

splendid work. It has fathered thousands of children, many of whom will no doubt grow into useful citizens. They will have cause to be thankful for the care bestowed on them by the officers of the department, and to be grateful for the manner in which the State has come to their relief. I have much pleasure in congratulating the officers, the Minister, and everybody associated with the administration of the department.

Mr. MUNSIE: I wish to supplement the remarks made by the Leader of the Opposition. Western Australia should be proud of the department. I congratulate the department on the selection of its foster-mothers. It would be a revelation to members to see the homes in which the boarded-out children have been placed. I have nothing but praise for the lady inspectors who examine the homes before they permit the children to go to them. I should be lacking in my duty if I did not testify to the work the department is doing.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: An important report such as this of the Charities Department should be printed and distributed, even to the other States. As it is, we get merely a typewritten copy, which very few can secure. The report is not lengthy, and it is highly important, showing as it does what the State is doing for the assistance of the children. I hope the Government will have the report printed.

Vote put and passed.

On motion by Hon. W. C. Angwin, progress reported.

House adjourned at 12.40 a.m. (Friday).

Legislative Council,

Tuesday, 21st November, 1920.

	PAGE
Questions, Police Department, inspectors ...	1648
Industrial, 48 hours weekly ...	1648
Esperance Northwards railway ...	1648
Bills: Pensioners (Rates Exemption), 3B. ...	1649
Pearling Act Amendment, report ...	1649
Licensing Act Amendment, Com. ...	1649

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

QUESTION—POLICE DEPARTMENT, INSPECTORS.

Hon. F. A. BAGLIN asked the Minister for Education: 1, How many inspectors are there in the Police Department? 2, What are

their names, ages, salaries, and their length of service? 3, What is the retiring age for police inspectors?

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION replied: 1, Twelve. 2, Name, age, salary and length of service: Chief Inspector McKenna, 69, £545, 48 years 10 months; Inspector Sellenger, 59, £420, 38 years 4 months; Inspector Duncan, 60, £420, 30 years 5 months; Inspector Mitchell, 60, £420, 35 years; Inspector Houlahan, 60, £420, 41 years; Inspector Walsh, 60, £380, 31 years; Inspector O'Halloran, 55, £395, 34 years; Inspector Condon, 60, £380, 36 years; Inspector Treadgold, 43, £380, 19 years 5 months; Inspector Simpson, 55, £380, 34 years; Inspector J. Smith, 55, £380, 29 years; Inspector Spedding-Smith, 49, £380, 28 years; Inspector Barry, 52, £380, 28 years. 2, The Police regulations provide that the retiring age of members of the force shall be 60 years, subject to the Minister on the report of the Commissioner allowing any member to remain in his position until otherwise decided.

QUESTION—INDUSTRIAL, 48 HOURS WEEK.

Hon. G. W. MILES asked the Minister for Education: 1, Have the Government lodged applications in the State Court of Arbitration for an award of 48 hours in respect of (a) Engineering employees in the Water Supply and Public Works Departments; (b) Water supply, sewerage, and drainage employees; (c) Dock, river, and harbour employees; (d) Engine-drivers and firemen; (e) Plumbers, carpenters and joiners, painters, shipwrights, and survey hands? 2, (a) Has the Minister for Trading Concerns made application to the State court for an award against the Amalgamated Society of Engineers; (b) If not, what is the reason for the Minister for Trading Concerns not citing the Amalgamated Society of Engineers?

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION replied: 1, Yes. 2, (a) No; (b) Because of proceedings in the Federal Arbitration Court and the pending appeal to the Privy Council.

QUESTION—ESPERANCE NORTHWARDS RAILWAY.

Hon. E. H. HARRIS (for Hon. J. W. Kirwan) asked the Minister for Education: What progress has been made with the construction of the Esperance Northwards railway since the Minister made his statement in this Chamber on the 26th October last?

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION replied: Eight miles of rails and 3,000 sleepers delivered at Esperance. Arrangements completed for transport of some of the necessary trucks, and practically finalised for despatch this month of locomotive; this latter has been difficult by reason of few vessels available suitable for the purpose.

BILL—PENSIONERS (RATES EX-EMPTION).

Third Reading.

Hon. G. POTTER (West) [4.39] : I move—

That the Bill be now read a third time.

