

privileges for their members and desire to guard them, as they are entitled to do; but I contend that responsible people at this critical stage should abandon some of those principles, at least during the war period.

Mr. Needham: Do not you know that that has been done?

Mr. ABBOTT: Not in Western Australia.

Hon. W. D. Johnson: The need for it here is not so great, because we do not manufacture munitions to any great extent.

Mr. ABBOTT: There is certainly a threat to close down our gold mines, although in my opinion there is no reason for doing so, because men can be obtained elsewhere. Men are employed in racing and in other non-essential occupations in the city and many of them could use a shovel. I could do so myself, and I am not too sure that it would not be better to do so than to be in Parliament.

Mr. Fox: You could not use a shovel in a mine.

Mr. ABBOTT: I am not now talking about the mines; I am referring to earth-works. The Government should release as many men as possible from its various services. The A.R.P. question has been thoroughly discussed. I merely wish to make a few remarks about those responsible for the removal of glass from shop windows and boarding up the openings. Some of the persons responsible for the work may be well able to afford it, but others certainly cannot. Neither the Federal nor the State Government is bearing any portion of the expense. In addition, the expenditure entailed is being treated as capital outlay and the taxpayers get no relief.

Mr. Needham: That makes it worse.

Mr. ABBOTT: Yes. The State Government, of course, cannot give relief from Federal taxation, however unfair the levy may be. As far as the State law is concerned, however, it is the Government's responsibility; and I submit to the Government that it is only reasonable to amend our laws so that the outlay may be treated as a deduction from income, even if it is spread over the estimated war period. It certainly is not capital expenditure; the alterations are only intended as a temporary measure, and we hope are not to be in use for long.

On motion by Mr. Wilson, debate adjourned.

RESOLUTION—PARLIAMENTARY ADVISORY COMMITTEES.

Message from the Council received and read requesting concurrence in the following resolution:—

That, in the opinion of this House, it would be in the best interest of the State and the war effort if the Government gave effect to the procedure adopted by the Commonwealth Government by appointing several Parliamentary Committees to inquire into and report upon such matters as may be referred to any of the Committees.

House adjourned at 5.50 p.m.

Legislative Council.

Wednesday, 22nd April, 1942.

	PAGE
Questions: Civil Defence, as to boarded shop-front advertisements	3128
Drought relief	3124
Motions: Civil Defence (Emergency Powers) Act, to disallow black-out regulation	3124
Civil Defence (Emergency Powers) Act, to disallow shop-front regulation	3140
Licensing Act, as to restrictions on liquor sales	3144

The PRESIDENT took the Chair at 11 a.m., and read prayers.

QUESTION—CIVIL DEFENCE.

As to Boarded Shop-front Advertisements.

Hon. Sir HAL COLEBATCH asked the Chief Secretary: Under what regulation are the occupiers of business premises, in the fronts of which glass has been replaced by timber, prohibited from painting upon such timber any information beyond their name and the nature of their business?

The CHIEF SECRETARY replied: Civil Defence (Emergency Powers) Act, 1940, Regulation 71B, paragraph (1), subparagraph (b), has been interpreted by the Solicitor General to mean that the advertisement of goods on any external part of an internal sector or building is prohibited.

QUESTION—DROUGHT RELIEF.

Hon. G. B. WOOD (without notice) asked the Chief Secretary: 1, What is the total amount advanced to farmers from the Drought Relief Fund? 2, What amount remains in the fund at present? 3, What amount has been repaid by farmers. 4, How much has been re-advanced to farmers? 5, What rate of interest has been charged on the moneys re-advanced or funded?

The CHIEF SECRETARY replied: The hon. member advised me of his intention to ask the questions and I have been able to obtain the following answers: 1, Advances to the 31st December, 1941, £458,415 (including hay purchases). 2, £356,304 at the 31st March, 1942. 3, £381,585 total to the 31st March, 1942 (includes recouped acreage grant). 4, Review of settlers' accounts for 1942-1943 season proceeding. To date re-advances totalling £84,259 to the 31st March, 1942, have been approved. 5, 1½ per cent. from the 1st April, 1942, to the 31st March, 1943.

MOTION—CIVIL DEFENCE (EMERGENCY POWERS) ACT.

To Disallow Black-out Regulation.

HON. J. CORNELL (South) [11.5]: I move—

That Regulation 10 made under the Civil Defence (Emergency Powers) Act, 1940, as published in the "Government Gazette" on the 20th day of February, 1942, and laid on the Table of the House on the 9th day of April, 1942, be and is hereby disallowed.

In dealing with this motion I am more or less at a disadvantage. In October last a sheaf of regulations under the Civil Defence (Emergency Powers) Act was laid on the Table of the House and no exception was taken for the obvious reason that we were then fighting only Germany and Italy, and the chance of an air raid was extremely remote. But on the 7th December Japan entered the arena as our enemy and the whole circumstances were altered. Japan's entry made air raids not only possible but actual. It appears from my reading of the regulations, No. 47 of the original regulations did not give the Civil Defence authorities the power which they have and which I am now seeking to have taken away from them. That is to say, Regulation No.

47, which was tabled last October, did not give the Civil Defence Council authority to direct, amongst other things, that the headlights and tail lights of cars, motor cycles and even bicycles should be masked. It did not give the council the power to say, as was pointed out by a member in another place, that a 1s. 11½d. torch should be screened by three sheets of notepaper. In order to get over that—I hope Mr. Parker will help me because he knows more about this business than I do—on the 20th February Regulation No. 10 was gazetted amending the original Regulation No. 47. That is the regulation I am seeking to have disallowed. If the original Regulation No. 47 had given power to the council to do what it did by order and not by regulation—and an order is not laid on the Table of the House of Parliament—there would have been no need for Regulation No. 10 gazetted on the 20th February. I do not propose to read the whole regulation, but amongst other things it provides that—

The council may at any time by giving prior public notice of its intention so to do in one or more daily newspapers on at least two occasions declare lighting restrictions totally or in any part for any shape, form, manner or intensity of lighting whether used indoors or outdoors or upon any vehicle, including a bicycle, or in any manner whatsoever (including any light emitted from any fire, furnace, device or other apparatus) in any particular locality, area or district or any portion or portions of any locality, area or district.

If the original Regulation No. 47 had included these particular powers there would have been no need for the amended regulation. Following upon that an Order in Council was promulgated in the "Government Gazette" of the 20th March. That long Order, amongst other things deals with the fixation of masks to headlights on motor cars, motor cycles and push bicycles, including the tail light used on the last-mentioned. On the 10th April, an order was also gazetted under the same regulation with regard to torches.

While the regulation dealing with torches sets out that it shall have application throughout the State, the one dealing with headlamps on motor cars and other vehicles does not include that particular reference. I have been assured that the amended regulation, which I am moving to disallow, was

prepared by the Civil Defence Council for application throughout the State. If the regulation is disallowed with a view to introducing some semblance of sanity into the actions of the powers-that-be with regard to the headlights of motor vehicles, push bicycles and torches, then, I have been told, the whole regulation will have to go by the board as we cannot amend it in part but must disallow the whole of it or none at all. I have made inquiries which confirm my statement that the regulation applying to the masking of headlights, including those attached to bicycles and also to torches, applies throughout the whole State.

Hon. L. B. Bolton: Which is ridiculous.

Hon. J. CORNELL: I have also been given to understand that so far as the military authorities are concerned, their order was for a total black-out of the State within a distance of three miles from the sea shore. I understand the application of the brown-out was consequent upon a decision of the Civil Defence Council and that it applies throughout the State for a distance of 100 miles inland from the coast. Goldfields members are aware that quite recently we received a communication from the local governing bodies in their province, including Yilgarn, Dundas, Kalgoorlie and Boulder, making inquiries regarding the black-out or brown-out conditions. The local authorities wanted to know what their position was and we put the matter before the Minister in charge of civil defence organisation (Hon. A. Panton). I think Mr. Hall, on behalf of the goldfields members, gave the Minister's reply on Friday night to the Kalgoorlie Road Board. The Minister informed us that the black-out area was solely the prerogative of the defence authorities whose order, if any was issued, had to be carried out.

How does that square with the Civil Defence Council's regulation that where no black-out operated, a brown-out should be instituted and that that would apply to motor vehicles, bicycles and torches? Not only does that apply to the masking of headlamps, but, I understand, it also governs the painting of the white lines and patches on motor cars throughout the whole State. I have the authority of the Police Department for making that statement. I could understand the Civil Defence Council promulgating an order to the effect that no vehicle was to enter brown-out or black-

out areas unless, and until, it conformed to the conditions laid down for vehicles operating within such areas. That would be quite logical, but that is not the position at all.

I was in Esperance six weeks ago and there I found the local Home Guard pulling up portions of the old jetty so that the Japanese could not land tanks there. No one could ascertain who had ordered them to carry out the work, but a fair proportion of the jetty was dismantled. It is interesting to note that the local road board and the Railway Department had agreed to maintain and keep in order part of the jetty that was then in course of partial demolition. A prominent local resident suggested that we should see the chairman of the road board about the matter. We had a talk with that gentleman and when we were driving back, the local resident was pulled up and he was informed that he would have to mask his headlights just as was necessary elsewhere.

Perhaps by a stretch of imagination one could agree that that was quite all right for Esperance, but surely such conditions should not apply in Kalgoorlie. A fortnight ago I was in Hopton and found that similar conditions obtain there. Very few people remain at that centre, but I asked some people there how the black-out and masking of motor headlights appealed to them. One resident replied, "There are very few of us left and we are all of mature age. The black-out does not affect us to any extent because when it is dark we go to bed."

Another aspect is that under the Traffic Act the regulations governing traffic within the metropolitan area are supervised by the police who issue licenses and launch prosecutions. Beyond the metropolitan area the local governing bodies must issue their own licenses and police their own traffic by-laws. The police rarely interfere—hardly ever. The only such case known to me, of the police asserting their undoubted power to preserve the peace and safety of the community, was the arrest of a man in charge of a motor car while under the influence of liquor, but the position now is that under this regulation the police are directed to enforce it. I submit, in all humility, if that is not an amendment of the Traffic Act I do not know what it is. By no stretch of imagination can the Civil Defence Council direct the police to do something that the law says is to be done by someone else. Heaven knows the police

today have enough dirty work to do, unwillingly, without being called upon to enforce an arrangement so absurd as the one I have described.

