

No. 11.—Clause 18, Subclause (2).—Strike out the words "being a radius of 40 chains from the site where it is proposed that such licensed premises should be erected within the metropolitan district, as provided in paragraph (2) of Section 109," and insert in place thereof the words "therein defined."

The PREMIER: This amendment does not make any real change. As a matter of fact I think it is an improvement. I move—

That the amendment be agreed to.

Question put and passed; the Council's amendment agreed to.

No. 12.—Clause 18, Subclause (3).—Strike out Subclause (3), and insert the following:—(3.) The area defined in a petition—(a) shall be the area comprised within a circle having a radius of 40 chains from the site of the proposed licensed premises, if the new license is required for premises within the met-

ropolitan district (as defined in Section 145); or (b) shall be subject to the approval of the Licenses Reduction Board, or the Licensing Court, as the case may be, if the new license is required for premises not situated within the metropolitan area. In either case the petition shall, within seven days after its presentation, be published in the "Gazette" and a newspaper circulating in the district.

The PREMIER: This bears on the amendment we have just agreed to. Therefore I move—

That the amendment be agreed to.

Question put and passed; the Council's amendment agreed to.

No. 13.—Clause 18, Subclause 4.—Insert after "inquiry" the words "to be held after the expiration of 14 days from the publication of the petition."

The PREMIER: This amendment means that reasonable time must be allowed. Of course, it would be allowed even without the amendment. I move—

That the amendment be agreed to.

Question put and passed; the Council's amendment agreed to.

No. 14.—Clause 20.—After "testimonial," in line 3, insert "and the court may call and receive evidence."

The PREMIER: This provides that the court may call evidence as to the character of the applicant. That is desirable. I move—

That the amendment be agreed to.

Question put and passed; the Council's amendment agreed to.

No. 15.—Clause 20.—Strike out the word "himself" and insert the words "the applicant as a licensee."

The PREMIER: This is merely a verbal amendment, and I move—

That the amendment be agreed to.

Question put and passed; the Council's amendment agreed to.

No. 16.—Clause 20.—After the word "report" insert "and evidence."

The PREMIER: This is consequential on No. 14. I move—

That the amendment be agreed to.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: The court will be open and therefore any person may be present to hear the evidence. This provides that not only shall the report be presented to the person but the evidence as well.

Question put and passed; the Council's amendment agreed to.

No. 17.—Clause 20.—Add at the end the following:—"The court may in its absolute discretion refuse an application for the transfer of a license."

The PREMIER: This provides that the transfer shall be at the absolute discretion of

the court. The amendment should be agreed to. I move—

That the amendment be agreed to.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: Suppose a person wishes to transfer a license to a district where the people are not anxious to have it. What will be the position? The transfer is at the absolute discretion of the court. They may refuse it or grant it. Does that mean that the court can, in defiance of the electors, transfer a license to a district where those electors may not require it?

The Premier: The license will be transferred from one man to another.

Mr. Mann: It means that the refusal only is at the discretion of the court.

The Minister for Mines: The Bill deals with the individual.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: Once the amendment is embodied in the Bill, it becomes part of Section 48 of the principal Act, which deals with an application for the renewal, transfer, or removal of a license. I am justified in asking whether this refers to removal.

The Premier: It does not.

Question put and passed; the Council's amendment agreed to.

No. 18—Clause 21, lines 1 and 2.—Strike out "repealed and a section is inserted in place thereof, as follows:—49," and insert the following:—"amended by inserting in Subsection (3) thereof after the words 'licensed house' the words 'is not provided with or'; and a section is inserted in the principal Act as follows:—49A."

The PREMIER: It is necessary that the court should have this control. I move—

That the amendment be agreed to.

Question put and passed; the Council's amendment agreed to.

No. 19—Clause 21, Subclause (1), paragraph (b).—Strike out the words "and shall be provided with running water and fixed basins."

The PREMIER: I move—

That the amendment be agreed to.

Hon. P. Collier: It follows the author out. The Minister for Mines: Who was the author?

Mr. O'Loughlen: The ex-member for East Perth.

Question put and passed; the Council's amendment agreed to.

No. 20—Clause 21, Subclause (1), (d).—Strike out "baths and," and after the word "laundry," in line two, insert "one bath and."

The PREMIER: This amendment fixes a minimum of one bathroom for ten bedrooms. That is a reasonable provision. I move—

That the amendment be agreed to.

Question put and passed; the Council's amendment agreed to.

No. 21.—Insert a new clause, to follow Clause 22, as follows:—Section 55 of the

principal Act is amended, as follows:—In Subsection (4) the words "any owner may enter on the premises at any time thereafter and thereupon" are omitted, and the words "on entry on the premises being lawfully made by the owner thereof" are inserted in place thereof.

No. 22.—In the new clause to follow Clause 22, add the following words:—The following words are added to Subsection (6):—"or in default of entry by a successor within the time therein limited." In Subsection (7).—After the words "Subsection (4)" the following words are inserted:—"or in default of entry by a successor within the time therein limited."

No. 23—Clause 23, Subclause (2).—Strike out the words "during the twelve months ending the last day of December preceeding the date of the license," and insert "or paid or payable by or to the licensee for liquor sold or supplied."

On motions by the Premier, the foregoing amendments were agreed to.

No. 24. Clause 29, Subclause (1).—After the word "revenue," in the third line after the end of paragraph (c), insert "as a moiety of the annual fee for the license." Strike out "payable in respect," and insert "payable on the issue." Insert the following, to stand as Subclause 14:—Notwithstanding anything in this section contained but subject to the provisions of Subsection (6) no liquor upon which the percentage fee has already been assessed or paid shall be liable to a second or subsequent assessment or payment under this section."

The PREMIER: This amendment will make clear the duty of the licensee. The amount is payable on the issue of the license. I move—

That the amendment be agreed to.

Question put and passed; the Council's amendment agreed to.

No. 25. Clause 30, Subclause (3).—After the word "seventy-one" insert "the principal Act."

The PREMIER: This amendment is quite unnecessary, but it is perfectly harmless. I move—

That the amendment be agreed to.

Mr. JOHNSTON: The amendment, to read properly, requires the insertion of the word "of" before "the." I move—

That the amendment be amended by inserting "of" before "the principal Act."

Amendment put and passed; the Council's amendment, as amended, agreed to.

No. 26. Clause 40.—Strike out Subclause (2), and insert:—" (2) The chairman or acting chairman for the time being of the licensing court shall be the chairman of the board." Subclauses (4) and (6).—Strike out these subclauses.

The PREMIER: The licensing magistrates constitute the board now, so the provision we made is unnecessary.

Mr. Mann: The licensing magistrates at the present time would be the board.

The PREMIER: Yes.

Mr. Mann: I thought you were going to have an independent board?

The PREMIER: We decided that the licensing magistrates must be the reduction board. When the court is appointed under the Act, the court will be the board. I move—

That the amendment be agreed to.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: The Council propose to strike out Subclauses (4) and (6) which give power to appoint a deputy member of the board, and to fill any vacancy. What will be the position if a member of the licensing court is sick or absent from the State?

The Premier: The Governor may appoint a deputy.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: The Governor could have done so under the Bill as it left us, but another place has struck out the subclauses giving this power. The Premier should insist on retaining the power to appoint deputy members of the court.

The Premier: I was dealing with only the first portion of the amendment.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: But the Premier moved that the amendment be agreed to. I move—

That the amendment be amended by deleting "Subclauses (4) and (6).—strike out these subclauses."

The Premier: I will agree to that.

Amendment put and passed; the Council's amendment, as amended, agreed to.

No. 27. Clause 41.—After the word "board" in line one, add the words "if in its opinion having regard to the matter referred to in Section 45 (82) a reduction is necessary."

The PREMIER: I ask the Committee not to accept this amendment because it would leave reduction optional with the board whether they have money or not. It should not be optional with the board to close hotels. Elsewhere provision has been made that any money remaining in the fund shall be returned to the contributors if prohibition be carried. When we have closed a sufficient number of hotels, we can amend the Act and provide that no further contributions need be made to the compensation fund.

Mr. Mann: Irrespective of whether hotels are required or not?

The PREMIER: The board will say what hotels shall be closed.

Mr. Mann: They have to go on closing hotels so long as there is money in the fund.

The PREMIER: Yes, and it will be for Parliament to say when the board are to stop. If we make it optional, they need not

close hotels at all. It is only fair that hotels should be closed so long as money is available. Then it will be a simple matter to decide when sufficient hotels have been closed.

Mr. Mann: That will be taking the matter out of the hands of the board. The board would always be subject to Parliament.

The PREMIER: No doubt; but I hope this power will not be given to the board. I move—

That the amendment be not agreed to.

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

No. 28.—Clause 44, Subclause 1, strike out the word "fourteen" and insert "twenty-one," and strike out the word "notice" and insert "summons":

The PREMIER: Twenty-one days' notice is not too long. The rest of the amendment is merely verbal. I move—

That the amendment be agreed to.

Question put and passed; the Council's amendment agreed to.

No. 29.—Clause 45, Subclause 2, paragraph (b), insert after "conducted" the words "as a place of accommodation and refreshment for the public."

The PREMIER: The amendment is unnecessary but harmless. I move—

That the amendment be agreed to.

Question put and passed; the Council's amendment agreed to.

No. 30.—Clause 50, in line 5 strike out the words "in the district":

The PREMIER: This amendment is unnecessary. It refers to the circulation of the newspaper in which notice is given. I move—

That the amendment be not agreed to.

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

No. 31.—Clause 54, add a subclause to stand as (4), as follows: "(4) If under Part VI. of this Act the proposal that prohibition shall come into force is carried, any moneys remaining to the credit of the compensation fund when the proposal takes effect shall be distributed by the board, in its discretion, amongst those licensees who have contributed to the fund and who have not already received compensation under this part":

The PREMIER: When contributors have ceased to hold any interest in hotels, by reason of prohibition being carried, they ought to get their money back. I move—

That the amendment be agreed to.

Mr. LAMBERT: This might have the effect of speeding up the depletion of the fund.

The PREMIER: The only reason for not agreeing to the amendment would be the hope

that the liquor traffic would be restored. But then there would be another compensation fund.

Mr. McCALLUM: There can be only 12 months' contributions in the fund, because the board must spend the amount collected in delicensing.

Mr. LAMBERT: Possibly it might cost more to ascertain who were entitled to the money than any small balance remaining in the fund.

The Premier: Let them have it. It is not Government money.

Question put and passed; the Council's amendment agreed to.

No. 32—Clause 58, add at the end the following proviso: "Provided that a proposal shall not be carried unless 30 per centum or more of the number of Assembly electors throughout the State vote for the proposal":

The PREMIER: This Chamber struck out the 30 per cent. I do not know that the 30 per cent. vote is of any great value, but I move—

That the amendment be agreed to.

Mrs. COWAN: I hope the amendment will not be agreed to. This Chamber struck out the 30 per cent. after due consideration. The three-fifths majority affords a very fair test without this 30 per cent. vote. I hope the Committee will adhere to the original arrangement.

Mr. TEESDALE: I ask the Committee not to stultify itself in this matter by allowing another place to insert the suggested condition.

Mr. CHESON: I hope the amendment will not be agreed to. The vote is sufficiently loaded already. Let us stick to what we carried.

Mr. MANN: I hope the amendment will be accepted. Unless we get a substantial vote in favour of prohibition it will cost more money than this State can afford, for police to enforce prohibition. We may take it that 15 per cent. of the electors on the roll are either dead or ineligible or out of the way. Thus we are left with an 85 per cent. maximum poll. The proposal is that 27 per cent. of that 85 per cent. shall control the other 58 per cent.