Hon. A. LOVEKIN (Metropolitan) [4.40]: Before the Bill finally leaves this Chamber, I would like the hon. member in charge of it to consider, and assure us, whether under it the pensioners will not be worse off than they are at the present time. A matter which has come under my notice shows how the Federal authorities act in such matters. It may be they will follow in regard to the pensioners under this measure the same course as they have adopted in another case, to which I shall refer in a moment. Then, if this Bill passes, our municipalities and road boards will suffer, in that they will have to postpone the collection of their rates, and that possibly the pensioners themselves will suffer by reduction of the amounts of their pensions. The case I am about to cite is one I can vouch for, because the daughter of the pensioner affected is employed in my company's office, and I got the facts from her this morning. The case is that of a widow who had four sons with her after her husband died. All of the sons went to the war. One of them was killed; one of them returned to Western Australia and died here by reason of his wounds; the third remained in the army and stayed in England; the fourth son is living here, and is married. The widow had two daughters, one of whom is married, and the mother has had to take this daughter back with a child. The other daughter, as I have mentioned, is working for my company. I need not mention her name, though I am prepared to give it privately. A month or two ago she was given a rise of 5s. in her salary. The mother at that time was in receipt of a pension of £1 7s. per week from the Federal authorities.

The Minister for Education: What sort of pension?

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: A pension given because the mother had been dependent upon the boy who was killed. It was a military pension. If the Federal authorities are going to treat the pensioners who are to be benefited by this Bill, in the same way as they treated that military pensioner, old age and invalid pensioners here will be worse off if this measure passes. As I have said, the girl was given an increase of 5s., and her mother had been receiving a pension of 27s.

The PRESIDENT: Does the hon. member's illustration apply to the Bill before the House?

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: I am endeavouring to reason by analogy. If the Federal Government will take steps such as they took in this case, they will probably take them in the case of pensioners under this Bill, who will ultimately find themselves worse off in-

stead of better. As soon as the Federal authorities learnt that the girl got the 5s. rise, they reduced the mother's pension by 7s.; so that the family are now worse off by 2s. per week. Before we finally pass this Bill, I want to know that the Federal Government are not going to reduce the pensions of old age and invalid pensioners upon learning that those pensioners are to receive some little rebate for the time being in regard to rates. I think we ought to be assured of that before passing this measure. We do not want to penalise municipalities and road boards in this State in order to assist the Federal Government to pay smaller pensions.

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

Ayes	12
Noes	10

Majority for .. 2

AYES.

Hon. F. A. Baglin	Hon. J. Mills
Hon. H. P. Colebatch	Hon. G. Potter
Hon. J. E. Dodd	Hon. A. J. H. Saw
Hon. J. Ewing	Hon. H. Seddon
Hon. E. H. Harris	Hon. R. G. Ardagh
Hon. J. W. Hickey	(Teller.)
Hon. G. W. Miles	

NOES.

Hon. J. Duffell	Hon. E. Rose
Hon. J. A. Greig	Hon. H. Stewart
Hon. V. Hamersley	Hon. F. E. S. Willmott
Hon. J. J. Holmes	Hon. A. Burvill
Hon. A. Lovekin	(Teller.)
Hon. J. M. Macfarlane	

Question thus passed.

Bill read a third time and returned to the Assembly with an amendment.

BILL—PEARLING ACT AMENDMENT.

Report of Committee adopted.

BILL—LICENSING ACT AMENDMENT.

In Committee.

Resumed from 15th November. Hon. J. Ewing in the Chair; the Minister for Education in charge of the Bill.

Clause 48—agreed to.

Clause 49—Determination of board to be final:

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: I move an amendment—

That after "board" in line 1, "in respect of questions of fact and procedure" be inserted.

The decision of the board should not be final except on questions of fact or of procedure. A member of the board might be interested in the trade, and consequently biased in his opinion.

Hon. J. J. Holmes: He has no right to be there if interested or biased.

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: Yet it may happen. In principle it is wrong that a decision, except on questions of fact or procedure, should be without appeal.

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: I see no advantage to be gained by taking the final decision away from the board. They will be dealing with questions of fact all the time.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: I am opposed to the amendment. The hon. member wants to provide for the removal of cases from the jurisdiction of the board to that of a higher court. It means that the people with the most money will win every time.

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: This is a question between parties. With two licensees to be compensated, an interested member of the board could award to one more compensation than he is entitled to, and to another less.

Hon. J. J. Holmes: The Governor has power to dismiss such a member of the board.