I noticed in this morning's paper that a certain person whom I have known for many years appeared in the Police Court charged with a breach of the Traffic Act—dangerous driving. His counsel, Mr. Lappin, said he would plead guilty because the injured person had what Mr. Gray, the Honorary Minister, by interjection the other day said the pedestrian ought not to have—the first right to the road. Mr. Lappin said that in consequence he would plead guilty on behalf of his client. The magistrate, Mr. Wallwork, said he was exceedingly glad of the admission made by Mr. Lappin, because it squared with his own view. I can best illustrate what claim a pedestrian has to the first right of the road in these days by recounting an incident that happened to me in the United States a few years ago. I called upon a United States senator in Kansas City, Missouri. Amongst other matters I put to the senator was how prohibition was operating in the State. He replied that it did not operate, and, proceeding, said, "I can best convey to you how it functions by outlining a case that was heard in a southern State court. Have you heard of the Fourteenth Amendment?" I pleaded ignorance. He went on, "The Fourteenth Amendment purports to give the nigger the vote. Some time ago in one of the other southern States a nigger appeared in court seeking the right to be registered as a voter. He had counsel, and the authorities had a counsel of their own. The two counsel argued for three hours. The judge turned to the nigger and said, 'Well, Sambo, you are the only person interested. What do you think?' The nigger replied, 'Well, Your Honour, after three bally hours have been spent of my time and your time and counsels' time and of the court's time, I have an idea what the decision will be. If the judgment of the court is that this nigger shall be registered as a voter, I am as certain as that I stand in this court that this nigger will not exercise the vote.' It would be more than his life was worth in some southern States should he appear as a voter at a voting booth." In spite of what Mr. Lappin and Mr. Wallwork said about the pedestrian's having the first right to the road, I maintain that he

is in exactly the same position as that nigger. He can have the right of the road, but he will be dead.

Another suggestion for overcoming the difficulty, and one made in the Police Court, was that pedestrians should only cross intersections where there are cross-walks. Now, I went to live in Claremont some 22 months ago, and one night my wife and I were proceeding along a cross-walk at one of the busiest intersections in Claremont, where buses turn to go up one way, and where a volume of traffic, including trolley buses, go across. It was a cross-walk, which I believed to be for the safety of pedestrians. I have not thought so since that occasion because we were almost cleaned up. I have seen motor cars and trucks doing 60 miles or more an hour over that cross-walk.

Another suggestion has been made for getting over the difficulty referring to black-outs and motor car headlights. It was urged that pedestrians should carry white handkerchiefs. That is all right; but where is a pedestrian to hold the handkerchief? At the rear or at the front? The suggestion is absurd. I am not much concerned about what happens in the areas within 100 miles of the General Post Office, nor about what occurs in country towns. I am concerned, however, about the absurdity of both regulations applying within the 100-mile radius in places where there is neither black-out nor brown-out. I cannot say much more on the subject, other than that hon. members should understand that it is not the regulations laid on the Table of the House that worry us, but the orders that may be issued under those regulations, orders which do not come before Parliament. One is handed over to the civil authorities and the Civil Defence Council, which exercise extraordinary powers. What either a civil authority or the Civil Defence Council directs appears in the "Government Gazette" and in the newspapers, and then, no matter how absurd it may be, it has the full force and effect of law.

I recognise that we are at war; but though we are at war we must not let others lay the flattering unction to their souls that whilst the absolute defence of our country is vested in the military authorities and whilst, similarly, the defence of the State is vested in the Civil Defence Council, those powers—that be are not human and cannot

arrive at absurd decisions. Anyone who knows war, knows that even the Army is able to arrive at some extraordinary decisions which are incompatible with the well-being and good ordering of the community, and, moreover, prove absolutely useless when tried out as instruments of war. What can be said of our actual defence can be said with much more emphasis when we come to civil defence. There is this difference, that those at the head of Army affairs have had the training for the work, have studied it, and have had the experience of actual combat to fit them for carrying out any job that is entrusted to them; but in the case of the Civil Defence Council we find that some of the officers who are endeavouring to do their jobs are really square pegs in round holes.

From my observations of war organisation outside actual defence, I should say that what inevitably happens at such times happened in this case early in the piece, and it was the worst time at which it could have happened because we were in great danger. Those people who are most qualified to do a job often have a certain degree of modesty in their make-up. They ask themselves, "Shall we do this or that, or shall we wait until we are called upon to do it?" What has happened is that a lot of people have rushed in early—that applies to many organisations—and have secured the good positions, whilst members of that section of the community who could have done the job better have hung back. The problem now is to put in the competent men and get the incompetent ones out. I regret that the whole regulation should have to be disallowed, but there is nothing else for it. Its disallowance may not achieve the object I have in view, but it is the only way in which I think the object can be achieved. I hope that other members more conversant with the drafting of regulations will point out any discrepancy.

HON. SIR HAL COLEBATCH (Metropolitan) [11.34]: I have very few words to say in seconding the motion. My concern is for the very large increase in the number of accidents directly attributable to the operation of the brown-out regulations. That increase in the number of accidents, even if it were not so large, would be sufficient to cast an obligation on the Government to endeavour to have some steps taken to minimise the

existing danger. It should not be impossible for the Civil Defence Council in co-operation with the military authorities to devise means which, without imperilling the safety of the country, would reduce the liability to accident. I do not know sufficient about the matter to make any elaborate suggestions, but it does seem to me that the simple course would be to have street lighting that would enable people to see their way about—I am not suggesting such street lighting as pertains in peace time—but lighting which would be under control from one centre so that, at a given moment and if necessary, it could be reduced to its present standard, or even put out altogether. That, I think, would be an easy course to adopt, especially when we know, as we do, that in a great many places even within the three-mile limit, and frequently in places directly under military or Government control, every night we see a blaze of light that would be discernible from the air miles away. It is absurd that while that sort of thing is allowed to go on, providing all the dangers that could be created by means of brilliant lighting, citizens should have to move about in almost total darkness to the imperilment of their lives and with a resultant alarming increase in the number of accidents, many of which have been of a fatal character.

HON. H. S. W. PARKER (Metropolitan-Suburban) [11.36]: We are told that this regulation was issued at the request of the Army. That is the very reason why it cannot be made. The regulation says—

Where air raids by any hostile force are impending—

They were not impending when the regulation was issued. The regulation proceeds—

Or are by the council believed to be impending, the council may . . .

If the council believes that an air raid by a hostile force is impending, it may do certain things. We have been told distinctly by the Minister, and it has been stated in another place, that this regulation was brought in at the direct request of the Army. It is not right that it should have been brought in at the request of anyone. It can be brought in only if and when an air raid is impending, or when the council considers that one is impending. I have no objection to the regulation itself; it is a good one, but I object to the way in which effect is given to it. The only thing we can

do is to object to the amendment, which is a proviso to the regulation, and permits black-outs to be enforced in special areas. The amendment says—

Provided that the council may by any order made under this regulation direct that a black-out conducted in pursuance of such order shall be so conducted in those districts or parts of districts specified, and that such black-out may be total or partial.

That is essentially an amendment to the original regulation. Paragraph (c) says—

The council may at any time by giving prior public notice in two issues of the paper . . .

I submit that that is very foolish. If an air raid is impending, or the council thinks one is impending, it should not have to wait in order to give two days' notice in the paper. What is required to be done should be done at once. I hope the regulation will be disallowed. I feel sure the council will then bring in another more effective regulation, which could be put into force more quickly. I also trust that when such regulation is brought in the council will say why it has been brought in, namely, because an air raid is impending or it thinks one is impending.

Hon. T. Moore: Do you not think that time has arrived?

Hon. H. S. W. PARKER: No. I do not think an air raid is impending. We are 2,000 miles away from the nearest portion of Australia that has so far been bombed by the Japanese. When the enemy bombs Australia from an aircraft carrier, it must do so in daylight. I am informed that aircraft cannot leave an aircraft carrier and get back at night. I am not sure whether it is that they cannot get back in the dark or cannot leave in the dark; they cannot do both in the dark.

Hon. T. Moore: They cannot find their ship in the dark.

Hon. H. S. W. PARKER: Exactly! I doubt if they could land on a ship in the dark. Nothing is impossible, but it is extremely improbable that they could do so. There is no danger of an attack from an aircraft at night at present. It must be made by daylight.

The Chief Secretary: What was the position when the regulation was brought in?

Hon. H. S. W. PARKER: The position then was that the Army had the wind up.

Hon. C. F. Baxter: And put the wind up everyone else.

Hon. H. S. W. PARKER: I believe that at that time Darwin had just been bombed. Unfortunately, the regulation that was brought in did nothing else but demoralise the people. On the other hand, fortunately there has been no occasion, from the point of view of an air raid, for such a regulation to be put into force. That has been borne out by the action of the Navy, which should be in a good position to know what is going on. The Navy keeps the lights in full flare in Fremantle harbour, all navigation lights are kept going, and all down the shipping channel the lights are still ablaze. We are told that the Army asked for this. If so, let the Army do the job if it thinks it necessary. It is only human nature to ask someone else to do a thing if one does not like doing it oneself. The Army on this occasion has asked the Civil Defence Council to declare a black-out and cause people to drive their cars without lights, well knowing that its own drivers cannot do that, and do not do it. Apparently the Army has asked the Civil Defence Council to do this, but ignores the regulations.

Hon. G. W. Miles: I do not think the Army would have asked the Civil Defence Council to declare this regulation as for the whole State.

Hon. H. S. W. PARKER: The council has entirely misunderstood the powers given to it by Parliament. Those powers were given for civil defence and not Army defence. If the Army ordered a black-out I, for one, would say most decidedly that we must comply with it. The Army has information it obviously cannot divulge to people outside, but how can the Army have information which necessitates black-outs, even to headlights, right to Kalgoorlie when Fremantle harbour is alight? That is where it seems so ridiculous. Unfortunately, the Civil Defence Council has been frightened into making a regulation which has proved unreasonable and unnecessary, because the American Army will not observe it; our own Army does not observe it, and the Navy does not want it. It is strange that we are doing this at the request of the Army, and causing many citizens to be killed, and much damage to property. Only this morning I saw a fence that had been knocked over. It was a high picket fence and obviously the car that knocked it over must have been travelling slowly, because it simply broke the pickets clean in two and did not push it right down.