The Minister for Mines: Out of 178,000 persons 42,000 can carry prohibition even with this amendment in the Bill.

Mr. MANN: Without a substantial vote in favour of prohibition, the enforcement of prohibition will be impossible. Importation of liquor is not controlled by the State, but only sale and resale.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: Also wholesale.

Mr. MANN: There is a train running every day from Port Augusta, and any traveller by that train can bring with him as much liquor as he chooses. If we have not a majority in favour of the proposal, it is useless.

Mrs. Cowan: A three-fifths majority is provided for now.

Mr. MANN: That means very little if the poll be a light one. I will support the Council's amendment.

Mr. MUNSIE: I hope the amendment will not be agreed to. Since we have a three-fifths majority, I see no necessity for this 30 per cent. provision.

The Minister for Mines: That is not a three-fifths majority of those on the roll.

Mr. MUNSIE: No, but the 30 per cent. means 30 per cent of those on the roll. At only one or two elections have members been returned by a three-fifths majority representing 30 per cent. of those on the roll. It means that 60 per cent. of the people will have to go to the poll, for we have to allow for the opposition to the proposal.

Mr. Underwood: It means nothing of the sort.

Mr. MUNSIE: I doubt whether, outside of Boulder, a 60 per cent. poll would be obtained in any electorate. Even a three-fifths majority might be defeated because of this 30 per cent. provision. Why should we consider those who do not go to the poll? The only people worthy of consideration are those who record their votes. I would disfranchise a man for not voting.

Mr. Underwood: There is the tyrant!

Mr. MUNSIE: I am not half as big a tyrant as is the hon. member. I hope the Committee will not stultify itself by going back on its unanimous finding.

Mr. DAVIES: I hope the amendment will not be agreed to. It means even more than is suggested by the member who has just sat down. A 50 per cent. vote will be the minimum. Yet at the East Perth by-election, attended by so much excitement, only 53 per cent. of the voters went to the poll. To insist upon the support of 30 per cent. of the voters on the roll is going altogether too far. A leader of the temperance party denounced it as iniquitous, although he thought at the time it meant 30 per cent. of those who went to the poll.

Mr. McCallum: Well, he was a silly man!

Hon. P. Collier: He was a nice leader of the temperance party!

Mr. DAVIES: This 30 per cent. provision will react like a boomerang.

Hon. P. Collier: Then the temperance party ought to support it so as to get the benefit of that reaction.

Mr. DAVIES: In New Zealand only a simple majority is required, and the poll is held on the day of the general elections. Judging from the incomplete returns of the recent poll there, continuance has won by 16,000 votes; and it is expected that the complete returns will show a margin of 18,000 votes. Here the liquor people have the safeguard of a three-fifths majority. If the bare majority principle had been carried, some regulation would have been brought in to prevent it from being put into practice. I ask members to consider the position, and ask themselves if they are working in their own interests by agreeing to a double-barrelled proposition on this important question.

Mr. O'Loghlen: The liquor trade would be entrenched for the next 50 years without this Bill.

Mr. RICHARDSON: I oppose the amendment. This is a double-barrelled proposition. If the prohibitionists desire to win, they must have a three-fifths majority. In addition to that, 30 per cent. of the people on the roll must vote.

Mr. Underwood: Why should that not be so?

Mr. RICHARDSON: Why should it be so?

Mr. Underwood: You are making a change.

Mr. RICHARDSON: No material reason for the 30 per cent. vote has been advanced. The hon. member interjects often enough, but he is not game to show why there should be a 30 per cent. majority. In no other instance has such a thing been demanded.

Mr. Johnston: This has been the law for 10 years.

Mr. Underwood: It has been the custom for 1,000 years.

Mr. RICHARDSON: Almost every member has said this question should not be decided at general election time, and that it would become the main issue if it were put before the people then.

Mr. Mann: There was a 51 per cent. vote on the question of continuance.

Mr. RICHARDSON: That was a burning question at the time. Prohibition will never be carried on a three-fifths majority.

Mr. O'Loghlen: Never.

Mr. RICHARDSON: Then why increase the difficulty? I hope there will be a big majority vote against this amendment.

Mr. UNDERWOOD: I support the amendment. When a change is made in circumstances that have existed for centuries, it should only be made at the will of the majority of the people. When we say that certain individuals should not do certain things, there should be an overwhelming majority in opposition to them. If it is not a solid majority, the law will not be obeyed. It has not been proved that the drinking of alcohol has constituted a danger to those who do not drink. We are not asking for a vote of a majority of the people, but we are asking that 30 per cent. of those nasty interfering people, who do not like things and cannot take them, shall go to the poll and vote against them.

Mr. Munsie: We are asking that 30 per cent. of the people on the roll should vote.

Mr. UNDERWOOD: We are not asking for an absolute majority vote.

Mr. Munsie: There is more here than we are asking for.

Mr. UNDERWOOD: I would agree to a simple majority if we had an absolute majority vote; that is to say, 50 per cent. plus one of the electors on the roll would have to vote for prohibition.

Mr. Munsie: And then we would be giving in all the duplications.

Mr. UNDERWOOD: We are now discussing the alteration of conditions that have prevailed for over 4,000 years. When we come to a question of altering the habits of people under those conditions, the new order of things should be backed with a fairly solid majority of the people. We are not asking for a majority at all. If there were 20 per cent. of the people who desired to retain the privileges that their ancestors enjoyed, we should remember that those ancestors built up an Empire on which the sun never sets and there has not been much to complain about in our Empire. If 20 per cent. of the people were desirous of an alteration, 80 per cent. should come along and vote against them. We are not asking for that, nor yet for an actual majority of those who do vote. We simply ask that a 30 per cent. majority of those interfering people shall cast their votes. Surely that is not too much to ask. On the other hand, it may be asked why we should be compelled to vote on a question affecting rights which have been enjoyed for thousands of years. If such an alteration is not decided upon by a solid majority of the people, the amended law will not have a good effect but will merely lead to trouble and discord. To change the whole system of people's lives and habits by virtue of a loud-mouthed but small minority, will only land us in trouble. We ask for nothing when we ask that 30 per cent. of the people shall go to the poll and vote. In view of past experience it is only a fair thing to ask. Recently we had before the people, a candidate who had the solid support of the prohibition party, who came out in full strength and, in addition, he had other political support as well. With all that backing, however, he was beaten by two to one. If 30 per cent. of the people go to the poll and vote for this alteration, the rest of us will obey the law when it is put into force. If it is only because of a few paid secretaries and a few people who become intoxicated with the exuberance of their own verbosity that we shall be called upon to go to the poll at all, there will be trouble. The member for Hannans spoke about those who are dead, but whose names remain on the roll. I will allow for the "dead-uns," but I contend that not 40 per cent. of the people whose names appear on the roll are dead.

The Minister for Works: Indeed, they are not.

Hon. P. Collier: But how do you know.

Mr. UNDERWOOD: Allowing that 40 per cent. are dead, we are still only asking for an absolute majority to come to the poll and vote to change habits that have existed for so long. If there is not a substantial majority, there is no right for such a change to be made.

Mr. J. H. SMITH: I support the amendment, because it is in the interests of the majority of the people. I have been surprised to hear the remarks of members who, apparently, oppose majority rule. We ask that 30 per cent. of the people should vote in favour of prohibition in addition to which a three-fifths majority has been agreed to. In the

event of a small poll, the effect would be that the minority would have an opportunity to decide what the majority should do. During the election campaign I stated I was in favour of a majority of the electors on the roll deciding this question, and I am in favour of that to-day. The Legislative Council has given us an object lesson in framing this amendment.

Mr. O'Loughlen: Where was your democracy when the simple majority was being discussed?

Mr. J. H. SMITH: I believe in the majority of the electors on the roll deciding the question.

Mr. O'Loughlen: Did you support that proposition?

Mr. J. H. SMITH: The question was never introduced in this Chamber.

Mr. O'Loughlen: It went to a division.

Mr. J. H. SMITH: I am still in favour of a majority of electors on the roll deciding this question.

Mr. Underwood: You mean a majority of those who vote.

Mr. J. H. SMITH: The Medical Association in the United States are requesting the Government to annul the prohibition order so far as medicines are concerned. That proves that alcohol is necessary in the sick rooms and in hospitals. I trust the amendment will be carried.

Mr. HICKMOTT: I oppose the amendment. I have heard no logical argument in favour of it. This Chamber agreed to the deletion of the provision for 30 per cent. and I cannot understand the member for Pilbara and the member for Nelson talking about the simple majority when they know that we decided upon the three-fifths majority being requisite.

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

Ayes	..	..	..	16
Noes	..	..	..	15

Majority for	..	..	1
--------------	----	----	---

## AYES.

Mr. Broun  
Mr. Denton  
Mr. Durack  
Mr. George  
Mr. Gibson

Mr. Plessee  
Mr. Sampson  
Mr. Scaddan  
Mr. J. H. Smith

Mr. H. C. Maley  
Mr. Mann  
Sir James Mitchell

Mr. Underwood  
Mr. Mullany  
(Teller.)

## NAES.

Mr. Angwin  
Mr. Chasson  
Mr. Collier  
Mrs. Cewen  
Mr. Davies  
Mr. Harrison  
Mr. Heron

Mr. Lacey  
Mr. Marshall  
  
Mr. J. M. Smith  
Mr. Teesdale  
Mr. A. Thomson  
Mr. O'Loughlen  
(Teller.)

## PASES.

For—	Against—
Mr. C. C. Maley	Mr. Carter
Mr. Pickering	Mr. Richardson

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

No. 33—Clause 59, Subclause (2), line 6.—Strike out the words "in the district."

No. 34—Clause 60.—Add at the end the following:—"At the expiration of the year in which the vote is taken."

No. 35—Clause 66.—Strike out "duty carried" in line 1.

No. 36—Clause 67.—After the words "Assembly or" insert "either House of the."

On motions by the Premier, the foregoing Council's amendments agreed to.

No. 37—Clause 71, Subclause 3, line 2.—After "bona fide" insert "traveller or."

The PREMIER: I move—

That the amendment be agreed to.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: I am surprised at the Premier accepting this amendment because he fought it so strenuously when the Bill was before this House. The amendment opens up the whole question of the bona fide traveller.

The Premier: It does not.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: What is the definition of a traveller? A person who is away from his home. The Premier knows that there has been great difficulty amongst the licensees because some refused to serve during prohibited hours, while others did so.

The Minister for Mines: This has nothing to do with Sunday trading; it deals with week days.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: It deals with the hours of closing at any time, week days or Sundays. The amendment will put the licensed victualler in the position he occupied previously.

The Premier: This is not the bona fide traveller clause.

The Minister for Mines: The definition of "bona fide traveller" appears in Clause 75.

The PREMIER: I have no desire to go back to the old order, and this amendment will not interfere with the restrictions set up against the bona fide traveller. It was decided that the bona fide traveller clause should operate within a radius of 20 miles of the Town Hall. Outside that radius the bona fide traveller is now recognised under the Bill, but since the House has said that we must have the bona fide traveller in the metropolitan area, this clause must be altered. I am doing only what the House said must be done, not what I wish to be done.



Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: The word "lodger" was inserted in this clause because the lodger resides on the premises; the hotel is his home. A traveller is a man who moves from place to place.