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: But I want to obviate any occasion for dismissal.

Amendment put and negatived.

Clause put and passed.

Clause 50—Notice of compensation payable:

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: I move an amendment—

That in line 5 "in the district" be struck out.

Hon. F. A. BAGLIN: If we agree to the amendment, the notice might be inserted in some newspaper which nobody concerned will see.

Hon. A. Lovekin: No, the amendment does not affect it. It will still be in a local newspaper.

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

Clauses 51 to 53—agreed to.

Clause 54—Compensation fund to be established:

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: The other day we passed an amendment to insert in a number of places "principal Act" instead of "this Act." The words "this Act" occur here also.

The Minister for Education: But the Bill will be incorporated with the principal Act and printed with it. So no amendment is necessary.

Clause put and passed.

Clause 55—agreed to.

Clause 56—The poll:

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: It is provided that the poll on prohibition shall be taken in every fifth year. I think that is too short an interval between polls on prohibition. I move an amendment—

That in line 2 "fifth" be struck out and "seventh" inserted in lieu.

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: It is purely a question of opinion. In the past the interval has been three years. The Bill

proposes to make it five years, but the hon. member would make it seven years. I will vote for the clause as it stands.

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: My only reason for moving the amendment was because it dealt with prohibition; the other dealt with local option. On the one hand we are going to cut away the whole business, and on the other we propose to revive it. Therefore, I consider that the poll once in every seven years will be frequent enough.

Amendment put and negatived.

Clause put and passed.

Clause 57—agreed to.

Clause 58—Majority for carrying proposal:

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: I wish to read for the benefit of the Committee a resolution which was carried at a meeting held at 81 Pier-street, Perth, on Friday, the 17th November, at which were present representatives from the Anti-Liquor League, W.C.T.U., Western Australian Alliance, Women's Labour Organisation, and Women's Service Guilds of W.A. The resolution reads—

That this meeting of Western Australian women enters an emphatic protest against the indignity Parliament is placing on them and other citizens by demanding that before the electors of this State are permitted to enact prohibition of the liquor traffic by referendum, they must secure a three-fifths majority—Clause 58 of "the new Licensing Bill."

This resolution was presented to me by a deputation to-day, representing all these bodies and I was asked to convey the contents of the resolution to the House. I agreed to do so.

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: I move an amendment—

That in lines 1 and 2 "three-fifths at least" be struck out, and the following added to the end of the clause:—"Provided a minimum of 80 per cent. of the persons entitled to vote as aforesaid shall have recorded their votes."

I have framed the amendment somewhat on the lines recommended by the Royal Commission in their report. If hon. members will refer to that report, they will notice under the heading "Local option" the Commission say—

The existing Act be amended to provide for a periodical State-wide poll to be taken (on a day other than that on which a Parliamentary election is held) on the question of a "wet" or "dry" State, such poll to be decided on a simple majority of the votes cast, and voting to be compulsory; provided, however, that a minimum of 85 per cent. of the electors on the roll is essential, but that such percentage shall suffice to carry the question for or against prohibition. Penalty for failing to vote to be £5.

The recommendation of the Commission appears to me to be the one means whereby it can be ascertained whether the electors as a body are, or are not in favour of prohibition. One can recognise that if this question be left to the decision of the electors and a simple majority of the electors without the voting being made compulsory, then there may occur what one may regard as a miscarriage of justice so far as the opinion of the electors is concerned. It may possibly happen that the electors do not take that interest in voting on this question which it should be their duty to do. Therefore, voting should be made compulsory. I have provided for a minimum poll of 80 per cent.

Hon. H. Stewart: Why not amend the Electoral Act at the same time?

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: It has been suggested that 80 per cent. is too high. But I cannot see that the method suggested in the Bill is the proper way of deciding the question nor can I agree that a simple majority without compulsory voting would be fair. I hope members will give this clause their fullest consideration. What I am trying to do is to put into force the recommendations of the Commission who gave the matter mature consideration.

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: The Government took into consideration the recommendation of the Royal Commission and decided not to adopt it. The Government are not prepared to adopt compulsory voting. It has been suggested at times that compulsory voting should be applied to Parliamentary elections, but on every occasion when the proposal has been put forward it has been turned down by Parliament. It may be said that it is the clear duty of electors to vote at a Parliamentary election, but I do not think it can be said that it is the clear duty of electors to vote at every local option poll. An individual may take an interest in the matter or he may not and he may refuse to vote. Then to make it an offence for declining to vote on such a poll would be to take a very drastic action. Under existing legislation there is provision for a three-fifths majority and a 30 per cent. poll in favour of the resolution. That 30 per cent. poll has been knocked out and it is now a little more liberal than it was before.