Any person who has had experience of driving at night in the black-out will know that within a week, if he has driven continuously, he will be a hopeless case of nerves. I tried to find out something from the taxi-drivers. I asked one man, "Do you do any driving at night?" He said, "No, not under any circumstances." I said, "Why?" He said, "It is too dangerous. You cannot drive at night without knocking someone over, and I do not want anyone's death on my hands." I did not tell him who I was. I went to the next taxi-driver and said, "Do you drive at night?" He said, "No." I said, "Why?" He said, "It is too dangerous." I left it at that. Obviously, when this regulation was brought in the people responsible did not appreciate what it meant. It is far too severe. I would have no objection if we were told that we cannot have our usual headlights, but that we are to be permitted to have light by which we can reasonably see, and also have shaded lights in the streets if necessary. But why the black-out? I cannot understand it.

The Civil Defence Council has not considered the health of the people one bit. A house cannot be blacked out unless it is hermetically sealed. What will happen to the occupants? I do not know, but I do know that in a great many houses people have diffused light, which will create a harvest for opticians in a few years to come. I have always been taught that light is cheap and eyesight expensive. We are now certainly building up a very unhappy future for the children who have to do their home work under diffused light, and also for the elderly people who desire to read at night. It is a strange thing, if our homes can be blacked out, that the Commonwealth Government does not do it, and we also have the instance of the Government Printing Office not being blacked out.

I went out last night to see what was occurring. I travelled only a very short distance, and there were more houses with lights showing than blacked out. I am certain, however, that the occupants of each of those houses thought they were completely blacked out. We will never have a complete black-out until a siren goes.

Hon. J. Cornell: There is no black-out on a moonlight night.

Hon. H. S. W. PARKER: There are so many anomalies that it is obvious the matter has not been thought out. This regulation

is entirely unreasonable and should be struck out. If we are to believe what we are told by Ministers, it is entirely illegal and cannot be enforced, because it cannot be brought in unless the Civil Defence Council considers that an enemy air raid is impending, and it was not brought in for that purpose. It has, therefore, no authority at the present time.

The danger to the citizens is also a matter to be considered. I do not care how careful one is when walking, one is liable to be knocked down by a motor car; and when driving a motor car it is extremely difficult, without the white lines on the edges of the kerbs, to see when to turn to the right or to the left, and the driver is liable to make the turn at the wrong place, which is undoubtedly what happened at the fence I saw this morning. Pedestrians are, therefore, not safe even on the footpath. Again, if one wants to stop a bus, there are no adequate means of doing so. We are not allowed to use a torch, and, incidentally, it is very dangerous to flash a torch at a driver. If a person stands out on the road, he is liable to be run over.

Hon. J. Cornell: You cannot stop some of them to get out either.

Hon. H. S. W. PARKER: In view of the danger to people and property alike, and to the nervous systems of all drivers at night, as well as the fact that the Army realises the position and allows its drivers to drive with full lights, while neither the Navy nor the Americans want the regulation, I think the council might amend it. I suggest it does not issue any order under them unless it is really necessary. I further suggest that in drawing up other regulations, it be given power to issue that order at once and not have to give two days' notice of it in the paper. I support this motion in the hope that any further order that may be made will be more reasonable.

HON. G. B. WOOD (East) [11.53]: I support the motion, and am in agreement with the remarks made by previous speakers. I am more concerned with the portion of the regulation affecting motor headlights, although there are many other undesirable features. The Government has gone too far. There has been no discrimination. Mr. Cornell talks about the difference between Esperance and Kalgoorlie. That comparison could be applied to many other towns. The

position in the country districts is intolerable. People have to move around the country at night-time, although most of them try to avoid doing so as much as possible. A couple of days ago I went to Quairading from York, fully intending to come back in the daylight. I was not able to do that and had to return in the evening. The road is in a shocking state, and it is criminal to ask anybody to travel over it.

Hon. C. F. Baxter: You risk your life.

Hon. G. B. WOOD: That is so. Apart from the possibility of meeting anybody, the road, in its present state, is such that it is not fit for anybody with bad lights to travel on, quite apart from the question of meeting other travellers.

As far as the regulation applies to the city, it is not so objectionable, because people have other means of transport and are able to get about. Even so, I believe the council has gone too far. Mr. Parker said that a person who drove continuously for a week would have eye strain, and his nerves would be racked. The other day I was talking to a man who is a head warden in a country town, and one of those who take part in the making of these headlamp masks. He started to travel from Perth to a country town one night, and said to me, "When I got to the top of Greenmount, I did not know where I was." He did not know whether he was going uphill or downhill, so he took the thing off. He is one of the men interested in the effect of these regulations, and he wants to abide by the law.

Like Mr. Parker, I consulted some people today. I spoke to two or three tramway men. I said, "What do you think of this masking of headlights and lighting restrictions in the city?" I will not tell members exactly what they replied, but they were not too keen on it. One of them said that the tramwaymen had had a meeting about it, and something further might be heard if these regulations were not disallowed. As far as we can gather, it appears that the military authorities have asked the Government to do this, but they are at variance themselves. I have taken particular note as to how many American cars and trucks have had their lights masked, and I saw only two small cars masked, and I think they were owned by officers. Their trucks are not masked.

Hon. T. Moore: Are they out at night?

Hon. G. B. WOOD: Yes. The ones stationed at Nedlands tear up and down the road with their lights full on. I was very nearly hit the other night by a military truck when going to York. I was never closer to an accident in my life. I was not able to move off the road because of a culvert. Through, I suppose, good driving on my part, and a lot of luck, I managed to squeeze in between a white post and the military truck. Young fellows have to learn to drive military trucks, but many of them should not be allowed out at night learning to drive with these masked headlights.

Hon. H. S. W. Parker: Did the truck have masked headlights?

Hon. G. B. WOOD: Yes. I want to ask this question: What would it convey to the enemy if a man was travelling from Northam to Wongan Hills with his lights full on?

Hon. J. Cornell: Nothing!

Hon. G. B. WOOD: I cannot see that it would convey anything. Cars going backwards and forwards from Fremantle to Perth under a blaze of light may indicate that there is a city in the vicinity, but I cannot see the necessity for the masking of lights in the bush. It is criminal to ask people to do it. I expect that other regulations will be prescribed, and I would put this question to the people who frame them: What is wrong with having a hood to cover the headlight so that when the necessity arises it could be placed over the lamp? I also agree with Mr. Parker that the lights could be dimmed. People have to carry gas masks in London, but they do not wear them all the time. They must have them ready, and the same principle should apply to lights. A man in York makes these leather hoods, but he has been told that they do not conform with the regulations. If further regulations are made, let them be sensible and reasonable.

I have not very much to say about the city, but I went through King's Park the other night. I wanted to see the effect of the brown-out in the city and suburbs and I assure members that many bright lights were visible. I saw two or three naked lights in the direction of West Perth, and lights from some large buildings were actually shining on the river. The ferries at Perth were a blaze of light.

Hon. W. J. Mann: No, they are blacked out.

Hon. G. B. WOOD: I went to the park about 7 p.m. and they were a blaze of light; the sidelights were reflected in the water. I shall support the motion with a view to protecting human life and property. The civil community has every right to carry on in something like a normal way.

The PRESIDENT: I must interrupt the discussion as the time for motions has expired.

[Resolved: That motions be continued.]

HON. L. B. BOLTON (Metropolitan) [12.2]: In the interests of public safety I must support the motion. I do quite a lot of night driving and I have had reasonable experience of both country and city driving. My main complaint is against the glaring lights permitted on some vehicles. I agree that something was necessary to overcome this menace. For a considerable time I have advocated that glaring headlights should not be permitted in the metropolitan area. If the Civil Defence Council, instead of over-doing things considerably, had declared against glaring headlights and compelled people in the metropolitan area to drive with dimmers or even with parking lights, conditions would have been perfectly safe and the desired object would have been achieved.

Let me refer to some incidents that have come under my notice. As late as Sunday night last I drove back from the country. Like Mr. Wood, I tried to leave early enough to get back to the city before dark. Unfortunately I did not succeed. Just as I left the Pearce Aerodrome, I had to drive with dimmed lights at the risk of contracting a severe headache. I support the member who said that if one drives with the regulation lights for any distance, it has a very bad effect on the eyes, and, in many people, induces headache. I drove carefully from Bullsbrook, and on the main road between Midland Junction and Guildford, all of a sudden, there came a blaze of light from no fewer than eight military trucks, each with headlights full on.

If the public has to obey these regulations, why should not the people, who we are told asked for the regulations, also obey them? Next day I inquired why so many military trucks were allowed to drive with lights full on, and was informed that so far a number of the trucks had not been fitted with the correct attachment, though others

had been. Why could not instructions be given to the drivers to use the dimmers or even parking lights? We all know that it is perfectly safe to drive with dimmers and, under existing conditions, if motorists were ordered to drive with parking lights, it would be quite safe, and there would not be the number of accidents we have had during the last week or two. On certain parts of roads, not necessarily in the country as suggested by Mr. Wood, but in the city, it is utterly impossible to see when driving with regulation lights. On more than one occasion I have had to pull up in order to get my bearings. In this respect the Civil Defence authorities have gone altogether too far.

Another point struck me before the new regulation was brought into effect. For some time at almost every week-end, I had driven through the Pearce Aerodrome and was allowed to do so until recently.

The Chief Secretary: Who authorised that

Hon. L. B. BOLTON: Well, I passed the Pearce Aerodrome; I might almost say that I drove through it. Until a fortnight or so ago I was allowed to drive with headlights full on to within 100 yards or less of the aerodrome. I was then ordered to put my lights out and not put them on again until I was 100 yards on the other side of the aerodrome. If an enemy wanted any indication of the exact position of the aerodrome, nothing could have been of greater assistance than a regulation of that sort.

I have my car fitted with the regulation dimmers and, after my experience of Sunday night, I am satisfied that it is altogether too dangerous to drive any distance with headlights so dimmed. I am not adopting an attitude of hostility to the Civil Defence or military authorities, but when the regulation is costing so much in life and property, it ought to be made more reasonable. If the motion is carried, I hope the regulation will be amended and made more reasonable.