The MINISTER FOR MINES: As introduced, the Bill contained no provision for supplying the bona fide traveller with liquor outside the recognised hours. We decided that the bona fide traveller, under certain conditions, should be supplied with liquor during prohibited hours. The amendment does not alter the position in any way. It does not prohibit the sale of liquor to a bona fide traveller. But no person shall be deemed to be a bona fide traveller under the clause if an hotel is within the radius of 20 miles of the Town Hall. Outside the hours as specified, within that radius, he can be a bona fide traveller as much as he likes but he cannot get liquor.

Mr. Davies: What about a bona fide lodger?

The MINISTER FOR MINES: He could obtain liquor. If every clause in the Bill were similarly amended, a bona fide traveller would still be a person outside the 20 miles radius.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: Clause 78 makes it an offence for any person to be found drinking on licensed premises or leaving such premises with liquor in his possession during prohibited hours. It also provides that this section shall not relate to a bona fide lodger or a weekly or other boarder within the meaning of Section 98. Then there is provision for travellers in certain districts. If this amendment were made there would be no penalty for these offences.

The Premier: The Bill applies to the whole of the State.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: The Premier has shifted his ground.

The PREMIER: I have not shifted my ground. I regret that the bona fide traveller has not been cut out altogether, but since it has been decided that he shall not be cut out, these words must be added. Travellers as such must be supplied.

Question put and passed; the Council's amendment agreed to.

No. 37a.—Add a new subclause to stand as Subclause 3 as follows:—(3) Notwithstanding anything contained in this section or the next following section to the contrary, a licensee shall be entitled, during the hours when his premises are closed for the sale of liquor to keep the same open for and conduct therein an eating-house: provided that this subsection shall not apply to any bar-room on his licensed premises or modify or affect the provisions of Subsections (1) and (2) of this section or Subsection (1) of Section 98 or the provisions of Sections 99 and 103 of this Act.

The PREMIER: I hope the Committee will not accept this amendment. If hotels can be kept open during all the hours between 9 p.m. and 9 a.m., we shall have no control over the sale of liquor.

Mr. Munsie: If a man wants a drink at 9 p.m., does not he want one at 10 p.m. just as much?

The PREMIER: The Committee has said that he must not have one after 9 p.m.

Mr. Munsie: Another place says he may, so we may as well let him have it.

The PREMIER: It will mean that hotels will be open night and day. It will take an army of police to watch them, and see that they do not sell liquor after hours. The hours of 9 a.m. to 9 p.m. have worked very well, and we should not disturb them. It would be foolish to make impossible the control of the sale of liquor after hours. The Bill is intended to bring about control in a much greater degree than before.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: You are putting everything back.

The PREMIER: We are not. I wonder if the hon. member will help me to negative this amendment. Perhaps he will argue that the hotels should be able to sell ginger beer and hop beer.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: In the country you would be one of the first to go to an hotel for dinner.

The PREMIER: I would not want dinner after 9 o'clock at night.

Mr. Munsie: It would depend on what hour you arrived at the town.

The Minister for Mines: I warrant the Premier would require a meal before nine in the morning.

The PREMIER: If I arrived after 9 p.m. I would be a bona fide traveller. There is no justification for the amendment. It will make the control of hotels impossible.

Mr. Munsie: No fear.

The PREMIER: If this amendment is accepted hotels will be a blaze of light after 9 p.m.

Mr. Mann: That would be better than trading behind closed doors.

The PREMIER: I do not think so. Under existing conditions, few people would enter an hotel after 9 p.m., because it is an offence to be found on the premises. This amendment would make it a virtue to be there after 9 o'clock. People would claim they were there to get tea, ginger beer, and bread and butter.

Mr. Mann: Why should not hotels provide such things?

The PREMIER: I do not know why people want them after 9 p.m. I would like to see the hon. member taking ginger beer and bread and butter after 9 p.m. The amendment is quite unnecessary, and we should pause before voting for it.

Mr. O'Loughlin: It does not matter what happens; let it go.

The PREMIER: It does matter. I am keen on controlling the trade.

Mr. Mann: This will make hotels other than liquor shops.

The PREMIER: That is all nonsense. One half of the hotels in Perth to-day will not supply meals—some members could tell us

what conveniences there are for cooking in various hotels—but from now on they will want to sell meals from 9 p.m. to 9 a.m. There is neither justification, reason, nor demand for such an amendment. I move—

That the amendment be not agreed to.

Mr. CHESSON: I hope the amendment will be agreed to.

The Premier: It will be worst provision in the Bill.

Mr. CHESSON: A fairly large section of workers living a few miles from goldfields towns make it a practice to go into the towns on Sunday and have dinner at the hotels. If this provision is not inserted, they will be unable to do that.

The Premier: That would not be after 9 p.m.

Mr. CHESSON: But Sunday is included in prohibited hours.

Mr. Teesdale: Do not the staff want a holiday?

Mr. CHESSON: There is no danger to the staff; they have to be there on account of boarders. The amendment will be a great convenience to prospectors and others.

Mr. McCALLUM: The amendment should not be agreed to as it will be impossible to enforce the Act at all. It will never be known why people are on hotel premises or what they are doing there. One of the worst provisions of the existing law is that which allows billiard rooms to be kept open till 11 p.m. The public frequently see people entering licensed premises after trading hours, and the suspicion is that they are going there to get drink. They may be going there to get drink or to play billiards. If they are caught on the premises, the excuse is that they are there for a game of billiards. The amendment will provide another excuse for their being on the premises, namely that they are there to get something to eat.

Mr. Mann: Provided the bar is closed, what does it matter?

Mr. McCALLUM: The hon. member knows that after hours drinking is not done in the bar. The liquor is taken from the bar and served all over the premises. There are secret lockers and cupboards all over the premises.

Mr. Mann: I do not know of that.

Mr. McCALLUM: I have had more than one drink with the hon. member in such circumstances.

The Minister for Mines: Officially he does not know of it.

Mr. McCALLUM: If the amendment is accepted it will be impossible to administer the law.

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

Ayes	..	..	..	20
Noes	..	..	..	13
—				
Majority for	..	..	..	7
—				

# AYES.

Mr. Brown	Mr. McCallum
Mr. Carter	Sir James Mitchell
Mrs. Cowan	Mr. Plesse
Mr. Davies	Mr. Sampson
Mr. Durack	Mr. Scaddan
Mr. George	Mr. J. M. Smith
Mr. Harrison	Mr. Teesdale
Mr. Hickmott	Mr. A. Thomson
Mr. Hughes	Mr. J. Thomson
Mr. H. K. Maley	Mr. Mullany

(Teller.)

# NOES.

Mr. Angwin	Mr. Lutey
Mr. Chesson	Mr. Mann
Mr. Collier	Mr. Marshall
Mr. Corboy	Mr. O'Loghlen
Mr. Denton	Mr. Underwood
	Mr. Heron

(Teller.)

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

No. 38—Clause 72, after "bona fide" insert "traveller":

The PREMIER: This amendment again merely restores the bona fide traveller. I move—

That the amendment be agreed to.

Question put and passed; the Council's amendment agreed to.

No. 39—Clause 73, Subclause 1, line 3, after "book" insert "in the form prescribed"; Subclause 2, add at the end "and the book shall be signed by lodger"; Subclause 6 (d), strike out "by any person" and insert under "Subsection 4;" Subclause 7, strike out this subclause; add to the clause "For the purposes of this section 'lodger' includes 'boarder'":

The PREMIER: This refers to the signing of the register of lodgers by the lodgers. I move—

That the amendment be agreed to.

Question put and passed; the Council's amendment agreed to.

No. 40—Clause 75, strike out the words "the licensing districts of Perth, Fremantle, Claremont, Subiaco, Leederville, Canning, or Guildford," and insert "an area bounded by a circle having a radius of 20 miles from the town hall in Perth"; in paragraph (h) strike out "within any other licensing district," and insert "elsewhere than within an area bounded by a circle having a radius of 20 miles from the town hall in Perth"; strike out the proviso at the end of the clause; add a proviso at the end, as follows: "Provided that notwithstanding this section, the sale or supply of liquor by the holder of a railway refreshment room license to travellers on a railway shall be lawful during the hours when licensed premises may be lawfully open to the public for the sale of liquor in the district in which the railway refreshment room is situated":

The PREMIER: This amendment fixes the area in respect of the bona fide traveller provision. The effect of the Bill is not changed, but the wording is simplified. The amendment also provides for the sale of liquor in railway refreshment rooms. Without this amendment a bona fide traveller could not be supplied with liquor in a railway refreshment room where the sale of liquor is restricted to bona fide travellers on the railway. I move—

That the amendment be agreed to.

Question put and passed; the Council's amendment agreed to.

No. 41—Clause 76, strike out this clause:

The PREMIER: This also has reference to the bona fide traveller. I move—

That the amendment be agreed to.

Question put and passed; the Council's amendment agreed to.

No. 42—Clause 77, strike out lines 1 and 2, and insert "A section is inserted in the principal Act, as follows: 'after bona fide insert traveller or'":

The PREMIER: The bona fide lodger has the right to carry away liquor from licensed premises during prohibited hours. I move—

That the amendment be agreed to.

However, I do not know that it is necessary that the bona fide traveller should carry away liquor. I have no objection to the Committee refusing to make this amendment.

Mr. McCALLUM: I hope the amendment will not be agreed to. In the case of the bona fide lodger the hotel is his home, and one can take away liquor from one's home. However, the abuse of the hotels on the riverside with drinking on Sundays, and the carrying away of liquor from them on board boats, and the consequent accidents and loss of life were due to the bona fide traveller clause, as was also a great deal of unseemly conduct.

Mr. O'Loughlen: It is a pity the whole State should be made to suffer for the sake of the few who misbehave.

Mr. McCALLUM: The bona fide traveller should not be allowed to carry liquor away.

Mr. LUTEY: If that privilege is granted to the bona fide lodger, I fail to see why the bona fide traveller, in the country for instance, should not enjoy it. He ought to be allowed to take with him a bottle of whisky on a hot and dusty journey.

Question put and negatived; the Council's amendment not agreed to.

No. 43—Clause 78, Subclause 3, after "bona fide" insert "traveller;" after the words "meaning of" insert "Section 100 or":

The PREMIER: The bona fide lodger has the right to be on licensed premises during prohibited hours. This amendment

gives the bona fide traveller the same right. I move—

That the amendment be agreed to.

Question put and passed; the Council's amendment agreed to.

No. 44—Clause 79, insert the following new clause, to stand as Clause 78:—"A section is inserted in the principal Act, as follows:—'104a. No licensee shall supply to any person by the glass liquor to be consumed with water or aerated water on the premises of the licensee after the 1st day of July, 1923, unless such liquor is supplied in a glass capable of holding one and a quarter gills. Penalty: £5'":

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: The person who brought about the introduction of this amendment must be a large shareholder in some glass works. The amendment involves the smashing up or the exporting of a large proportion of the glasses used in Western Australian hotels at the present time.

Hon. P. Collier: The glass required by the amendment would be a seven-ounce glass.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: The glasses at present supplied are not always filled up with water or soda. This question ought not to have a place in the Bill, but should be left to the purchasers of liquor.

The Minister for Mines: It is a silly amendment.

Hon. P. Collier: The Minister for Works had it inserted.

Question put and negatived; the Council's amendment disagreed with.

No. 45—Clause 87—Strike out "sixteen" and insert "eighteen."

The PREMIER: This refers to the age of children who may be in a hotel bar. I move—

That the amendment be agreed to.

Question put and passed; the Council's amendment agreed to.

No. 46—Clause 89, line 4.—After "employed" insert "This section shall not apply to any person over the age of eighteen years who was bona fide employed as a barman or barmaid on the 24th August, 1922."

The PREMIER: This provides that the section shall not apply to certain bar tenders over 18 years of age. I move—

That the amendment be agreed to.