Hon. Sir Edward WITTENOOM: The question of prohibition has been before us for a long time and I am one of those who consider that it would be impossible to have what is called State prohibition. I even go to the length of saying that were prohibition advocated for the Commonwealth, I would consider a long time before I would agree to support it. At any rate, in a State I do not think prohibition could be carried out with success because there would be required an army of inspectors to watch the railways and steamers and to prevent smuggling, just as is the case in America. I am in favour of the three-fifths majority as the clause provides. Whilst I am prepared to admit that a great deal of harm has arisen through

drink, at the same time I know of numerous instances where people enjoy the beverage without any harm coming to them. Therefore, I do not consider it fair to take away from a certain number of people a privilege which they have enjoyed for many years unless that be done by the pronounced opinion of a fair majority. Why should 500 out of 20,000 take away from 10,000 a privilege which that 10,000 has enjoyed for so long? The clause should be permitted to remain as it stands. It is argued that a bare majority should rule. Let us suppose that some member of this House had the opportunity of inserting a clause in the Bill to compel teetotalers to drink and that such a provision could be decided upon by a bare majority. What would be the position then?

Hon. F. E. S. Willmott: Some of them would jump at it.

Hon. Sir Edward WITTENOOM: There is one aspect which has not entered the minds of many. I have had the opportunity of finding out what I am about to state by reason of the fact that I am a director of the Trustee Company. In the cases that have come before me time after time, men who have participated in the liquor trade have erected buildings into which they have put a lot of their money, as the buildings must be up to the standard fixed by the licensing authorities. Those people engaged in the trade, not merely for the purpose of making a living, but to build up a competency for their wives and families in the event of their death. The Trustee Company with which I am connected has 14 of these hotels. The husbands died and the properties were left to the wives and children. Surely in such circumstances, we should not take away these privileges and opportunities which the beneficiaries have inherited, unless the decision is by a pronounced majority of the people. These people who have spent large sums of money in erecting hotels, and have been enabled to make due provision for their families after death, should be considered. If the decision for prohibition were carried by a bare majority, every one of those individuals connected with the 14 hotels I have referred to, would be left with less than nothing. To my mind, nothing less than a three-fifths majority would be fair if a decision were arrived at to deprive these beneficiaries of their living. In the circumstances, I intend to vote for the clause as it stands.

Hon. E. H. Harris: Will you not tell us what you think of the amendment?

Hon. H. SEDDON: We are really discussing the amendment, rather than the question of prohibition. The restriction suggested by Mr. Nicholson would interfere considerably with the 80 per cent. poll which is stipulated. In fact, those restrictions would practically render an 80 per cent. poll an impossibility. The highest poll recorded in Western Australia represented 84 per cent. at Boulder. That percentage was obtained only after most strenuous efforts by both sides. Those who have experience in connection with elec-

tions will appreciate that there appear on the rolls a great number of names of persons who are really ineligible to vote. There are always a certain number who have died or who are away from the district either on holidays or for business purposes, and cannot be secured. There are also the people who are sick. If Mr. Nicholson makes provision for exempting from the necessity to vote people who are five miles away from the polling booth, the difficulty regarding the percentage poll will be increased.

Hon. J. Nicholson: I am prepared to increase the distance to 10 miles or so.

Hon. H. SEDDON: Whatever is done will have a bad effect on the poll. If the highest percentage obtained after a closely fought election was 84 per cent., it shows that the provision for an 80 per cent. poll is too high. It is well known that people try to dodge their obligations at the polling booth.

Hon. J. Nicholson: The amendment proposes to make voting compulsory.

Hon. H. SEDDON: That is so, but the liquor people can take such action as will render the poll inoperative. Nothing would be easier than to keep their supporters away from the poll so that it would be below 80 per cent. As to the President's arguments, the fact is lost sight of that in investing money in hotels, people adopt that business for the purpose of erecting good buildings. The carrying of prohibition will not interfere with residential hotels for they could still carry on, thus giving effect to the purpose for which the licenses were ostensibly granted. I oppose the amendment, and I intend to move a further amendment later on to provide for a simple majority.