HON. W. J. MANN (South-West) [12.9]: The complaint of the people in the part of the country I represent is that under the brown-out regulations it is practically impossible for them to travel at night. A great part of the road between Brunswick and the Naturaliste lighthouse is within the three miles limit, and there black-out

conditions have to be observed. Nobody complains of that; people realise that they are living near the coastline and that such precautions are necessary. Naturaliste is one of the lights that incoming ships used to pick up and were glad to get from it an indication of where the coastline was. People further back do complain. They are not fortunate enough to have macadamised roads; they have to travel over heavily corrugated roads, and I would defy any man to drive a motor car safely over such roads at 10 miles an hour. If one tried to drive over them without at least dimmers at less than 30 or 40 miles an hour, one would soon find oneself amongst the timber. The roads are not very wide, and it is not possible to travel over such surfaces at a low rate of speed. The more a road is corrugated, the greater the pace a motorist has to make in order to keep on the road.

Last Saturday a Perth woman was notified that she was wanted in the forest country 50 miles from the coast owing to a case of sickness there. She caught the train to Busselton and then had tremendous difficulty to get a car to take her the rest of the distance, because drivers did not want to travel at night over the road. The difficulty was overcome by a young man who said he was prepared to take the risk, but there is a definite danger in travelling at all on unmacadamised roads in the forest country, particularly under present conditions. When the lights are dimmed a kangaroo hopping across the road might be run down, fallen trees encountered, or a number of things could happen, all of which increase the risks of driving on country roads. I am afraid the Civil Defence Council did not take these matters into consideration when it framed the regulation. I support the motion.

HON. J. M. MACFARLANE (Metropolitan-Suburban) [12.13]: I want the regulation disallowed and improved upon, because I am satisfied that the Civil Defence Council has gone to extremes in making the regulation apply as it does. I emphasise that the risk of driving with dimmed lights is not confined to the country. There are streets and intersections in the metropolitan area so dimly lighted that it is very difficult for a driver to tell where he is and, as with a driver in the country, he must have a good knowledge of the roads in order to find his way about without incurring considerable

risk. A neighbour of mine was ordered to take his wife into hospital and tried to engage a taxi-car for that purpose. Some delay took place and, the matter becoming urgent, he asked me to drive his wife to hospital. I willingly agreed, but that drive badly upset my nerves, particularly owing to the condition of the passenger. It made me realise that no one should attempt to use motor cars at night, because of the conditions prevailing. It might have been better had the Civil Defence Council ordered that the lamp glasses should be blacked out to the extent of only half or five-eighths, so as to enable drivers to get a clear view of kerbs and of people standing at the side of the road.

I agree with what Mr. Parker said with regard to the danger of air raids if the enemy established a base in the north of Australia. In my opinion, the regulation should be disallowed because of the risk not only to members of the public, but to drivers of motor cars. I found it impossible to see the length of this Chamber clearly; I could not see the corners of streets into which I had to turn, nor was I readily able to distinguish streets with which I am familiar. I would much prefer that people be prevented altogether from driving vehicles at night time; they should stop at home and be safe. If we are to have regulations, however, then let them be reasonable and sensible. Until they are amended, let people keep off the streets at night time.

HON. H. V. PIESSE (South-East) [12.18]: We have a number of members who seem to be more expert than are our military authorities and the officers of the Civil Defence Council. When all is said and done, we did pass through a serious and anxious time a few weeks ago, and the Government acted in all good faith in promulgating these regulations. Those responsible for them have done the right thing. As Mr. Macfarlane said, the majority of us should keep off the roads at night. I am prepared to admit that night travelling should be permitted in cases of emergency; but otherwise the public, including members of Parliament, should stop at home at night.

Members: No.

Hon. H. V. PIESSE: They should do that rather than disobey the regulations.

Hon. J. Cornell: I suggest the hon. member follow that advice.

Hon. H. V. PIESSE: I have done so on several occasions since the regulations have been in force. As I said, in cases of emergency, drivers should be permitted to use more light, but not the glaring lights that were used in the past.

Hon. G. B. Wood: Nobody wants them.

Hon. H. V. PIESSE: All the talk we have had on this matter seems to suggest that we are not at war. Some members seem to know more than do the powers that be. I am aware that the military authorities allow their trucks to run at night with full lights, but a tremendous number of the trucks have had their lights masked. It might be advisable to amend the regulations slightly; but, if we had had an air raid, people would be talking now about the excellent preparations that were made to meet it.

We should not complain about all that has been done in this connection, but should try to assist in every way possible. I agree that members of the medical profession and certain other people should be permitted to use brighter lights when travelling at night; but the time has arrived when motor vehicles should not be run at night unless absolutely necessary. If the regulation has done nothing else, it has resulted in the conservation of petrol. I intend to support the motion, because I think the regulation might be altered with advantage.

HON. T. MOORE (Central) [12.21]: I am of the same opinion as Mr. Piesse. I believe much good has resulted from these regulations, particularly in the metropolitan area, as the effect has been greatly to lessen motor traffic at night. We are attempting in my province to carry on essential services, and I have interviewed the Liquid Fuel Control Board on many occasions. The board has met me fairly, although it has cut down petrol requirements for essential service to a minimum. That is the point I want to make. I have interviewed the board on occasions with regard to supplies for shearing plants, wheat carting contractors and for other essential services. After having been allowed a meagre supply, I come to the city and cannot fail to observe the great number of motor cars on the road. Something should be done to prevent this.

Hon. H. S. W. Parker: Why not bring in a regulation to deal with traffic at night?

Hon. T. MOORE: It has already been said that the regulations have had the effect

of lessening motor traffic. One member spoke about night driving affecting his nerves. The regulations will help to keep off the road the taxi drivers who carry the swanks home at night after cocktail parties.

Hon. H. S. W. Parker: Taxi-cars are being used to drive people to the Fremantle gaol.

Hon. T. MOORE: No part of the State is better served than is the metropolitan area. We find motor cars travelling along tram routes. I have travelled in Perth at night and noticed that the people usually only travel in the early evening to go to the theatres and to return home at night. For this purpose they use the trams. Nevertheless, cars are still on the road at night, and I want to know why the people using them do not travel by bus or other public conveyance.

Hon. H. S. W. Parker: What about the bus drivers?

Hon. T. MOORE: Forty years ago in Melbourne there were no numbers on trams. They had small coloured lights, green, blue, yellow and so on, to indicate the route along which they were travelling. Recently I wanted to catch a tram to South Perth. As members know, these trams are not frequent at night, and I was ashamed at the number of trams I had to stop before I finally boarded the one I wanted. Would it not be better to put small lights on our cars to indicate their destination? By so doing, the unfortunate drivers would not have to pull up trams street after street only to find that the passengers wanted another tram. That seems to me to be ridiculous. If my suggestion were carried out, the people would get into the run of the new method in a week or two, and much annoyance would be saved to both the passengers and the drivers.

It does seem absurd to have to dim lights on a car in country districts 100 miles from the coast. Of course, when the car arrives at the black-out area the lights should be dimmed. So far as the city is concerned, however, the Civil Defence Council has done good work. It must be borne in mind that the members of that council are not hoodlums. They are capable men trying to do the right thing, and it is necessary that people should become accustomed to brown-outs and black-outs. Would it not be absurd to allow motor cars to proceed along the streets at night with lights full on and at the same time ask people to block every chink in

their windows? The two would not go together. The brown-out regulations have proved effective in the city; and I believe it would be difficult to discern the city from the air at night time. It is better that the people should become accustomed to these conditions, rather than wait until we actually have air raids. I hope that day will be long distant, although it is possible that we may have a day raid at any time.

I commend the Civil Defence Council for the work which it has done. We should not find fault with that body of men; they are doing a necessary job and doing it well. Many people are thinking that, because of the temporary lull in the war position, our enemies are not going to attack us. To my mind, however, the lull is ominous. This is the time when we should be thinking that something may happen soon. Let us, therefore, all do our bit; let us submit to these regulations; let us put up with inconvenience, but let us be ready when the time comes. That is the point I want to make. I hope my suggestion as to the placing of lights on trams will be adopted without loss of a day. I agree with Mr. Cornell that there should be a limit to the area within which we should permit cars to drive with lights on. As regards that limit, I would suggest that once motor drivers reached the hills district they should dim their lights. They will be aware when they are nearing the coast, but the hills would serve as a guide. There must be some point at which the lighting must comply with the regulations. I think the regulations are sound, provided they are administered with justice.

THE CHIEF SECRETARY (Hon. W. H. Kitson—West) [12.28]: It was very pleasing to hear that at least one or two members have some regard for the Civil Defence Council in this matter. I am really surprised at some of the statements made this morning with regard to lighting restrictions. I am not a member of the Civil Defence Council, nor can I say that I agree entirely with everything that has been done by the council. I am quite prepared, however, to accept its dictum, believing that it is comprised of reasonable persons, advised by those who, I hope, are the best authorities in the State and who have in their possession a tremendous amount of information supplied from quarters which have actually had to endure the horrors of air raids and warfare.

Only a few weeks ago I think every member of this House was of the opinion that not many days would elapse before we would experience what the northern part of this country had undergone.

Hon. J. Cornell: I never thought that.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: The hon. member realised then that it was a possibility.

Hon. J. Cornell: No, I did not.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: He admitted there was a probability, and I do not know anybody in this House who did not have that idea.

Hon. J. Cornell: It was a physical impossibility.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: A physical impossibility! The hon. member cannot put himself up as an expert against those who have to deal with this kind of thing, and who carry the responsibility. He would probably have been the first to criticise the Civil Defence Council if something of that sort had happened and we had not been prepared.

Hon. J. Cornell: No!

The CHIEF SECRETARY: How often have we heard it said in recent months that we must be prepared for all eventualities.

Hon. T. Moore: That is the point.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: Not for the eventuality that appears to be possible to-night or tomorrow morning but for the eventuality that may occur next week or next month.

Hon. J. Cornell: It is the things that never happen that we worry over.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: I listened to the hon. member's speech without interjection, and I hope the hon. member will allow me to continue my remarks to their logical conclusion without interjections of that kind. I want to say a word or two about the Civil Defence Council and the regulations. The council is composed of men occupying high and responsible positions in this State, and those men do not make these regulations just for the fun of the thing. They do it because they think that the circumstances warrant the regulations. Mr. Parker had some rather strong things to say. He suggested that the Civil Defence Council had no legal right to implement regulations of this type, because he believed they were doing it at the request of the military authorities.