Question put and passed; the Council's amendment agreed to.

No. 47—Clause 91—Strike out this clause:

The PREMIER: The clause provides a penalty for sending a child for liquor. Provision is already made in Section 116 of the principal Act.

Mr. McCallum: No, that relates only to the bar.

Mr. Mann: Yes, it does not say anything about the procurement of liquor. This is different.

The PREMIER: I move—

That the amendment be not agreed to.

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

No. 48.—Clause 93, line 14—Strike out "may" and insert "shall":

The PREMIER: This makes it mandatory on the court to dismiss the case if the licensee proves that he took reasonable care to prevent a person being unlawfully on the premises. I move—

That the amendment be agreed to.

Question put and passed; the Council's amendment agreed to.

No. 49.—Clause 96—Strike out this clause:

The PREMIER: This deals with the employment of Asiatics.

Mr. O'Loughlen: Oh, yes, that must go out.

The PREMIER: Another place proposes to strike out the clause. I move—

That the amendment be not agreed to.

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

No. 50.—Clause 101, line 2.—Strike out all words after "is" down to and including the words "twenty pounds," in line 19, and insert the words "amended by adding the following subsection":—

The PREMIER: This amendment permits billiards to be played on licensed premises after hours, at all events by a lodger. It also permits billiards to be played after 11 p.m. under an occasional license. I do not know why we should allow billiards to be played after hours.

Mr. O'Loughlen: Why allow people to be about after hours? Why not send them to bed at 6 o'clock?

The PREMIER: I advise the hon. member to try it on himself. If the amendment be agreed to, games may be played on licensed premises after closing hours. The amendment will make it impossible to control the sale of liquor. I move—

That the amendment be not agreed to.

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

No. 51.—Clause 102, Subclause 1, line 2.—After the word "or" insert "engage in any unlawful." Strike out in Subclause (2) the words "or any game or pretended game of chance," and insert after the word "or," in line one, the words "engages in any unlawful":

The PREMIER: These are just consequential amendments. I move—

That the amendment be agreed to.

Question put and passed; the Council's amendment agreed to.

No. 52.—Clause 104.—Add at the end of the clause "and by inserting after the word

'offence, in line 9, the words 'or the licensing court.'"

The PREMIER: This allows the licensing court to forfeit a license for an offence in cases where the justices do not act. Certainly if certain offences are committed, the licensee should lose his license. I move—

That the amendment be agreed to.

Question put and passed; the Council's amendment agreed to.

No. 53.—Clause 107.—After the figures "117" insert "and Part X. of this Act." And in line 9.—After "be" insert "personally."

The PREMIER: This deals with State hotels and the adulteration of liquor. I move—

That the amendment be agreed to.

Question put and passed; the Council's amendment agreed to.

No. 54.—Clause 108.—Strike out this clause:

The PREMIER: To strike out this clause is to strike out the restriction on the number of clubs. I move—

That the amendment be not agreed to.

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

No. 55.—Clause 112.—Insert the following proviso to 149 (2):—Provided that it shall be lawful for a member of a residential club which contains not less than 10 bedrooms if in the metropolitan area, and not less than two bedrooms if outside the metropolitan area, together with a suitable complement of bedding and furniture, and in which meals are customarily provided, on giving six hours' notice in writing to the secretary, and subject to the approval in writing of the committee, to invite not more than three guests, whose names shall be stated in the notice, to dinner in the club premises on any day except Sunday, and thereupon such guests shall be entitled to use the club premises or such parts of the club premises as are set apart for the use of guests between six p.m. and twelve midnight on such day; but no such guest shall pay or be allowed to pay for any meal, liquor, or other refreshment in the club.

The PREMIER: This continues the present practice of inviting guests to residential clubs.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: Clubs are to close at 11 o'clock at night.

The PREMIER: Yes, but no one can have a drink after 11 o'clock. I move—

That the amendment be agreed to.

Question thus passed; the Council's amendment following result:—

Ayes	..	..	..	19
Noes	..	..	..	15
Majority for	..	..	..	4

## AYES.

Mr. Broun	Mr. Mann
Mr. Carter	Sir James Mitchell
Mr. Denton	Mr. O'Loghlen
Mr. Durack	Mr. Piesse
Mr. George	Mr. Sampson
Mr. Gibson	Mr. Scaddan
Mr. Harrison	Mr. J. Thomson
Mr. Hickmott	Mr. Underwood
Mr. Johnston	Mr. Mullany
Mr. H. K. Maley	(Teller.)

## NOES.

Mr. Angwin	Mr. Lambert
Mr. Chasson	Mr. Lutey
Mr. Collier	Mr. Marshall
Mr. Corboy	Mr. McCallum
Mrs. Cowan	Mr. J. M. Smith
Mr. Davies	Mr. Teesdale
Mr. Heron	Mr. Munsie
Mr. Hughes	(Teller.)

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

No. 56.—Insert the following new clause, to follow Clause 112:—On the recommendation of the Chairman of Licensing Courts, the Minister may exempt from the provisions of Section 149a and Section 165a any registered club where the amount paid or payable for all liquor (excluding the duties therein) purchased by or for such club during the twelve months ended 31st December immediately preceding did not exceed the amount of members' subscriptions received by the club for such period.

The PREMIER: This amendment seeks to exempt from the provisions of two clauses in the Bill clubs where the value of the liquor purchased does not exceed the amount of member's subscriptions. This would apply to small clubs such as golf, yachting clubs, etc. There is no risk in passing the amendment. I move—

That the amendment be agreed to.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: I suppose this would not apply to clubs which had no members. In Fremantle recently a certificate was given to a club which had no members. It was in connection with the Commercial Travellers' Club. This institution now holds two certificates under the one registration, embracing Perth and Fremantle. This is illegal. The Inspector of Police reported to the licensing bench that there was no register of members for Fremantle. The only register was a combined one for Perth and Fremantle. The licensing magistrates had no power to register the Fremantle club in view of that fact. Under such a principle a club which had a large membership in the city, could establish a branch in every town in the State. The licensing bench ought to be asked for an explanation. Why should a club, however small, be exempt from taxation under this Bill?

The Premier: It will not be exempt.

Mr. Mann: This is to encourage clubs for other than drinking purposes.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: All clubs selling liquor should pay a tax.

The MINISTER FOR MINES: This has nothing to do with the question of taxation, and merely exempts clubs of this nature from Clause 149 (a) which deals with the closing hours, and Clause 165 (a) which deals with drinking on Sunday. The object the Legislative Council had was to exempt yacht and golf clubs. There is no reason why we should exempt one type of club any more than others.

Hon. P. Collier: In any case the fees and the drink bill have nothing to do with the question.

The MINISTER FOR MINES: That is so, and I do not think we should agree to the amendment.

Mr. McCALLUM: The suggested amendment is a clear request for class privileges. The amendment is framed to suit the Weld Club only, so that they may keep open after 11 o'clock and all day Sunday. There is no other club for which it is required and the fact that it could apply to other clubs is merely held up as an example.

Hon. P. Collier: That is the smoke screen.

Mr. McCALLUM: We know that the Weld Club charges the highest subscription fees.

The Minister for Mines: You would probably know if their fees would exceed their drink bill.

Mr. McCALLUM: I do not know that, but it is possible. Why should it be necessary for that special privilege to be granted to that club?

Hon. P. Collier: So that they may tell the latest stories.

Mr. McCALLUM: This amendment clearly sets out what clubs exist for. I do not think Parliament should stoop to legislate for one club. South Australia did it, but Parliament there had the manliness to name the club concerned, which was to be exempt from the law. Why should this Parliament cater for the specially selected club comprising members of Western Australia's elite?

The Minister for Mines: Don Cameron did not look for his name among them when he rushed into the meat safe.

Mr. McCALLUM: One is not always a free agent in special circumstances.

The Minister for Mines: In any case, they did not discourage him on that occasion.

Mr. McCALLUM: I hope the amendment will not be agreed to. If clubs perform the social office attributed to them, we should encourage the reduction of fees and extension of membership rather than legislate for a club which imposes the highest subscriptions.

Mr. HUGHES: I hope the amendment will not be agreed to. It is suggested that the amendment implies a restriction upon sale of liquor by saying that these privileges will be granted only to clubs where the members' subscriptions exceed the amount of the liquor bill. There are a number of clubs along the river front whose membership comprises a large number of young men, who are teetotallers. The fact that they do not drink means that another member may consume

liquor representing twice the amount of his subscription and he will be allowed to take strangers there as well.

Mr. Mann: Are you referring to the A.N.A. Club?

Mr. HUGHES: No, I am not referring to any club in particular.

The Minister for Mines: The Dinghy Club has no bar.

Mr. HUGHES: The existence of a liquor bar in clubs, which are formed ostensibly for the purpose of encouraging athletics, is really against the best interests of the young athletes. The fact that so large a percentage of the membership will be teetotallers means that a larger quantity of liquor will be available for consumption by the others. If we agree to the amendment we may just as well permit them to run open houses on Sundays and apply that to the pubs as well.

The Minister for Mines: We knocked out the bona fide traveller clause and yet it is proposed to grant these privileges to clubs!

Mr. HUGHES: That is so, and we should not agree to it.

The PREMIER: The Committee should remember that these privileges can only be granted on the recommendation of the chairman of the licensing court.

Member: And he will probably be a member of the Weld Club.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: We should provide that the chairman of the licensing court shall not be a member of a club.

Question put and negatived; the Council's amendment not agreed to.

No. 57—Clause 113:—After the word "bedrooms," in line eight, insert "if in the metropolitan area or two bedrooms if outside the metropolitan area." Add a proviso, as follows:—Provided that the Licensing Court may grant an occasional license which shall exempt the club from the provisions of this section on any special occasion during certain hours and on the special occasion to be specified in the license.

The PREMIER: I move—

That the amendment be agreed to.

It is suggested that the provision for 10 bedrooms shall apply to clubs in the metropolitan area and that only two bedrooms will be required if the clubs are outside the metropolitan area. There is also a proviso setting out that the licensing court may grant an occasional license exempting the club from the provisions of the Act during certain hours and on special occasions.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: What about the proviso?

The Minister for Mines: That is all right. It is in existence now.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: We should provide that no member of the licensing court should be a member of a club.

Members: Why?

Mr. O'Loughlen: They cannot be more biassed than some members of Parliament.

Question put and passed; the Council's amendment agreed to.

No. 58—Clause 115, line 7; after "thera-on" insert "and cost of carriage from place to place within the State."

No. 59—Clause 118; add a subclause to stand as Subclause 3 as follows:—"Part X. of this Act shall apply to club premises which shall be deemed to be licensed premises for the purpose of Part X."

On motion by the Premier, the foregoing Council's amendments agreed to.

No. 60—Clause 123, Subclause 1; strike out this subclause.

The PREMIER: I move—

That the amendment be agreed to.

It is proposed to strike out the subclauses dealing with the strength of liquor. We vide that the strength of beer should not be more than 9 per cent. of proof spirit and in the case of stout, not more than 12 per cent. It has been found that the clause will shut out the importation of special lines of stout which are required by invalids. I do not know why we limited the strength of beer because there is a danger of the strength being increased, if the position is not safeguarded.

Mr. McCALLUM: I know that a difficulty has arisen, but I should like to see the strength of beer prescribed in the Bill. We set out to make it compulsory to manufacture a lighter beer in Western Australia. The members of the Royal Commission were pleased to find that quite a number of brewers are specialising in light beers, particularly on the goldfields and in some of the country districts. We were told that the percentage we prescribed would be acceptable to brewers, although to manufacture beer which had to be sent over a long journey, such as to the North-West, there was a certain amount of risk in connection with second fermentation making the liquor over the standard of strength specified in the Bill. It has been found that the clause as we passed it, would prohibit the importation of Irish stouts.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: Why not have Australian stouts?