Hon. A. J. H. SAW: I oppose the amendment. I am opposed to compulsory voting on any question for the simple reason that when a vote is taken, one requires to get an intelligent opinion from those who vote. That can be secured only by taking the vote of people who are interested in a subject and have studied it. How can we get an intelligent vote from people who do not take sufficient interest in the question to go to the poll voluntarily and have to be compelled by an Act of Parliament to record their votes? Mr. Nicholson spoke of getting the mature and deliberate opinion of the people. That is what we will not get under the amendment. The opinion of a man who is too indolent to go to the poll voluntarily is not worth having.

The CHAIRMAN: I wish to point out to hon. members that we are discussing the striking out of "three-fifths."

Hon. J. E. DODD: I was inclined at first sight to vote for Mr. Nicholson's amendment. It seemed to be a fair method of getting over a very difficult problem. After giving the matter consideration, however, I feel I cannot conscientiously vote in favour of it. First of all it is proposed to make it compulsory for everyone to vote. All through this discussion on the Licensing Bill, I have wanted to know why we should hedge the Bill

with restrictions that do not apply to other questions and other subjects? Why should we go out of our road to make it compulsory for every voter to record his vote on this Bill when we do not make a similar provision regarding any other matter? Quite apart from the aspect of whether we can get a compulsory poll—as a matter of fact it is not possible to get one, as it is easy to make one's vote informal—my objection is to hedging the Bill round with restrictions which have not been applied to bigger problems. Mr. Nicholson proposes to further restrict the vote by the provision for the 80 per cent. minimum. Why should these restrictions be imposed on this question when more important issues than the Licensing Bill have been decided by the vote of the people of Australia without any such restrictions? Older issues have been raised from time to time and we did not hear anything from the supporters of the three-fifths majority then. When the conscription referendum was taken there was no question of the three-fifths majority and yet that was on a question of sending human beings to fight for us. Surely that issue was far more important than any raised by the Licensing Act Amendment Bill? The question of Federation was more important and yet that was decided on a bare majority. If it had been the habit of the people of Australia to decide such important questions on the basis of a three-fifths majority, I should have been prepared to adhere to the principle. I cannot understand why we should single out this one question for such a restriction. Certainly it would be advisable to secure as large a poll as possible and that could be obtained by holding the referendum on the day of a general election. It would be fair to take the poll on that day. If such a majority were insisted upon, together with the 80 per cent. minimum, hon. members will realise there is nothing to prevent the rolls being stuffed. To-day in South Australia, alterations in connection with the land assessments have to be carried by a 50 per cent. majority. Whenever the poll is taken, the people against the proposal simply stay away from the poll and defeat the question in that way. There are a hundred and one ways in which one can defeat such a referendum. Although I would like to support the proposal, I cannot conscientiously do so.

Hon. J. A. GREIG: I am in favour of striking out the provision for the three-fifths majority.

Hon. J. Nicholson: This is not the amendment to deal with the three-fifths majority. This is a new clause.

The CHAIRMAN: A new clause cannot be taken at this stage. We are discussing the amendment to strike out "three-fifths."

Hon. J. A. GREIG: While I am in favour of striking out the three-fifths, I am not in favour of Mr. Nicholson's proposals.

The CHAIRMAN: I think we might discuss those when we come to them. I do not wish to curtail speeches, but hon. members

might stick to the amendment before the Chair.

Hon. J. A. GREIG: I am not opposed to the three-fifths for the purpose of inserting Mr. Nicholson's amendment, because I can see several dangers. One danger arises out of the proposal that any person living five miles away from the polling booth on the day of the poll, shall not be compelled to vote. In the country districts probably one-third of the voters live more than five miles away from the polling booth. That provision, of course, can be amended, but there are so many modifications suggested that it would be practically impossible to get the 80 per cent. poll. I am opposed to any vote being in proportion to the number of names on the roll. The question should be decided by those who vote. I have seen quite enough to convince me that the names on the roll are no guide.

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: The proposal to strike out "three-fifths" is so intimately associated with my proposed new clause dealing with compulsory voting that I wish it to be clearly understood I am moving the former in the hope that compulsory voting will be agreed to. Will the Leader of the House permit this clause to be postponed until the new clause is considered? If I agree to strike out the three-fifths—

The CHAIRMAN: The hon. member cannot anticipate what the Committee will do.