Hon. H. S. W. Parker: You told us that yourself.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: I am going to tell the hon. member the same thing again. Why did the military authorities request that certain areas be totally blacked out?

Hon. G. W. Miles: Are you sure the military authorities requested a black-out at Kalgoorlie?

The CHIEF SECRETARY: I will tell the hon. member in a moment what they requested. Why should the military authorities suggest a black-out anywhere? Have they not justification for requesting that, and they having made the request, what would we say about the Civil Defence Council if it replied, "We do not agree?"

Hon. H. S. W. Parker: The Civil Defence Council should have said, "Do it yourself."

The CHIEF SECRETARY: It is admitted by everybody that the danger which was so apparent in this country only a few weeks ago was such that it was necessary that we should have a black-out right round the coast, and nobody has complained about that.

Hon. T. Moore: They are doing it willingly.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: Of course they are! It was the request of the military authorities that there should be a black-out three miles from the coast and right round the coast. I am advised by the Civil Defence Council that the original black-out from Woodman's Point to Trigg's Island was requested by the G.O.C. Western Command. What would this House have said had the Civil Defence Council taken no notice of that, especially five or six weeks ago? The extension of the black-out from Woodman's Point to Trigg's Island to include that portion of the coast between Trigg's Island and Little Island was imposed by the Civil Defence Council. That was not at the request of the military authorities. The black-out at Albany was requested by the G.O.C. Western Command. Has anybody complained about the black-out at Albany or at any of our ports? Of course not!

I am advised that the original brown-out was not ordered at the request of the military authorities but was ordered following a telegram received from the Prime Minister. This was considered by the lighting sub-

committee which recommended that restrictions be imposed, the recommendation being adopted by the Civil Defence Council. The increased brown-out so as to restrict lighting on and in connection with shops, houses, buildings and other premises, was imposed as a result of the conference held in Canberra on the 4th February, 1942, between the State Premiers. The Premiers were asked to consider this matter, and they arrived at a certain decision, and that decision was to apply to all the States in the Commonwealth. The Civil Defence Council of this State simply implemented the decision of that conference. Are we, as a Legislative Council, to say that the Civil Defence Council should not have taken any notice?

Hon. H. S. W. Parker: I go further and say that the Civil Defence Council could not legally take any notice.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: The order made prohibited all external lighting attached to houses, shops, buildings and other premises, and affected internal lighting to the extent that the source of supply could not be seen from outside. So far as my experience goes, I think the brown-out has been fairly satisfactory. There have been offenders, and I suppose we shall continue to have them, and they will have to be attended to, but from my experience I feel that the restrictions have been carried out very well. There has been a little delay in certain districts but the position is quite good. The motor lighting restrictions were imposed as a result of the three-mile black-out area between Woodman's Point and Little Island, and was one of the measures adopted by the conference of State Premiers held at Canberra on the 4th February, 1942.

Might I suggest that if these regulations had not been promulgated it would have been exceedingly difficult for people of any other district to have done the things required if, and when, a real emergency had occurred. How foolish it would have been if these matters had been left until within an hour of an air raid! How would it have been possible for motorists to have their headlights dealt with as they have to be attended to now unless some regulation had been put into force?

Hon. J. M. Macfarlane: They could have used black-out paper.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: I ask the hon. member what time he would have had to use black-out paper an hour or half-an-

hour before a raid. In a total black-out it is necessary that motor headlights should be hooded. Regulation lights provided for here are the same as those in use in the Old Country. They are the result of many months of hard experiences. If it is necessary to have restrictions of this kind in a black-out area, how are we to get over the difficulty of cars proceeding from a black-out area into a brown-out area or vice versa?

Hon. G. B. Wood: Movable covers could be used.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: That is the hon. member's idea, but those who have given serious consideration to this matter for a long time, and who did not arrive at this decision willy-nilly but had experts to advise them, apparently do not agree with the hon. member. I do not agree with some of the things the Civil Defence Council has done. There is probably room for a difference of opinion in regard to them, but I accept its decisions, and I contend that if there had been any serious eventuality four or five weeks ago we would have thanked the council for what has been done. What happened overseas in one particular city when an air raid took place at night, with very little warning? Motor cars that had not been hooded as they were expected to be were used by the civil population in their hundreds, and as a result of the use of those cars at night—cars whose headlights had not been dimmed—that particular city suffered terribly. That is what would have applied here. Those are difficulties we have to face. Surely to goodness, in the interests of the public as a whole, we can put up with what little inconvenience we may have to incur as a result of lighting restrictions.

I do not suggest for a moment that at present the restrictions could not be relaxed a little, but how are we going to deal with those motor cars whose lights have already been treated in accordance with this regulation? There would probably have to be some other means adopted than hooded lights. I am not going to say that the Civil Defence Council should not take into consideration something of that kind, if it is advised by the authorities that to do so is safe. I have been asked why the lighting restrictions should apply to Kalgoorlie. All I have to say is that I accept the dictum of the Civil Defence Council. Only two or three weeks ago there were people in the metropolitan area from Kalgoorlie and

Boulder who complained about the treatment meted out to those centres. They considered more should be done because they regarded Kalgoorlie and Boulder as vital areas.

Hon. T. Moore: I understand they have dug slit trenches up there.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: Yes; they consider those centres to be vital areas and that certain things should be done. Now we are hearing growls from the same district because this regulation is applied to it. I am pleased there has been no real necessity for testing the regulation up to date, but the promulgation of this and other regulations has had the effect of teaching thousands of people that there is a need for them to be prepared for air raids. They have had an experience of what it means to travel in the black-out and the brown-out, and it has taught thousands that they must be more careful than ever before.

Obviously it is dangerous to walk on the roads at night time, but I do not say that pedestrians should not do so, because I believe they have just as much right as anyone else to the use of thoroughfares. Everyone should exercise care. Those who drive motor cars at night under existing conditions must have due regard to their responsibilities. I fully appreciate how difficult night driving is. Only the other night, when travelling to Fremantle from Parliament House, when the Honorary Minister accompanied me, I had an experience that emphasised that aspect. We were travelling at about 14 miles an hour, yet we almost had a collision. I did not know until next morning that it had had any particular effect on my car, but I was very fortunate indeed. The collision nearly occurred with a heavy truck, the driver of which had encountered some trouble and he had no lights showing. The next morning I found that I had suffered minor injuries so the incident could easily have been far more serious.

In these difficult times we have to accept risks. If it is essential that we travel at night, we must recognise the element of danger and exercise every precaution. Recently I had to travel by night from Toodyay, and I do not mind admitting that both I and my Under Secretary, who relieved me at the wheel, felt the strain of driving along country roads with dimmed headlights.

Hon. G. B. Wood: And you travelled all the way on a bitumen road.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: No, on a gravel road.

Hon. C. F. Baxter: Only over about five or six miles of gravel road.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: It certainly seemed much more than that.

Hon. C. F. Baxter: You try a drive over the Quairading-road, to which Mr. Wood referred.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: I am merely pointing out that we all recognise the difficulties of the situation at present, and I believe every member of the Civil Defence Council appreciates his responsibilities. For that reason I have spoken in the strain my words have indicated.

Hon. C. F. Baxter: You ought to take them over bush roads at night time.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: I should say that most of the members of the Civil Defence Council have done as much night driving over country roads as the hon. member has done in recent times. I have great regard for these gentlemen, who are doing a very fine job. I cannot subscribe to the suggestion that they promulgate regulations just for the sake of doing so and without due regard to their effect.

The only other phase to which I shall refer concerns the part the military authorities play in these matters. The Civil Defence Council receives advice from the military authorities. If I were associated with that body and the military people indicated that certain courses of action were necessary, I would be the first to do everything possible to implement their requests. They know more about these matters than I do. They are in possession of information that it is not possible for me to have. Although they might not advance reasons that appeared to me to be adequate from my point of view, I would still do what they requested. For my part I am sincerely glad that the position has eased up somewhat, and certainly it is better than it was a few weeks ago.

Hon. V. Hamersley: The military authorities must have thought action was pending.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: We all realise that the position today is better than it was a little while ago.

Hon. J. Cornell: Do not run away with the idea that the military authorities do not get the wind up.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: Perhaps we had better leave that phase alone.

Hon. T. Moore: Yes, I think so.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: I want members to understand clearly that while I hold a position of responsibility, if the military authorities advise that certain action is necessary, I will go as far as I possibly can to comply with their requirements. I think that is the attitude adopted by the Civil Defence Council. I am indeed glad that the situation today is not quite so serious as it was a few weeks ago, and I trust that it will still further improve. In that event I am sure the Civil Defence Council will give consideration to relaxing the regulations to some extent. How it can be done, I do not know and I am content to leave such considerations for the Civil Defence Council to deal with.

Even though these regulations cause me certain inconvenience, I am prepared to put up with that so long as I am satisfied that I am assisting in preparations to meet an emergency that may arise. That should be our attitude throughout and members should not indulge in carping criticism because something is done with which they are not in complete agreement. If we were to adopt that attitude, we would get more consideration. In view of my remarks, members will appreciate that I am opposed to the motion. If the regulation is disallowed, another will be substituted for it, and just what alteration can be made, the effect of which will be to secure the approval of all members of Parliament, I cannot understand—particularly in view of the statements made this morning.

Hon. H. S. W. Parker: You would never secure complete agreement.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: I do not pose as an expert but I tell members that this work is the responsibility of the Civil Defence Council. Parliament reposed that responsibility in the members of that body by legislation and, generally speaking, the council has a big job to perform. Particularly in recent times the council has done valuable work on behalf of the public. I do not think we should interfere with a regulation of this kind unless we have good cause for doing so. I cannot admit that the reasons submitted this morning would justify any drastic alteration in the regulation as framed at present.

HON. E. H. H. HALL (Central) [12.53]: Any impartial and unbiassed person who listened to the debate this morning must have been impressed by the contributions of Mr. Cornell, Mr. Parker and Mr. Bolton, and could not fail to arrive at the decision that the motion is fully justified. I recognise the good work performed by the Civil Defence Council. Despite what the Chief Secretary has said, we must remember that the members of that body are acting in an honorary capacity in undertaking their part-time job. I think that men entrusted with the defence of the civil population should have a full-time job and be treated accordingly. It was not my intention to add appreciably to the debate but I wanted to express my appreciation of the remarks by the three members I have mentioned specifically.