Mr. O'Loughlen: Would you drink them?

Mr. McCALLUM: It is generally agreed that there is no comparison between the stouts from Great Britain and stout manufactured in any other part of the world.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: I do not agree with that.

Mr. O'Loughlen: You do not drink either, so you are no judge.

Mr. McCALLUM: It cannot be said that one competes with the other because of the wide difference in the price. The Commission wished to provide for the manufacture of a lighter beer in the State and I thought that the Government would have drafted a clause that would have met the difficulty. We should encourage the manufacture of light beer as much as possible.

Mr. UNDERWOOD: There are many people who are solicitous about the North-West,

and when they wish to cut down the strength of beer to the level of lemonade we shall consume stronger liquor. I do not know why the North-West should have all this attention bestowed on it. Last year almost every person who spoke was desirous of doing something for the North-West. Only the other night I heard a Federal Minister express the desire to do something for the North-West. I object to anyone saying that we in the North-West want a lighter beer than can be taken down here.

The Minister for Mines: We would not suggest it.

Mr. UNDERWOOD: If you cut down the strength of beer or stout we will drink gin or whisky. I protest against those people who have never been to the North-West, and who know nothing about it, wanting to adopt us. We want to lead our own lives and drink what comes our way.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: I find that another place desires this clause to be deleted so as to give the imported article a chance to be brought in.

Hon. P. Collier: It is the only thing that they can beat Australia in.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: We can make anything in Australia that can be made in England or Ireland. It seems that members who drink stout have no faith in the local production.

Mr. Teesdale: Why be a fanatic like that?

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: The hon. member believes that the imported article is better than the local, perhaps because it suits his palate better. I believe in trying to build up Australian industries, and it is everyone's duty to do that. I know there has been someone in the corridors lately watching the interests of the imported article.

Mr. O'Loughlen: Of course there has been no one in the corridors looking after the local article!

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: They did not come near me.

The Minister for Mines: Do you think that the imported stout will affect the local article?

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: It will affect the local industry.

The Minister for Mines: At double the price?

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: Those who drink it fancy it is better, because it suits their palate better. I trust the Committee will disagree with the amendment and show to the community that we believe in local manufactures as much as possible.

Mr. TEESDALE: I agree with the member for South Fremantle and I am surprised at the attitude of the member for North-East Fremantle. I take no second position in supporting local industries, but I am not going to let it get me down. Do you know, Mr. Chairman that there are hundreds of invalids to-day who are kept alive with Irish stout? Do not the doctors order this stout three times a day when their patients cannot assimilate food? We know that the local stout is so weak sometimes that it runs out of the case when it goes up north. We in

the north must have something with a sting in it. A nobbler of stout is one of the principal drinks to take in the far north, and we give it to our women folk. When it is 117 in the shade up there Guinness's stout is a life saver.

Mr. UNDERWOOD: We have heard a great deal about the strength of Dublin stout but we know that it is fortified with alcohol. Being an advocate of light drinks I am not in favour of putting up something that is supposed to be light in alcohol, but which contains much of it. If one desires a good long drink to quench the thirst, one does not require too much alcohol. The only difference between the Australian and the imported stout is that the imported is more highly fortified with alcohol. If one wants alcohol one can get it in gin, rum, or whisky. To quench the thirst and revive one, the Australian stout is as good as Dublin stout.

Mr. Teesdale: It is not hard to take, anyhow.

Mr. UNDERWOOD: Neither is rum. We should persuade our people that Australian stout is the better.

Hon. P. Collier: That is the difference between yourself now and your normal condition.

Mr. UNDERWOOD: I drink stout or light beverages of that description only when I have had sufficient of a higher alcoholic strength.

Hon. P. Collier: I did not mean it.

Mr. UNDERWOOD: It is something to top off with.

Mr. PICKERING: Hitherto I have always regarded the member for Pilbara as an authority on the drink question, but I am not conceding that qualification any longer. There seems to be a confusion because of the colour. There are beers of two colours, one amber and one black. Some members think that anything black is stout. There is only one stout in the world, and that is made in Dublin. The black beverage we drink is really porter, a light black beer. It would be regrettable if the importation of stout were prohibited, because that is an article of food.

Question put and passed; the Council's amendment agreed to.

No. 61—Insert a new clause, to follow Clause 124, as follows:—"Section 184 of the principal Act is amended by deleting all the words after 'analyst' to the end of the section, and inserting the words 'with a suitable identification number by the inspector.'"

No. 62—Clause 127—Strike out "two gallons," and insert "one gallon":

On motions by the Premier, the foregoing amendments were agreed to.

No. 63—Clause 130—Add a subclause, as follows:—(2) Section three of the Sale of Liquor and Tobacco Act, 1916, is amended by inserting after the words "Licensing Act of 1911," in line 2, the words "or a brewer's license or a spirit merchant's license":

The PREMIER: This makes provision for keeping a record of sales, and is a very good amendment. I move—

That the amendment be agreed to.

Question put and passed; the Council's amendment agreed to.

No. 64. Add the following new clause, to follow Clause 130:—Saving of right of renewal of certain licenses under pending applications. 131. Notwithstanding anything contained in this Act to the contrary, a gallon or two-gallon license, or a spirit merchant's license under and subject to the principal Act may, on payment of the fee payable under that Act, be granted or issued to any person who, prior to the 31st day of December, 1922, is an applicant or the holder of a certificate for such license, but section twenty-nine of this Act shall apply to such license: Provided that the Receiver of Revenue shall, if required to do so—(a) issue to the holder of a certificate for a gallon license or a two-gallon license, in lieu of such license, a spirit merchant's license under and subject to this Act, on payment of the prescribed fee; (b) issue to the holder of a certificate for a two-gallon license held by or on behalf of a person carrying on the business of a brewer, in lieu of such license, a brewer's license, and also, if desired, a spirit merchant's license under and subject to this Act, on payment of the prescribed fees; (c) issue to the holder of a certificate for a spirit merchant's license under the principal Act, in lieu of such license, a spirit merchant's license under and subject to this Act, on payment of the prescribed fee.

No. 65. Clause 127—In the form of "brewery license" strike out the words "the said" in line 5. After the word "person," in line 9, insert "or the representative of a person," and in line 10 strike out "made in Western Australia" and insert "the produce of the brewery."

On motions by the Premier, the foregoing amendments were agreed to.

Resolutions reported.

The PREMIER: As we must draw up reasons for disagreeing to certain amendments and agreeing to others with modifications, I move—

That the adoption of the report be made an order of the day for the next sitting of the House.

Question put and passed.

## ANNUAL ESTIMATES, 1922-23.

In Committee of Supply.

Resumed from the 7th December; Mr. Angelo in the Chair.

Department of Minister for Water Supply, Sewerage and Drainage (Hon. W. J. George, Minister).

Vote—Metropolitan Water Supply, Sewerage and Drainage Department, £113,091:

The MINISTER FOR WORKS (Hon. W. J. George—Murray-Wellington) [9.40]: It is an old saying that it is difficult to gold refined gold or to paint the lily white—

Hon. P. Collier: It is not difficult to paint with the water you are supplying.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: And it is difficult indeed for me to say anything fresh in connection with the metropolitan water works.

Mr. Corboy: The water you are supplying at North Perth is not very fresh.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: I can quite understand members trying to get a little humour out of the Estimates after the solid work on the Licensing Bill.

Hon. P. Collier: Humour, do you call it?

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: I would like to direct the attention of members to the report on the Table containing in as concise a form as possible the facts and the figures in regard to this most important undertaking. As some members may not have had time to go thoroughly through the report, I shall make a few observations on it. The capital of the undertaking is now in the neighbourhood of two and a quarter millions. The revenue collected during the last 12 months was £192,755 and the expenditure exceeded the revenue collected by the sum of £8,810 0s. 2d. Folios 22 and 23 of the report give a very concise and clear statement of the operations of this undertaking each year since 1896, and I am sure that if members can spare from their laborious duties a little leisure to study those particulars, they will derive a great amount of pleasure from it. Members doubtless would like to know something of what the department is doing regarding the proposed Canning scheme. The exhaustive inquiries and surveys indicated in the report by Mr. Ritchie, the expert who came from Melbourne, have been thoroughly made and completed. The engineering department, the head of which is Mr. Lawson, are very carefully collating the facts and preparing their recommendations. It is expected that these recommendations will shortly be put into the hands of the Government for final decision. Generally speaking, the investigations have proved favourable. The points put forward in connection with the scheme have been confirmed in many directions, and in some respects have been improved. During the 12 months under review considerable work has been done, not only to increase the quantity of water supplied, but also to make people more satisfied with the quantity they desire. The work done consists of the following: The main connecting Mundaring Weir with the metropolitan area right through Midland Junction, Guildford and Bayswater to Perth, has been enlarged and it is now connected with the reservoir here, giving us over a million gallons per day of Mundaring water, or about double of what we have been receiving previously. Last year we took



from the Mundaring Weir 275,000,000 gallons of water, which materially assisted in meeting the needs of the citizens. The Bickley reservoir, which hon. members will recollect was built with the idea of being used as a service reservoir, has faithfully fulfilled that purpose, and moreover has given us a larger supply than we were anticipating from that source. Last year we took from it 170,000,000 gallons of water. The Osborne Park bores have not been very much called upon, because constant care and manipulation of the water supply enabled us to meet all requirements without having much recourse to the bores. However, last year we took from all the bores in the metropolitan area 1,560,000,000 gallons of water, and from the Mundaring, Bickley, and Victoria reservoirs 1,000,000,000. The engineers found that by careful manipulation of the supply they could obviate the necessity last summer for imposing the restrictions upon the use of water which were enforced during the previous summer. We hope and believe that in the coming year it will not be necessary to impose any restrictions. During the last few weeks there was a striking instance of how water is sometimes used in the metropolitan area. Hon. members will recollect the very hot spell which lasted a few days. The result of that hot spell was that 12,300,000 gallons of water were used in one day, being the highest consumption during the current financial year. Prior to that day, about 8,000,000 gallons were being consumed. From the consumption of 12,000,000 odd gallons it is evident that the requirements of the metropolitan area are very heavy.

Hon. P. Collier: What about the gardens?

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: I take it the difference between the eight and the 12 million gallons was used for gardens and lawns, which very naturally the owners desired to keep going. I am not referring to the fact as indicating a misuse of water. I am quoting the figures to prove that if there came along a time of real difficulty in water supply, and if restrictions were placed upon the use of water except for domestic and manufacturing purposes, something like seven or eight million gallons of water per day would supply our needs.

Hon. P. Collier: That is a cheerful prospect you are holding out. If the worst comes to the worst, we can let all our gardens die.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: Yes, if the hon. member likes to put it that way. However, that is not the view with which the suggestion is put forward. My object is merely to assure members that there is no danger of actual famine for domestic and manufacturing uses. During the debate just finished I heard all sorts of suggestions about stout and beer, and my wish is to reassure the Committee so far as water is concerned. The Leader of the Opposition some years ago was Minister for Water Supply.

Mr. Corboy: Under him we were not restricted like we have been under you.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: At that time there was not the enormous drain there is to-day; and, having been behind the scenes, the Leader of the Opposition can realise fully the sincerity and the accuracy of the statements I am making.

Hon. P. Collier: You cannot get me like that.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: I know there has been a great deal of complaint as to the quality of the water. Some of those who complained were, no doubt, quite justified in what they alleged. I do not deny that there has been discolouration of the water. Still, the analysis of the water has put our consciences at ease, satisfying us that we have not been supplying anything deleterious to the health of consumers.

Mr. MacCallum Smith: It is gross nonsense to say that the water is fit for human consumption.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: The member for North Perth is entitled to his opinion. Complaints have been received from various parts of Perth regarding the supply. North Perth and Mt. Lawley have complained bitterly, not only in the Press and through members of Parliament, but by correspondence addressed to the department. I want it to be clearly understood that those portions of the metropolitan area whose levels are high can never expect to get from a gravitation scheme the full quantity of water they would like to have, because as soon the lower levels start drawing there is no means known at present of giving the same full supply to the higher levels as would be available if the draft below were not so heavy. However, something has been done to remedy the matter by laying down a 24-inch main from Mount Hawthorn to Walcott-street, and along that street, thus obtaining a larger volume of water. Further, we are laying a 24-inch main from Cottesloe towards Fremantle. We have not been able to take that main as far as I should have liked, because the cash at command would not permit it; but we are taking it fully a mile, or possibly one and a half miles, nearer to Fremantle. That of itself should have a considerable influence upon the quantity of water delivered to Fremantle and thence distributed. During the year the highest point of distribution so far reached is, as I have said, 12½ millions of gallons in a day. The lowest point was 2,333,000 gallons of water in one day, during June. Hon. members will recognise from those figures what a difference it makes when very hot weather comes along. With regard to the question of sewerage and the filter beds on Burswood Island, Colonel Langley, a very eminent American expert, has reported upon river pollution, which was ascribed by many people to the septic tanks on Burswood Island. Colonel Langley's report entirely exonerates the department, pointing out that they have done all that could

possibly be done, and that their methods are certainly not behind those of similar departments in any other part of the world. The question of sewerage and storm water drainage at Subiaco has naturally given some anxiety to the people there, and has caused some agitation. We hope that funds will be available to permit of the carrying out of the scheme, which, I am satisfied, will represent a great improvement. One of the troubles the department have had during the past two years is the constant and steady rise of water in low-lying lands in the metropolitan area. We are aware that this has occurred at Shenton Park, Subiaco, and elsewhere, the most prominent instance being in Jolimont. I do not wish to enter into the merits of the latter, because the question has been before the courts and a decision has been given against the Government. That adverse judgment the Government have taken with as good a grace as possible, and they are giving full consideration to all the claims which have been made. In the metropolitan area there are 659 miles of reticulation, the largest pipes being 24 inches, diminishing to grades of 3 inches in cast-iron and in some cases to galvanised piping of 1 inch diameter. When the Goldfields Water Supply Vote was before the Committee, considerable reference was made to the question of meters. Some hon. members expressed the opinion that the rent charged for the meters had more than paid their cost, and that therefore the charging of rent should cease. I wish hon. members to take these figures into their minds: In the metropolitan area we have over 22,000 meters, and we are obliged to keep a staff varying from ten to twenty men all the year round to deal with those meters and where necessary repair them. Last year 7,267 meters had to be taken up and replaced with others, while the 7,267 underwent repairs. The cost of those repairs was very heavy indeed. The Loan Estimates provide for the supply and the laying of further mains where found to be necessary. Hon. members should bear in mind that although we put in larger mains, that expenditure does not necessarily imply an increase in revenue. It would do so if every ratepayer had his premises metered, and if the excess water were charged and paid for. But the result of the laying of further mains will be that we shall add very considerably to our capital investment without gaining the larger return which might be expected. The works which have been or are being done include service reservoirs, Bickley Brook and Mount Hawthorn; 21-inch main, Tower and Loftus-streets; 24-inch main, Mount Hawthorn to and along Walcott-street; 12 and 18-inch mains, Victoria Park to South Perth; 12-inch concrete main, North Beach-road; 12-inch main, Guildford to Maylands; Fremantle, Richmond reservoir. There are various other works necessarily incidental to a large scheme of this sort. As to stormwater drainage, we are at present engaged in putting in rather a large drain at Hyde

Park towards Monger's Lake and Parry-street. This is a most essential work, but it was started earlier than perhaps it would have been but for the fact that there was a call for employment by quite a number of men. The work being necessary, funds were found and operations were begun. The issue of owners' and agents' lists has proved very successful indeed. During last financial year the lists totalled £49,399 and the collections £48,875, or an equivalent of 99 per cent. So the issue of the lists was economical for the department and represented a considerable saving of trouble to the people engaged in letting houses and to those occupying them. The excess water lists for the year totalled £46,000 and the collections totalled £43,000—equal to 94 per cent. This result may, I think, be regarded as very creditable to the department. There has been a lot of trouble in regard to rates due on vacant land. I was not satisfied with this two or three years ago, and so the matter was carefully gone into. As a result, instead of many thousands being outstanding last year, there was only £7,000, which includes quite a number of arrears from previous years. The sewerage house connections have been very well attended to. Out of a total of 2,978 agreements 2,910 persons have paid in full. In all, £394,604 was advanced for house connections, and on the 30th June last only £10,148 remained due. I do not know that I can say much more about sewerage house connections. The scheme is running very well. Hon. members know all about it, and so, too, do the people. They know its virtues and its faults. The departmental officers are doing all they can to remedy its faults, and all complaints received are thoroughly investigated and, so far as possible, rectified. I commend the Estimates to the Committee, and if required I shall endeavour to give further information.

Mr. McCALLUM (South Fremantle) [10.2]: Listening to the Minister, one would think everything in respect of water supply and sewerage in the metropolitan area was all that could be desired. However, I am satisfied that the public will not accept the statement that everything in this department is as it should be. This department, instead of being termed the Water Supply and Sewerage Department, ought to be known as the excuses and explanations department.

The Minister for Works: We do not excuse anything.

Mr. McCALLUM: They offer excuses for every difficulty that arises. They endeavour to explain away everything to their own satisfaction, although to the disgust of the general public. The water supply of the metropolitan area is an absolute disgrace.

Mr. MacCallum Smith: Absolute!

Mr. McCALLUM: It is a shocking example of incompetence.

The Minister for Works: You should not say that.

**Mr. McCALLUM:** I say it deliberately. For the past 10 years the water supply of the metropolitan area has been a disgrace to successive Governments. There is no other part of the Commonwealth where it would be tolerated. The people here have sat down under it, accepting explanation after explanation, statement after statement, hope after hope each year that an improvement would be effected. After all the protests made last year we had the experience this year that on the first hot day practically the whole of my district and a great portion of Fremantle was without water supply at all. Even in normal times, the supply in the White Gum Valley and Beaconsfield areas, closely populated, is very scarce. I know of numerous houses where they cannot get sufficient water to meet their domestic requirements.

**The Minister for Works:** Too much is used in watering gardens.

**Mr. McCALLUM:** The people have a right to water gardens. The Minister holds that a garden is a luxury. It should be the aim of this department to supply sufficient water to all homes, and to encourage the owners to beautify their surroundings with gardens. When people incur an expenditure of hundreds of pounds in trying to improve their surroundings and make the city attractive, to build up a metropolitan area approaching those elsewhere in the Commonwealth, they are virtually told by those in charge of the water supply that what they are doing is a luxury, that they have no right to expect water for such purposes, that it is given to them as something of a favour, and that all they should look to the department for is sufficient water for domestic requirements.

**The Minister for Works:** That was the charter on which the water supply was started in 1890.

**Mr. McCALLUM:** It is time it was altered. We are now in 1922. It is evident that this department have been slumbering since 1890. They are still living in the shadows of dead men. It is time they awakened to the position and saw to it that the public are supplied according to the advances which civilisation has made. The department should not be allowed to live on the level of the aborigines who were here half a century ago. The department should be given to understand that.

**The Minister for Works:** The department understand it quite well.

**Mr. McCALLUM:** When the declaration comes from the department that a garden or a lawn around a home is a luxury, something for which the people have no right to expect water, it is a poor lookout for our standard of civilisation. Now we have another standard set up by the department, of which Parliament has never been asked to approve. The department are now taking the stand that it is not their function to supply water for fire fighting purposes, that the department merely have to cater for domestic purposes. At Fremantle they have declined to put in a service to meet the fire fighting requirements of the

district, and they ask the citizens there to find two-thirds of the cost.

**The Minister for Works:** The insurance companies one-third, the citizens one-third, and the Government one-third.

**Mr. McCALLUM:** What kind of a proposition is it for a Government department to ask the insurance companies and the citizens to pay two-thirds of the cost, yet not be given any say in the control and management of the service? The department are to have all the control and to say how much water is to be supplied, and when it is to be there, and are to collect from the district two-thirds of the cost!

**The Minister for Works:** Perth paid for its fire main.

**Mr. McCALLUM:** Paid for one small section, a sum of about £1,100. Yet we have in Fremantle firms of the standard of Messrs. G. Wood, Son & Co., who have been burnt out twice, Messrs. Robert Harper & Co., who have been burnt out once, Messrs. Fisher Beards, and others; these firms have rebuilt or are rebuilding. How can firms like those be expected to build palatial warehouses when they cannot be assured of sufficient water for fire fighting purposes?

**The Minister for Works:** They are prepared to take the risk. They are erecting the finest buildings you have ever had in Fremantle.

**Mr. McCALLUM:** Yes, after listening to the promises and explanations and excuses offered by the department, they are expecting some improvement. The Minister has not given us anything definite as to the necessary relief of the Fremantle district. He has said merely that the pipes are to be brought closer to Fremantle, but that funds are not there to continue the works. He has made no reference to the supply for fire fighting purposes at Fremantle. Those firms enumerated have rebuilt on the excuses and explanations given by the department, expecting that some improvement would be made.

**The Minister for Works:** No excuses have been made. Why use that offensive word?

**Mr. McCALLUM:** Whenever there is an outcry from the public we have a whole column of excuses in the newspaper next morning. As soon as any complaint is made, the department take it as offensive. They think they are above criticism, that no one should find fault with them, though people are without a water supply at all. There is in my district a private hospital which during the summer was for a day and a half without a drop of water.

**Mr. Harrison:** How did they manage?

**Mr. McCALLUM:** They borrowed water from the neighbours.

**The Minister for Works:** Where is that hospital?

**Mr. McCALLUM:** Nurse Sheedy's, on the corner of South-street. The department know all about it, because I rang them myself. There was no water supply either for the hospital or for the sewerage system.

The Minister for Works: I expect it is above the height where gravitation will carry the water.

Mr. McCALLUM: But 18 months ago the department put down a larger main past there.

The Minister for Works: Showing that they are doing their best.

Mr. McCALLUM: It shows there is something wrong when public funds are expended and still the department cannot give the supply. Why was public money expended on a main which will not carry the necessary supply, but leave a hospital without water?

The Minister for Works: We will find out.

Mr. McCALLUM: The department know all about it. Everybody in the district is complaining. The Minister knows that we were all that day without water.

The Minister for Works: I know that a lot of old pipes down there were stopped up. It was the fault, not of the department, but of the consumers.

Mr. McCALLUM: The Minister knows that on the day we complained he immediately rang up the department and verified the complaints which we made. Even the Federal Hotel, opposite the Town Hall, in the main street had no water that day. When a large residential hotel in the main street cannot get water, there is something particularly wrong. What I want is a clear statement as to whether it is due to shortage of funds, and as to what amount is required to give the metropolitan area a proper water supply. The water is most inferior. All the explanations in the world that it is not injurious to health will not convince the general public that it is palatable. It is far below the standard of that supplied in other Australian cities, and there is no reason why we should be behind other capitals in this respect. I was hopeful that, this year, we should have an improved service in Fremantle. But on the high levels, as soon as there is any demand at all, the houses are entirely without water, or at least for hours on end are unable to get any water. I know many homes where the tap is turned on and a tub stood under it in the hope that the tub will fill some time during the day.