We all agree that members of the Civil Defence Council have carried out their work excellently, but it is quite impossible to have 100 per cent. efficiency and satisfaction respecting such a body. No one would expect it. When weak spots develop, it is the manifest duty of members to point them out. If I heard him correctly, the Chief Secretary himself admitted that it might be possible to relax some of the more stringent features of the regulations. That brings to my mind one matter I have not referred to previously but which could appropriately be mentioned now. To put it mildly, the people of Geraldton recently suffered intensely in consequence of a mistake made by someone in authority associated with the Civil Defence Council. I shall not comment upon it beyond saying that a false alarm was despatched from Perth at 3.30 a.m. I understand the mistake was made by someone in authority in Perth.

The fact remains that an official air-raid alarm was despatched from Perth to Geraldton. The siren sounded and the utmost consternation was manifest especially among the women many of whose menfolk were in uniform serving either oversea or in camp. When men like Mr. Parker, who has had military experience, can speak as he did today, we must sit up and take notice. Uninformed criticism is worthless and we are told that we should not indulge in destructive criticism. After listening to Mr. Parker, Mr. Cornell and Mr. Bolton, I am convinced that the Civil Defence Council could very well consider the relaxation of the more stringent

regulations that have been promulgated. Particularly should the regulation restricting the lighting of motor cars not be enforced in country districts. There is no necessity for it there. While we cannot expect 100 per cent. unanimity, I am safe in claiming that the great majority of the people will favour disallowing the regulation under discussion.

HON. J. A. DIMMITT (Metropolitan-Suburban) [12.57]: The disallowance of the regulation will have the effect of referring the matter back to the Civil Defence Council and the military authorities for the consideration of the possibility of relaxing the provisions which, however essential they may have been at the time the regulation was promulgated, may not be so necessary now. Most of us agree that regulations once promulgated are likely to remain in force for a period much longer than is absolutely essential. I believe that the regulation under discussion illustrates that fact. I am not concerned to any extent about private motorists in the metropolitan area who can look after themselves by using public conveyances, but I am concerned about bus and taxi drivers, who are suffering many disabilities through having to drive under hazardous conditions with, at times, 30 to 40 passengers in their care.

If the regulation relating to the dimming of motor headlamps is not relaxed to some extent, it will not be in the best interests of the travelling public. In the "West Australian" this morning we read a report showing that a bus carrying 27 passengers capsized on one of the main highways early last night. The accident, presumably, was due to the absence of proper driving lights. I support the motion because I believe it to be in the best interests of public safety if the whole matter be referred back to the authorities for reconsideration with a view to relaxation.

Sitting suspended from 1.0 to 2.15 p.m.

HON. J. CORNELL (South—in reply) [2.15]: Although my motion appears to me perfectly plain on the face of it, there are one or two matters I would like to clear up; namely, matters arising out of what has emanated from the Chief Secretary. In moving the motion I mentioned that I was concerned, not with the regulation, but only with the order promulgated throughout the State by the Civil Defence Council and hav-

ing reference to the adornment of motor vehicles and the masking of headlights under the order. What I said in respect of the metropolitan area was merely an illustration of what might happen if a pedestrian asserted that right to the road which he has under the law.

I still consider that the military authorities are not one iota blameworthy in regard to restrictions on motor vehicles throughout the country. The Chief Secretary has stated that all the military authorities asked should be done—I understand it is rather the Navy that is affected—was the preparation for a black-out within three miles of our coasts. The Army had nothing whatever to do with the brown-out, as has been acknowledged by the Chief Secretary. The brown-out, the hon. gentleman said, came as a suggestion of the Prime Minister, and was extended to a distance of 100 miles from the coast. So far as I understand, the only provision of the brown-out applying within the 100 miles is the masking of headlights and the pasting of pieces of paper over torches. That is what I am desirous of having rectified. I consider that ample justification has been advanced here today for an alteration in that respect, if in no other.

I pointed out that there was only one way of disallowing the order; namely, to disallow the regulation giving the Civil Defence Council power to make the order. If so much of the order could be disallowed, I would have moved in that direction. But the order itself is not before us. The order is something that has emanated from the regulation, and the order is all that I speak of. By no stretch of imagination can it be maintained that there is the faintest analogy between Western Australia and the Old Country in respect of air raids; that is, when they actually happen. A German bomber or fighter is within 35 miles of England's coastline and can come over on an air raid for his amusement. Therefore it is not feasible to suggest that an invader might get over here in his plane as he could get over England from Europe. There is no analogy whatever, in that respect, between the British Isles and Australia. Personally I do not think an invader by air will ever get over Western Australia, apart from the North-West coastline. If he did get over, would he have the time he requires

to find the concentration of people that are congregated in small corners of England and Scotland? Thus there is no analogy whatever between the two situations. The only danger here exists in the metropolitan area.

The Chief Secretary: On a point of explanation, I think the hon. member has misunderstood my reference to the English regulations, which was only in regard to the type of headlight and the mask over it.

Hon. J. CORNELL: Well, I merely wrote down these words, "What happened overseas?" The masking of headlights in congested areas of England or Scotland, in view of the close proximity of air raiders might be justified; but I cannot understand the logic of extending the application of portion of an order, and not the whole of the order, outside the 100-mile area here. I again reiterate that if that order was qualified by the requirement that any vehicle entering the black-out or brown-out area should obey the regulation, the position would be different.

There is one matter which I especially want to be clearly understood. I have already stated that the original regulation No. 47, to my thinking, did not give the power to do what I take exception to. That power was implemented by the schedule containing the regulation laid on the Table of the House on the 20th February. One or two members appear to be under the misconception that what I am moving to disallow is not a regulation but part of a schedule. I take it that the only value the schedule has is that it indicates the figures where such and such portions of the original regulation are to be altered.

I am well aware that the original Regulation No. 47 is sacrosanct, because it cannot now be disallowed. What my aim is directed at is that portion of Regulation No. 10 in the schedule which says, "Regulation No. 47 is amended by adding thereto a proviso" and so on. All I wish to do by my motion is to disallow the proviso to the original Regulation No. 47 as stated in the schedule. It may be a matter of phraseology, but I think I have made clear to the Chief Secretary what I think the House is desirous of obtaining. I merely add that we could not amend part of the proviso to Regulation No. 47 set out as Regulation No. 10 in the schedule, but must disallow the whole of it.

Question put and passed.

MOTION—CIVIL DEFENCE (EMERGENCY POWERS) ACT.

To Disallow Shop-front Regulation.

HON. SIE HAL COLEBATCH (Metropolitan) [2.28]: I move—

That Regulation No. 10 made under the Civil Defence (Emergency Powers) Act, 1940, as published in the "Government Gazette" on the 20th day of March, 1942, and laid on the Table of the House on the 9th day of April, 1942, be and is hereby disallowed.

I shall not detain the House at any length. In discussing the previous motion the Chief Secretary made reference to the members of the Civil Defence Council. I am acquainted with many of those members, and they possess the highest qualifications, indeed exceptional qualifications; but those are qualifications largely of a professional character, and I believe that some mistakes might have been avoided had there been reasonable representation on the council of practical business men.

Incidentally, there are so many regulations and they are put up in so complicated a fashion that one hardly knows where one is. The Chief Secretary advises me that the regulation under which this was done is No. 71. Apparently it is done under an amendment of No. 71A contained in Regulation No. 10; consequently my motion has been framed as has already been intimated. As in the case of the regulation to which Mr. Cornell took exception, the trouble is that orders were made under the regulation and, as in that instance, those orders can be upset only by disallowing the regulation. My sole motive in moving this motion is that the matter shall be referred back to the Civil Defence Council, and it should be a very easy matter for it to frame another regulation that will not be objectionable.

All of this arises out of the decision to remove the glass from windows and to substitute timber. I would like to read a regulation gazetted on the 13th March, as follows:—

The Civil Defence Council, acting pursuant to Regulation 67 of the Civil Defence Regulations, 1941 (as amended), and for the purpose of Regulation 66 of the said regulations relating to measures to be taken for the protection of the public from flying glass, hereby declares that in that portion of the city of Perth more particularly defined and described in the schedule hereunder the measure which is approved by the Civil Defence Council for the protection of the public from flying glass is the following: The complete removal of all glass from

windows, show windows, display cases and mirrors, doors, screens, partitions and other structures where such glass is on the basement or ground floor storeys and is adjacent to or abutting on a street, right-of-way, arcade, or passage over or through which the public has a right of way or which is commonly used by the public or to which the public has access.

Then follows this very important proviso—

Provided that, where in relation to any internal sector or building situated in that portion of the city of Perth aforesaid, the controlling authority thereof—

That means the owner or occupier of the premises—

—has, prior to the publication of this notice in the "Government Gazette" adopted any measure, other than the measure abovementioned, for the protection of the public against flying glass which the officer or person appointed for the purpose by the Civil Defence Council is satisfied and so certifies is sufficient for the purpose of protecting the public from flying glass, such controlling authority shall not be required to adopt the measure hereby notified as approved by the Civil Defence Council while he or it continues to maintain the other measure previously adopted by such controlling authority as aforesaid.

That means, if it means anything at all, as I have no doubt it does—for if one walks along the streets one sees what has happened—that those people who took the precaution of covering their glass with wire netting are to be allowed to retain that provision. Personally, I think it is right that they should, for it is a sufficient protection. But it does not seem altogether fair that they should be allowed to continue in that way and that others should be compelled to remove the glass from their windows and to substitute timber.

I am sure it is manifestly unfair and incapable of justification from any point of view that the very heavy expense to which they are put in that direction has to be counted as capital expenditure and may not be counted as ordinary expenditure, which would, of course, be a deduction from their profits for the purpose of income tax. That a man, having been compelled to take out all glass and board up his windows, should not be allowed to regard the expenditure as part of his current expenses for the year when calculating the profit on which he pays income tax, is not only absurd but manifestly unfair. I suppose—as was suggested by a correspondent in this morning's paper—that when, and we hope it will not be long, the emergency has passed and the man removes the timber and restores the glass, that will

be regarded as a capital improvement also. That is not directly covered by this regulation; it is all in another regulation.