The Minister for Works: So the water was wasting when it came on.

Mr. McCALLUM: Not sufficient water came through in the day to fill the tub.

The Minister for Works: I wish we could catch them.

Mr. McCALLUM: I do it at my own home. Let the Minister come and catch me. The tap is turned on from early in the morning till late at night in order to get water.

The Minister for Works: You are doing something illegal.

Mr. McCALLUM: I do not care. We are not going without water. I have had to leave my home in the morning in order to get a bath further down the street. I might just as well live in the Sahara desert.

Mr. MacCallum Smith: Have you to pay water rates?

Mr. McCALLUM: They see that the rates are not neglected. There are scores of people worse off than we are.

The Minister for Works: In many cases in Fremantle new pipes ought to be put down. They have been laid so long that the water cannot get through them.

Mr. McCALLUM: That is the function of the department.

The Minister for Works: It is not our business.

Mr. McCALLUM: It is the function of the department to point that out.

The Minister for Works: That is the householder's business.

Mr. McCALLUM: If that was the reason there would be some water in the pipes.

The Minister for Works: Not in all of them. I have a supply in mind where the pipes were corroded. New pipes had to be put in, and you know who had to pay for them.

Mr. McCALLUM: The pipes would not be entirely blocked. I am speaking of houses where there is no water. It is high time the position was altered. The citizens of Fremantle are paying a higher rate of fire insurance because of the lack of water, and insurance companies have increased their premiums. The residential and business portion of the town is paying a higher rate because of the insufficient supply of water. Insurance companies are within their rights in putting up the rates, because they say that in the event of a fire there is no hope of putting it out.

The Minister for Works: They often prefer that, because salvage is not worth much if the goods are ruined by water.

Mr. McCALLUM: I want the people to be given a decent water supply. The Minister should ask for a vote that will be large enough to carry out the scheme the engineers have in mind. It is no good putting the matter off year after year and asking people to be content with an explanation. They have gone past their endurance and want something done. Little or nothing has been done for years; in fact, things are worse than they used to be. The increased facilities have not kept pace with the increased demand for water. I hope something definite will be placed before us.

Mr. WILSON (Collie) [10.20]: I would draw attention to the attitude taken up by a certain departmental head concerning returned soldiers, to whom so much was promised. A few months ago the department was approached on the question of two men who had been reduced in the pay they were receiving from the department. One man named Sheppard, who is now out of employment, was employed by the department as a storekeeper in Loftus-street. For one year he received the full amount of wages. In the meantime the wingies and stumpies, the men who had lost an arm or a leg or were otherwise incapacitated for hard work as a result of the war, approached the Government to appoint a committee to see where

jobs could be made available for them. About this time an officer of the department went to Sheppard and another, and asked what pensions they were receiving. Sheppard replied that was none of his business. Shortly after, this man was reduced in wages by practically the amount of the pension he was drawing, although he was getting the pension because he had lost a limb. He objected, and words passed between him and the officer in question. The wingies and stumpies approached me and other members of the returned soldiers' party in this House, and we decided to interview Mr. Lawson. The member for Claremont (Mr. J. Thomson) and I saw him and understood that everything would be fixed up. We said we would see that Sheppard apologised to Mr. Lawson for his rudeness if that gentleman would reconsider the case. We attended a meeting of the wingies and stumpies. Sheppard did not care about apologising, but the meeting prevailed upon him to do so, and a letter of apology was sent to Mr. Lawson. That officer still refused to employ the man, and we then waited as a deputation upon the Minister for Works. There were present the president and secretary of the Wingies and Stumpies, the member for Leederville (Capt. Carter), the member for Moore (Lieut.-Col. Denton), the member for York (Mr. Latham), the member for Yilgarn (Mr. Corboy), the member for Claremont and I. The Minister was exceedingly sympathetic and said he would see what could be done. Nothing, however, was done. We then waited upon the Premier. He too was very sympathetic and promised he would look into the matter and give certain directions. This evening's paper publishes certain questions that have been asked by the Returned Soldiers' League of candidates for Federal honours. The first is: 1, Are you in favour of preference to returned soldiers? That is one of the things that has been shouted from the housetops ever since the war. If there is one type of returned soldier that deserves more consideration than another, it is he who has left some portion of his body on the field of Flanders. The second question is: (2), Are you prepared to give the above your entire support in Parliament? We hardly need to be asked that question, for we all give it our support. The third question is: Are you prepared to investigate and place before the House any individual case of alleged injustice to returned soldiers that may be brought before your notice? There is no need for that either so far as returned soldier members are concerned. I do not intend to be made the catspaw of any returned soldiers' league. I shall fight for what is necessary for the soldiers irrespective of any promptings I may receive from any league or association. If there are any prickings of conscience they would apply only in the case of the wingies and stumpies. We have received plenty of sympathy and sound advice, but so far nothing has been done.

The Minister for Works: You are referring to Sheppard?

Mr. WILSON: Yes; he has been living on his bare pension since he lost his employment through the fault of a departmental officer.

The Minister for Works: Do I understand that he was reduced in wages by the amount of pension he was drawing?

Mr. WILSON: He was drawing about £4 4s a week and no fault was found with him. When it was ascertained what his pension was, his pay was reduced by approximately that amount. Either the departmental officer did not know his duty when he paid the full amount of wages, and the man was not earning it, or an injustice has been done him since. I believe the Minister is sympathetic, but we want to see him put his foot down and have his orders carried out. This man has only got returned soldier members to see that he gets a fair deal.

The Minister for Works: As far as I know they all get a fair deal.

Mr. WILSON: This man got the kick out. He was put out because of a little show of temper between the officer and himself. An officer has a right to respect his superior, but a private has an equal right to respect from his officer. After we got this man and the Association to apologise, nothing was done. It was like kicking him when he was down.

The Minister for Works: And yet it was a returned soldier who was dealing with the case.

Mr. WILSON: There are returned soldiers and returned soldiers.

The Minister for Works: Mr. Lawson will give the returned soldier a job every time and a good one.

Mr. WILSON: I am not abusing Mr. Lawson, but I object to the system that allows a promise made by the Government to be broken by departmental officials. I hope the Minister will say something definite, so that the wingies and stumpies may know the position they stand in. Plenty of employers in the town are paying full rates to such men provided they can do the work that other fellows are doing, notwithstanding the pension they receive. Once the Government lay down the rule that a man is deficient because he is maimed and is not entitled to full wages because he is getting a pension, other people will follow suit. We want the Government to operate on good lines and see that a fair deal is given to these married soldiers, so that private people may not take the lead and reduce wages on account of pensions that have been given to these men for services rendered and losses sustained during the war. I would pay a tribute to the late Mr. Frank Wilson. When the men began to return from the war, some of them maimed and mauled, he, as Premier, made no attempt to reduce wages. He saw that they drew the full amount. I do not think he died any the worse for that; in fact, he must have died a happier man. I hope the Minister will take the question in hand, and see

that something is done to carry out the promise made to this man who is living solely on his small pension.

Lieut.-Colonel DENTON (Moore) [10.30]: I am pleased, in a sense, to hear that in the metropolitan area there is a water difficulty. I would like to carry the metropolitan members to the country districts where we still will have difficulty during the summer. Some time ago I made representations regarding a dam at Piawaning. In that district they have to carry water and produce for long distances. I made a special plea for more water at centres along the Midland line. The same thing applies along the Wongan Hills line towards the Lower Murchison. The Government will have to do something regarding water supplies in that area. So far as I know, the Government have done nothing in connection with water conservation in those parts and, therefore, they will be faced with the necessity to carry water for long distance over the railways to serve the settlers.

The Minister for Works: Cannot settlers put down dams for themselves?

Lieut.-Colonel DENTON: They do, but Nature has not been good to us in that area. In the previous year when copious rains fell, the dams have been filled, but that is not the position this year, and the settlers will not have sufficient water to enable them to carry on. As a result, people will have to sell their stock at a low rate. Regarding the complaint voiced by the member for Collic (Mr. Wilson), I desire to enter my protest as well against the treatment of the returned maimed and incapacitated soldiers. I have had the displeasure of knowing the case of this returned soldier, and I know it has not received fair consideration. One of the outstanding promises made to us when we came back was that we were to get a fair deal and preference to returned soldiers. I know the case of which the member for Collic spoke, and I am sure that that man has not had a fair deal. I do not wish to move any further regarding that matter, but I feel disposed to do so, so as to get a fair deal for that individual.

The Minister for Works: I wish I had known you intended to refer to this matter because I could have brought forward my papers. I cannot reply to the protest because I cannot remember all the facts disclosed by the file.

Lieut.-Colonel DENTON: No one expects you to.

The Minister for Works: I am not going to allow any man to insult an officer of the department.

Mr. Wilson: But if the man apologised—

The Minister for Works: Apology be hanged!

Mr. Wilson: Why did you ask for it then?

The Minister for Works: You know what an apology is worth. It is not worth the paper it is written on.

Mr. Wilson: Don't you say that about returned soldiers! It is!

Lieut.-Colonel DENTON: I consider it is absolutely proper and equitable that returned soldiers should have preference, particularly men who are not fit and those who are maimed and limbless. They have served their country and preserved the integrity of Australia. They should have first call on the generosity of the State. I do not mean generosity, for we do not want that. All we want is justice.

The Minister for Works: So far as I know they have had it.

Mr. MacCallum SMITH (North Perth) [10.35]: After listening to the Minister introduce his Estimates, I feel disposed to treat him charitably. I can only assume that owing to the numerous positions he holds as a Minister he has not been able to gather that information which we should like from this big department, and he has not the information we should expect him to supply. He comes before the Committee to-night and gives us a statement which is practically written out for him by the officers of his department.

The Minister for Works: This was written out by myself—

Mr. MacCallum SMITH: From information supplied by your officers.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: Do not blame the officers. They will do the work if they get the money.

Mr. MacCallum SMITH: It is all very well to say we must not blame the officers. Parliament has not yet refused money required by the Minister or officers of the department to carry out the necessary works. The Minister has never asked for money to put the metropolitan water supply on a proper footing. It is idle for him to advance that among the many excuses he has put forward during the past few years. The metropolitan area wants a decent water supply.

The Minister for Works. You persuade the Treasurer to give me the money and we will do it.

Mr. Corboy: That is your job as Minister for Works, not the job of the member for North Perth. You should keep a stiff upper lip—like your colleague!

Mr. MacCallum SMITH: The Minister cannot bluff the Committee with that sort of excuse.

The Minister for Works: The Minister is not making any excuse.

Mr. MacCallum SMITH: The fact is that the Government have not asked Parliament for the necessary funds to provide an adequate water supply for the metropolis.

The Minister for Works: The Minister for Works does not ask Parliament for it. If the Treasurer cannot find the money, the Minister for Works cannot do the work. You know that very well, and you are only talking rubbish.

Mr. MacCallum SMITH: I know that it would be a simple matter to find the money

necessary to carry out work required for the metropolitan water supply. Other cities much smaller than Perth have been able to raise all the money they require, and I am certain the State Government could raise whatever money is needed to carry out this important work. The fact remains that no attempt has been made to do that.

The Minister for Works: That is rubbish.

Mr. MacCallum SMITH: I defy the Minister to show where any serious or genuine attempt has been made to put the metropolitan water supply on a proper footing. The Minister comes here and gives us a lot of twaddle about figures, the number of meters in use, their cost, the number of gallons of water supplied for the people, and the cost of it.

Hon. P. Collier: And the miles of piping.

Mr. MacCallum SMITH: The fact remains that the metropolitan area has been without a decent water supply for years past. The information the Minister gives us every time he introduces his Estimates is of no use to the people. We want water, not figures and facts.

The Minister for Works: I want money, not twaddle.

Mr. MacCallum SMITH: Let the Minister give us less twaddle and he will get the money. The people of Perth have a most unsatisfactory water supply. It is a disgrace to the community. Unfortunately, we have no voice in the affairs of the water supply. There is no metropolitan member in the Government to see that the metropolis gets justice.

Mr. Corboy: You had better come over here.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: Has no metropolitan member anything to say? You stick there with the Country Party members, who are working against the metropolitan area!

Hon. P. Collier: They have threatened to turn the Government out if they spend any money in these parts.

The Minister for Works: What has the member for North Perth to say to that?

Mr. MacCallum SMITH: The Minister has given us figures and information that are of little use.

The Minister for Works: I am sorry I spoke over your head.

Mr. Corboy: You are always in the clouds.

Mr. Hughes: Then it is a pity the Minister does not let down more water.

Mr. MacCallum SMITH: I will read to the Committee what has been said by the Mayor of Perth, who knows far more about the requirements of the people than do the Minister for Works and his officers.

The Minister for Works: We admit that.

Mr. MacCallum SMITH: If that is admitted, why has the Minister been so foolish and obstinate in not following the recommendations of the Mayor and councillors of Perth?

The Minister for Works: I have responsibilities and you have not! That is the difference.

Hon. P. Collier: But the Minister will not listen to the Mayor.

Mr. MacCallum SMITH: There is friction between the Mayor and the Minister.

The Minister for Works: There is no friction. The hatchet has been buried.

Mr. MacCallum SMITH: This friction is one reason why, I think, the city is without a decent water supply. At the risk of wearying hon. members, I will read a portion of the Mayor's annual report, which was presented to the ratepayers last month. He put the matter in a nutshell in the following paragraphs:—

Last November I stated in my report, "another year has passed away and we are still apparently as far as ever from obtaining an adequate supply of water from the hills."

Hon. P. Collier: It reads like an epitaph!

Mr. MacCallum SMITH: The Mayor continued—

The same remarks apply after the passage of another twelve months. At the opening of Parliament on the 28th July, 1921, the Governor's Speech contained the following statement: "Such matters of urgency as the augmentation of the metropolitan water supply are receiving attention. Requisite supplies for next summer have been secured, and the preliminary investigations in connection with the permanent scheme from the Canning River are nearing completion."

The Minister for Agriculture: Let the Mayor pay attention to the roads and streets, which are in such a bad condition!

The Minister for Works: Let him attend to the complaints of the ratepayers!

Mr. MacCallum SMITH: The report continues—

One would imagine that the investigations must have been completed long ere this, but, as far as can be gathered, no steps have been taken to put the work in hand, although I am safe in saying there is no public work in the metropolitan area which is of a more urgent nature than this. In view of the apathy displayed by the Government in this matter over a long period of years, one is forced to the conclusion that it is useless to hope for the initiation of a permanent Canning scheme so long as the water supply remains under their control.

The Minister for Works: This business will not be given to the City of Perth, anyhow.

Mr. MacCallum SMITH: The Mayor said—

Naturally so much pressure is brought to bear upon the Government to expend State revenues on the development of the country that the local concerns of the metropolitan area have to go lamenting.

Hon. P. Collier: There you are. What about that?

Mr. Latham: I wish we could put it into effect for you.

**Mr. MacCallum SMITH:** The Mayor continues—

It is quite wrong, however, that these local concerns should be controlled by the State. They should be placed in the hands of the representatives of the local people. The Premier has on several occasions stated that he approves of this principle. Before he went to England I understand it was arranged that a conference of representatives of local authorities in the metropolitan area should be convened to discuss the question in all its bearings, but up to the present date nothing has been done. Certainly in May last the Minister for Water Supply informed the local authorities of this desire of the Premier, and stated that he hoped to call the conference during the month of June. As requested by the Minister, the two representatives were appointed from this council to attend the conference, but that is the last that has been heard of the matter. In the meantime, the quantity of water available to the consumers in the summer months, and the quality of the fluid, are exceedingly unsatisfactory. In the annual report of the department for the year ended the 30th June last, it is stated that to remove the disabilities in regard to the poor pressure and discolouration in the North Perth and Mt. Lawley districts, the construction of a 24-inch main from the Mt. Hawthorn reservoir is in hand. The report adds that in the opinion of the departmental engineer this will prevent any recurrence of the trouble, but from the complaints which continue to appear in the Press, it would seem that the difficulty has by no means been yet overcome. The report goes on to say that the lack of funds and high rate of interest have prevented the department embarking on other major works of improvement, but the Mt. Hawthorn and Bickley Brook reservoirs were completed and brought into use during the year, and the third section of the main from Mundaring to the metropolis is completed. In my opinion any further temporary measures for dealing with the vital question of a water supply for the metropolitan area should be prohibited. Any new work put in hand should form part of the permanent scheme; but as before stated, I have little hope that the question will be dealt with in a proper manner as long as it remains under Government control.

That puts the position very clearly. The Department has absolutely failed to give the people a decent water supply. The Minister still hangs on to the control. It is surely time that he handed it over to some other authority. The Premier has expressed himself in favour of that course, and I understand the Minister for Works is also favourable to that policy. Yet nothing is done.

**Mr. Latham:** Over £79,000 was spent last year on the metropolitan water supply.

**Mr. MacCallum SMITH:** The fact remains that the water supply in the district I represent is unfit for human consumption.

**Mr. Corboy:** If such a large sum was spent on it last year, it is all the more discreditable that there has not been an improvement.

**Mr. MacCallum SMITH:** I am surprised that the Minister should tell the people that so long as they have water to drink, they should not bother about their gardens.

**The Minister for Works:** I did not tell them that.

**Mr. MacCallum SMITH:** That was published in the Press.

**The Minister for Works:** Not in the way you put it. Eighty gallons a day for every man, woman, and child! Do you mean to tell me that there is no waste?

**Mr. MacCallum SMITH:** We have only the Department's word for that. The member for South Fremantle has stated that he has had no water for days.

**Mr. Harrison:** You do not look as if you belonged to the great unwashed.

**Mr. MacCallum SMITH:** The hon. member's district is connected with the goldfields water main, and I have no doubt he has a bath occasionally.

**The Minister for Works interjected.**

**Mr. MacCallum SMITH:** The Minister is not justified in making such a remark. I ask that he be requested to withdraw it.

**The Minister for Works:** I will withdraw it, but it is a fact all the same.

**Mr. MacCallum SMITH:** I ask that he be made to withdraw that also.

**The CHAIRMAN:** The Minister must withdraw without qualification.

**The Minister for Works:** Oh, I withdraw.

**Mr. MacCallum SMITH:** I have the honour to represent a large number of people and I would be failing in my duty if I did not draw attention to the serious position regarding the water supply of North Perth.

**The Minister for Works:** You need not be so nasty about it.

**Mr. Corboy:** He is not half as nasty as the water supplied by the Minister.

**Mr. MacCallum SMITH:** If the Minister had to drink that water he would be more than nasty; he would be uncontrollable. Our complaints are more than justified, and they have been continuous year after year. The Minister must have heard of the public meetings to protest against the quality of the water being supplied. Does he think that the people of North Perth call these meetings for amusement? I assure him they are in dead earnest, and at one time the people were so infuriated that they made up their minds not to pay the rates.

**Mr. Corboy:** You surely did not preach direct action.

**Mr. MacCallum SMITH:** I told them I would not pay if I were in the same position. I remind the Minister that a deputation waited on him in regard to the damage done to the gardens and to the people's clothing by the water supplied, and asked that some rebate should be allowed.



The Minister for Works: That was done.

Mr. MacCallum SMITH: What rebate have they been allowed?

The Minister for Works: Each case was dealt with on its merits. I cannot give you the details in every instance.

Mr. MacCallum SMITH: My experience is that when such matters are left in the hands of the officers of the Department the people get very little consideration. I would like to know more definitely how much has been written off the rates in the aggregate.

The Minister for Works: I cannot tell you.

Mr. MacCallum SMITH: I would like the Minister to tell us what his intentions are in regard to placing the water supply in the hands of local authorities. Is he genuine in this matter, or is it only so much bluff, and keeping us on the string year after year? Will he hand over the control to some authority which will be capable of giving us what we want in the way of a good water supply at a reasonable rate? Will the Premier give us this opportunity?

Hon. W. C. Agwin: Will he hand over that £80,000 profit that has been made?

Mr. MacCallum SMITH: No doubt that profit would be used in the direction of reducing the rates. As things are at present, the Department has absolutely failed to supply us with potable water. Not only that, but it is adopting a dog in the manger policy. They will not allow the people to assume control, though they cannot manage it themselves. Year after year we see a paragraph in the Governor's speech relating to the water supply, but it proves to be nothing but a pious expression.

Progress reported.

*House adjourned at 10.55 p.m.*

## Legislative Council.

*Wednesday, 13th December, 1922.*

Questions: S.S. "Kwinana" Sale	...	2167
Hospital for Insane, Appointment of Chief Attendant	...	2167
Treasurer's Advance, Expenditure	...	2168
Soldiers' Settlement, Dependants	...	2168
Assent to Bills	...	2168
Bills: Interpretation Act Amendment, 1A.	...	2168
Land and Income Tax Assessment Amendment, 1A.	...	2168
Licensing Act Amendment, Assembly's Message	...	2169
Esperance Northwards Railway Extension, 3A., passed	...	2168
Agricultural Seeds, Com.	...	2168
Closer Settlement (No. 2), Com.	...	2169
Jarnadup-Denmark Railway, 2A.	...	2174
Land Tax and Income Tax	...	2180
Dog Act Amendment, Com., recom.	...	2180

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

### QUESTION—"KWINANA," SALE.

Hon. F. A. BAGLIN asked the Minister for Education: 1, What was the price for which the s.s. "Kwinana" was sold? 2, What were the conditions upon which the sale was effected? 3, Who were the purchasers?

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION replied: 1, £12. 2, "Tenders will be received at the office of the State Steamships up to noon on the 7th August for the purchase of the hull of s.s. 'Kwinana' as she now lies at Rockingham." 3, Mr. Owen Carlon.

### QUESTION—HOSPITAL FOR INSANE.

#### *Appointment of Chief Attendant.*

Hon. F. A. BAGLIN asked the Minister for Education: 1, Has the position of Chief Attendant at the Hospital for Insane been filled and, if so, is the present occupier of the position junior to several others in the service? 2, What position in relation to the Chief Attendant's office does Attendant O'Brien occupy? 3, What are the reasons for not making the appointment according to seniority in the service? 4, What is the cost to the department, and to whom are salaries paid, in connection with the Chief Attendant's office? 5, How long is it since Attendant O'Brien was on annual leave? 6, What leave is now due to Attendant O'Brien?

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION replied: 1, Yes. 2, None; but part of his time is occupied in drawing up duty sheets under the Chief Attendant. 3, The best man was selected. 4, Chief Attendant, £318; Deputy, £300. Part of Attendant O'Brien's salary for time spent in drawing up duty sheets. 5, April, 1919. 6, Two years' annual leave, 56 days.