Following the compulsion upon people to remove the glass from their windows and substitute timber, several occupiers left small squares in the timber, covering them with wire netting. That was a complete protection and it also enabled the passers-by to see what was for sale in the premises. Walking along the street one can see dozens of places in which expense has been incurred in making these small apertures which have subsequently been covered in. I did notice on my way home yesterday afternoon one establishment on which a square was allowed to remain. That was a small shop engaged in what I suppose some regard as the important business of selling lottery tickets. That shop was permitted to display its wares to the public.

Another provision prohibits the display in any glass case of any goods that can be seen by any person before he goes right into the shop. To my mind that is utterly absurd. Does it mean that business people have to do away with that kind of display altogether? Of course, they could erect a little screen, but in the case of small shopkeepers it would close the place up altogether. Newsagents desired to put up a little board in front of their shops with copies of the papers they have for sale. That was done, but officers came along and ordered their removal. For what purpose? What earthly good is such a restriction to anybody?

Lastly, there was a general instruction that on the timbered windows nothing should be placed but the name of the proprietor and the nature of his business. As recently as last Saturday a notice was placed in the Press under the authority of Mr. Panton, the Chairman of the Civil Defence Council, that immediate proceedings would be taken against anybody offending against that regulation. What was the result? A great many business people apparently had not seen the notice, or were determined to defy it, because during the last two or three days all sorts of things in addition to the name and nature of the business have been painted on the boards.

Apparently the Civil Defence Council has now realised that the original order—the one that Mr. Panton said was going to be rigorously enforced—was not necessary and

that it hampered business people in a fashion that could not be justified, for a notice was published in the Press yesterday afternoon and again this morning that the Council would be prepared to receive from business people a copy of what they proposed to put on the boards and the council would use its discretion whether such matters should be permitted or not. I can see no good purpose to be served by the council interfering at all in a matter of that kind. Why should not business men, having been put to the heavy expense and inconvenience of removing glass and boarding-up their windows, be allowed to make what appeal to the public is left to them and put on their boards whatever is appropriate without, of course, being allowed to offend against the law by displaying anything improper? The council has decided that its original order was extreme but it is unnecessary that the council should endeavour to prevent anybody from making such displays.

I hope the regulation will be disallowed in order that it may be left for the council to frame one which, while protecting the interests of the public, will not act as the present regulation does to the grave detriment of the small storekeepers. Already those small storekeepers are facing extreme difficulty in many directions. Most of them have lost all their employees. A great many shops have been closed, and the shopkeepers remaining are chiefly women and elderly men, too old for military service. Nothing should be done to embarrass them any further.

THE CHIEF SECRETARY (Hon. W. H. Kitson—West) [2.40]: There is an entirely different reason for this regulation from that governing the one that has just been disallowed. The idea behind this regulation is to prevent the congregation of people in the centre of the city and particularly the congregation of women and children. I am told that it applies to only a very restricted part of the city and that since the new order has been in vogue there has been a considerable reduction in the number of people who have congregated in various parts of the centre of the city. The reason for the banning of some of the displays referred to by Sir Hal Colebatch is the same. Such displays have the effect of causing people to congregate in one particular place.

It may be of interest to the House to know of one case which I am advised occurred in Hay-street. The shopkeeper concerned left two small apertures in his window. Over one he had the words "For men only" and over the other "For women only." The crowds of people who stopped to look through the apertures not intended for them were such as to interfere with traffic in the street. That is only one instance.

Hon. J. A. Dimmitt: It probably was the only instance.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: It may not have been. It is the only one of which I know. It is of interest as showing what can happen. The Civil Defence Council is only too anxious to do what it can to protect the public. The Minister, who is chairman of the council, has stated on more than one occasion that it is desirable to take whatever steps are possible to prevent a congregation of such large numbers of people, particularly women and children, at any given hour in the streets in the centre of the city. That is all that is behind the regulations. The argument used by Sir Hal that there is no reason why a business man should not be allowed to put on his boarded window any advertisement which he thinks fit so long as it is in connection with the business, is receiving the attention of the council, as he has pointed out.

Many shopkeepers submit to the council what they desire painted on these boarded windows. The council has only one object and that is the protection of the public. It is, in its opinion, necessary to have regulations of this kind with the restrictions they involve. If this House should disallow the regulation, as stated by Sir Hal Colebatch, it will simply mean that the Civil Defence Council will have to reconsider the position. I have no doubt that some other regulation will take its place. What form it will take I do not know.

I say again, as a matter of interest, that I received advice from the Under Secretary for Civil Defence, Mr. Telfer, who is accompanying the Minister to a conference in the Eastern States, to the effect that both Adelaide and Melbourne are now following the example of Perth in regard to the removal of glass. I do not know anything about the question of advertisements. We are not alone in our decision to remove glass. If the same body that orders that removal also considers that something further is necessary to protect the public and that that some-

thing consists of preventing the congregation of large numbers of people in any one place at any one time, we should have some regard to its viewpoint.

This is another of those phases about which there is probably room for a difference of opinion. Where such a position does arise somebody has to take the responsibility for making the decision. In this case it has been taken by the council which was appointed under the Act, and I do not see very much wrong with it. I cannot see why there is any necessity for shopkeepers to have a whole list of things painted on the boarded windows. So long as a fair indication of the type of commodity for sale is given, that seems to be all that is necessary. I have no option but to oppose the motion. Members can rest assured that the Civil Defence Council has taken this action only in what it believes to be the best interests of the public generally.

HON. H. S. W. PARKER (Metropolitan-Suburban) [248]: I have no doubt the Civil Defence Council framed this regulation with the object of keeping people out of town, and if that is so it has been very effective because it is most depressing and demoralising to go into the city today. The council has not given sufficient thought to the matter. It has rushed in. In London, where there has been extensive bombing, one of the features of that city, which has to a large extent helped to save the people, have been the humorous displays put in the windows after the raid, showing how the traders carried on their businesses. The authorities there have allowed them to carry on and have helped the people to be cheerful.

If any regulation of a similar nature to this is brought in later, I shall, at the first opportunity, consider the advisability of moving to disallow it. I can see no rhyme or reason for trying to keep people out of the city. We live in the city; we shop in the city and we have perishable goods displayed in shops without windows or glass. The Civil Defence Council says that the shops must be closed so that nothing can be seen from the roadway. One instance brought to my notice was that of a man who runs a piano shop. He was told to put a screen across his door because the people, as they walk past in the street, could see his pianos! How many women or children is that going to bring into the town?

Yesterday two women came to me. They keep book shops. One told me she was not allowed to paint a book on the woodwork outside the shop windows. The Civil Defence Council have advertised, "Before you put any signs up, show them to us because it might save you having to take them down." I do not think any one of us when we passed the Civil Defence (Emergency Powers) Act, dreamt for a moment that any council would have the right to say what advertising there should be. Traders are not allowed, under these regulations, to advertise within a certain area. I wanted to get a certain article today and had to go from shop to shop before I could find it, whereas ordinarily I would see it in a shop window. That is merely a matter of personal inconvenience, but I presume I am a normal individual.

I suggest that the Government arranges for some people not in the Civil Service—or might I put it quasi-Civil Service—to be appointed to this council. We have already heard how the council is influenced by the Minister. He stated definitely and distinctly that if the Army asked him to do anything he would do it at once. The inference was, although it was not definitely said, that a regulation was passed by the Civil Defence Council because the Army asked for it. Let us have a body entirely independent of all civil servants. That body could then call in experts. My experience is that if experts are on a committee, the same efficiency is not obtained as when it consists of ordinary men who can, when necessary, call in experts for advice. The members of the Civil Defence Council may be honest in their intentions, but it is not right for them to deal with such serious matters as this.

True, it is advisable to keep people out of the city, but there is a difference between that and frightening people and discouraging them. Why force through the bankruptcy court so many people, such as the shopkeepers in the arcades, merely to keep a few persons out of town? Why prevent the great number of strangers who are at present in and around our city and passing through it, from seeing what goods we have for sale? Why encourage these people who have loose cash in their pockets to spend it in hotels instead of being able to see in the shops attractive displays of goods on which to spend their money? The argument can be raised against that that we do not want

them to spend their money; that we prefer them to save it and invest it in bonds. But the people about whom I am speaking will never save it. They will spend it in hotels. Why should we not display our perishable articles, such as fruit, in the open?

The Civil Defence Council did not draw any distinction between different classes of business. Fish shops and meat shops have to be closed up in such a way that it is not possible to see inside. There has to be a screen across the door. This is a fearful indictment against the business ability of those people who have devoted so much time and attention to the matter. I do not say anything against the integrity or honesty of the members of the Civil Defence Council. I would be grossly wrong if I did. I do think, however, that the wrong people have been appointed. They have not had the necessary training to qualify them to deal with such matters as now confront them. The Government would be well advised to consider, if not an entirely fresh council, at any rate the augmenting of that council with people who have a better knowledge of general conditions, and who have more diversified information. I have much pleasure in supporting the motion.

HON. J. CORNELL (South) [2.57]: I wish to say a few words on this motion. I may not recognise logic or commonsense when I hear it, but we are told that an order was made in regard to brown-out and black-out areas in the City of Perth. The business people had either to take their glass out, or to protect it sufficiently from shatter. Many have taken it out, and many have not. Still others have not protected their glass from shatter. When the businessman has taken the glass out, his obligation ends. But there cannot be a series of holes right along the wall. Without mentioning the expense involved, it is at the option of the landlord or tenant to do what any sensible man would do, close up the hole. But when he closes it up, all that he is allowed to display on the boards is "John Brown, Upholsterer."

The object of the regulations is to stop an aggregation of people in the city and their congregation at some fantastic sign which some businessman may paint on his boards. Where is the commonsense or logic of that? Where is the greatest congregation of people in the metropolitan area at one given time? What has been done to dis-

perse it? If members will go to Newspaper House and the area from William-street almost to the Adelphi Hotel, between 4.30 p.m. and 6.30 p.m., they will find that all the metropolitan buses and trolley buses travelling westward start from there. A large number of people congregate in that vicinity and tear at one another to get into these buses. If we go to Stirling Gardens we find the same thing there. If we go to Wellington-street in the vicinity of the railway station we find a great congregation of people intent on boarding trains. In spite of this, picture theatres are allowed to attract hundreds of people under their roofs. Yet we are told that the object of the regulation is to prevent such gatherings.

Hon. H. S. W. Parker: Sydney held a show.

Hon. J. CORNELL: I do not care what Sydney did. Then what about our hotels? I have looked at them and I say that they have not taken out the glass or boarded up their windows. Members know what a great congregation of people can be found at a hotel. Go to an S.P. betting shop on a race day and we find a great concourse of people, but nothing is done to prevent their gathering there. According to the Press this morning the Civil Defence Council is prepared, if shopkeepers submit in duplicate particulars of what they wish to put on their boards, to say whether they may do so or not. I repeat that the only objection can be that some fantastic sign might attract a large number of people who might be blown up in an air raid.

HON. E. H. H. HALL (Central) [3.2]: What is the aim and object of enforcing this regulation? Are the members of the Civil Defence Council desirous of putting up something in order to get as nearly as possible a unanimous response from the public, or something that will have to be continually amended? We receive much criticism from all sorts of people, but that is to be expected. I usually return to my home by the Midland Railway, and I find that my reservation for tomorrow has been cancelled and I have to travel by another train if I am to get home at all. I say that is due to war conditions and, though a personal inconvenience, must be submitted to by any reasonable person. But when people are ordered or forbidden to do something which any reasonable-minded person can see

is ridiculous, they cannot be expected to submit to it. I do not think I am wrong in making that remark because that is what a majority of the people feel. For that reason I shall support the motion.

HON. SIR HAL COLEBATCHE (Metropolitan—in reply) [3.4]: The only point taken by the Chief Secretary was that the regulation was intended to prevent the congregation of a large number of people in the city, but I point out that, in addition, it has the effect of driving people to the big shops because the regulation does not apply in any way to the big shops. They are really arcades leading from street to street, and the effect of the regulation is to prevent people from patronising the small shopkeepers and to drive the whole of the trade into the big houses, where there are large congregations of people. I have not a word to say against the big houses; I do not think they are doing anything they should not be allowed to do, but we should see that no improper burden is imposed upon the small shopkeepers.

Question put and passed.

MOTION—LICENSING ACT.

As to Restrictions on Liquor Sales.

Debate resumed from the previous day on the following motion by Hon. C. F. Baxter (East):—

1, That in the opinion of this House any further liquor restrictions proposed by the State Government should be confined to areas already prescribed, and in these areas—

- (a) The closing time be 7 p.m. in lieu of 6 p.m.
- (b) No liquor in bottles be supplied from any licensed premises after 4 p.m.
- (c) No liquor in bottles or other containers advertising such liquors shall be displayed after 4 p.m.

2, And in addition throughout the State—

- (a) For sly grog selling there shall be imprisonment for the first and any subsequent offence without the option of a fine.
- (b) That it shall be made an offence for any person to bring into or have in his possession any liquor within the precincts of any public hall where any entertainment is being or about to be held.
- (c) And that the provisions of the Licensing Act be rigidly enforced.

HON. C. F. BAXTER (East—in reply) [3.6]: It is certainly pleasing to find that support has been given by each and every

speaker, not to the motion in its entirety but to the main portions of it. This should indicate to the Government the wisdom of doing a great deal more than it has done in the past. One member, I think it was Mr. Cornell, asked what would be the effect of the motion if it was passed. The only effect will be the influence it might have on Ministers for the good of the State in general. If Ministers decline to take any notice of it, the responsibility for lack of action must rest on their shoulders entirely.

Much has been said about the 6 o'clock closing of hotels. Apparently the Chief Secretary is the one of all the members in this House who thinks that 6 o'clock closing has been effective in safeguarding the situation. Much more than that is needed. When we consider the various paragraphs of the motion, we realise that only one of them would necessitate the introduction of legislation, and the question is whether the existing scandal is to be allowed to continue or whether a small amendment is to be made to one section of the Act. It is quite competent for the Government to bring down an amendment of that section without opening up the whole of the provisions of the Act to discussion.

As regards the hours of trading, I purposely left that question open in order to get an expression of opinion from members. I am pleased that they practically agreed to what I had in mind. If we are going to apply the hours stipulated by the Prime Minister, I should say that from 11 a.m. to 2 p.m. and from 4 p.m. to 8 p.m. would meet the situation. Some members are strongly opposed to the action of the Prime Minister in going to the extent of restricting hours. I do not know exactly how matters stand there, because almost every day we find a difference of opinion amongst Commonwealth Ministers. The Commonwealth Cabinet seems to be a peculiar one: the Ministers do not speak with one voice.

The Honorary Minister: They are doing the job, anyhow!

Hon. C. F. BAXTER: Of course they are—for the unionists of Australia and for that section only. From that standpoint they are doing the work excellently. The closing hours must be reasonable from the standpoint of all sections of the community. The Chief Secretary said that we could consider not every section of the community but only one section and that this was con-

sidered by the Government when it adopted 6 o'clock closing. This means that the men who finished work at 5 p.m. were given consideration, but no thought was given to the section that finished at 6 o'clock. As a matter of fact we know that in fixing the time at 6 p.m. the Government was only pandering to different bodies that have voiced an opinion in favour of 6 o'clock closing.

The Honorary Minister interjected.

Hon. C. F. BAXTER: The Honorary Minister had an opportunity to speak to the motion. Apparently he did not think fit to do so, and I do not think he has any room for grousing now. As regards paragraph (b) providing that no liquor in bottles be supplied from licensed premises after 4 p.m., I agree that if the hour were made 2 p.m., it would save a lot of trouble.

To combat sly-grog selling, there is no need for any amendment to the Act. The law already provides that whoever is adjudicating on the bench may impose imprisonment without a fine for this offence. I intended that this House, by passing the motion with no uncertain voice—it should be passed unanimously—would express the opinion that a fine should not be inflicted for sly-grog selling, but that there should be imprisonment for the first or any subsequent offence without the option of a fine. Then those responsible for administering the Act would take that as the cue and in future there would be no more fines; the punishment would be imprisonment.

Paragraph (ii) (b) is a difficult one and will necessitate an amendment of the Act. Are we going to allow a continuance of the state of affairs under which liquor may be taken to places of amusement, thereby creating the awful conditions we have experienced, more especially during the last three or four years? There is no control; the police cannot control this sort of thing. A new cafe has been opened in Hay-street; it seems to be run on sound lines, but people who frequent the place are taking liquor there—bottles and bottles of it—and thus another eye-sore is being produced in the city. Unless we amend the Act, that sort of thing will continue. It is not for private members to bring down an amendment of the Licensing Act; that is the duty of the Government.

The Act can be rigidly enforced to prevent the indiscriminate selling of liquor to inebriated people or to people under the age

of 21 years. When the Government is considering the matter, let it put that provision into force. Let the police be instructed to enforce it. Fifty special constables are being sought—I do not know where the Government will get them—but let instructions be given to the police to take these matters in hand—sly-grog selling, supplying liquor to inebriated persons or to persons under the age of 21 years.

I feel sure the House will agree to the motion. If so, I hope the Government will accept it. If the Government is afraid of accepting responsibility for action in pursuance of the motion, then it can simply say, "This is a resolution of Parliament; we are carrying out Parliament's direction, and Parliament must accept the responsibility." I am sure that Parliament is quite agreeable to accepting such responsibility, because we all know that much good will be done if the motion is agreed to.

Question put and passed.

House adjourned at 3.17 p.m.

Legislative Assembly.

Wednesday, 22nd April, 1942.

	PAGE
Questions: Water supplies, Katanning scheme	3146
Betting, as to co-ordination in punishment	3146
Prisons—(1) Food at Pardelup, (2) Facilities at Barton's Mill	3147
Agricultural Bank, Merredin branch mortgages	3147
Transport, bus and parlour coach schedules	3147
Vegetable growing, as to seed supplies	3148
Neon signs, reduction of rent	3148
Bill: Interest Regulation, leave to introduce IB.	3148, 3153
Motion: Printing Ministerial Statement, as to State's War Effort	3153

The Speaker took the Chair at 11 a.m. and read prayers.

QUESTION—WATER SUPPLIES.

Katanning Scheme.

Mr. WATTS asked the Minister for Works: What was the total cost of the recently completed work on the Katanning water scheme?

The MINISTER FOR WORKS replied: The final cost of the bituminous surfacing of the catchment area is not yet available. Expenditure brought to account to date totals £23,482.

QUESTION—BETTING.

As to Co-ordination in Punishment.

Hon. W. D. JOHNSON asked the Minister for Justice: 1, As he has informed the House that neither the Government nor Parliament can influence or direct the Police Court bench except by legislative action, is he aware—(a) that Resident Magistrate Craig of the Fremantle Court, when sentencing illegal starting-price betting offenders, declared from the Bench that he intended to commit habitual offenders to prison? (b) that after this declaration the Bench was strengthened by the presence of two Justices of the Peace who influenced a decision by weight of numbers? (c) that these Justices disagreed with an imprisonment penalty being introduced and continued the practice of regularly fining offenders? (d) that the fines imposed were much below the usual penalties imposed in similar cases in other metropolitan courts? 2, Will the Government take action to reduce the powers of Messrs. Farrell and Griffiths, J.S.P., as exercised in the Fremantle Police Court, regularly nullifying the Resident Magistrate's conception of the correct punishment for this form of offence? 3, If not, is it appreciated that these two Justices are exercising authority that is at present denied to Government and Parliament? 4, Will the Government consider the immediate introduction of a roster under which every Fremantle Justice of the Peace will in turn be called upon to adjudicate on illegal starting-price betting offences? 5, If not, does the Government appreciate that it is allowing two Justices of the Peace to carry all the responsibility in adjudicating on this type of law-breaking?

The MINISTER FOR JUSTICE replied: 1, (a) I believe the Resident Magistrate did pass some comment to this effect. (b) No. (c) I am aware that imprisonment has not been imposed by the Fremantle Court for offences of the nature referred to. (d) Yes. 2, This cannot be done without amending the Justices Act. 3, It is not within the province of the Government to direct Justices regarding the measure of punishment to be imposed as Parliament has given them discretionary powers. 4, No. The Justices Act stipulates that Justices of the Peace shall have and may exercise within their district the powers conferred upon them by any Act of Parliament and the