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: Mr. Dodd suggested that it was unfair to hedge this trade with restrictions different from what would be afforded to any other trade. In tabling this amendment I was guided by the report of the Royal Commission, who apparently thoroughly investigated the matter and endeavoured, while protecting the rights of the trade, to improve the conditions and minimise, if not eliminate, the evils.

Hon. J. J. Holmes: Your own amendment aims at a bare majority decision.

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: Mr. Dodd meant a majority decision of voluntary voters, whereas the majority I suggest would be under compulsory voting. The liquor trade is very different from any other trade. Large sums of money have been invested in it. I wish to get the deliberate opinion of the electors. Perhaps I had better ask leave to withdraw my amendment until the new clause dealing with compulsory voting is carried.

Hon. H. Stewart: You have jumped another member's amendment.

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: I notice that Mr. Seddon has tabled an amendment to the same effect and, in order that his amendment might be considered, I ask leave to withdraw my amendment. If the proposed clause providing for compulsory voting is carried, I can then ask for the recommitment of the Bill to provide for a majority instead of a three-fifths majority decision.

Hon. H. STEWART: On a point of order, if Mr. Nicholson secured leave to withdraw his amendment, would another member be in order in proposing the same amendment?

The CHAIRMAN: Certainly not, and I would not permit it.

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: Mr. Nicholson suggests that the votes of members on this question are going to be influenced by his amendments on the Notice Paper. The hon. member would move for the striking out of the three-fifths majority if he thought the compulsory voting clause would be carried. Under this amendment the question would not be carried unless 80 per cent. of the electors voted. Under the existing Act there is a provision that a certain question shall not be carried unless 30 per cent. were in favour of it. It might be possible to justify a provision of that kind, but a moment's reflection should show that a provision such as has been suggested contains elements amounting to an absurdity. Sixty per cent. of the electors on the roll might go to the poll and vote for prohibition. Ten per cent. might go and vote against it, and prohibition would be defeated simply by those who remained away from the poll. Had those people, instead of remaining away, gone to the poll and voted against prohibition, prohibition even then would have been carried. The hon. member's proposal suggests that a man can have greater influence on a poll by staying away than by going to it. I do not think the Committee will agree to that.

Hon. H. SEDDON: Sir Edward Wittenoom raised the question of smuggling. A majority of the people are law abiding and would be content to abide by the decision. People who engaged in smuggling would incur considerable risk and in course of time smuggling would die out. The young folks growing up under the new conditions of prohibition would not be brought into contact with drink, and it would be only a question of time before the evil died out. There are certain individuals who are strongly in favour of retaining drink, but they are people who have been accustomed to it. Drink is an acquired and not a natural taste. I advise members to read Jack London's book entitled "John Barleycorn," which shows that drink is an acquired taste.

Hon. F. E. S. Willmott: That is only his opinion.

Hon. H. SEDDON: It is worth reading.

Hon. A. Lovekin: I thought John Barleycorn was whisky.

Hon. H. SEDDON: There is no great danger of a small poll. On the last occasion there was a 50 per cent. poll. The liquor people exerted every effort and spent any amount of money and had the best organisation, and every possible elector was taken to the poll. The people who fought for prohibition were handicapped by lack of funds and organisation, because they had to depend upon a few enthusiasts. Having an effective organisation on the one side and on the other side a few enthusiasts fighting for prohibition, the handicap is sufficiently serious and the poll should be decided by a simple majority. It is idle to think we can keep this question out of Parliament unless we give the people a free and untrammelled issue upon which to vote. The question will overshadow every

other unless that is done, and the people will, when they go to the poll, decide as to the election of representatives in Parliament on the question of whether they are in favour of prohibition or not. If we are going to submit this matter to the people we should give them the simple majority vote.

Hon. F. A. BAGLIN: I am interested to find the number of converts to the idea of compulsory voting. This House on another occasion decided it was right to compel people to put their names on the roll. If that is right, the next step is to compel them to record their votes. I am in favour of compulsory voting for prohibition, as well as in the case of all general elections.

Hon. E. H. Harris: The clause does not provide for that.

Hon. F. A. BAGLIN: It is the thin edge of the wedge. The party to which I belong holds that people should be compelled to record their votes at general elections.

Hon. J. E. DODD: If a person is compelled to vote he may be compelled to vote on something that he does not in the least understand. It is absurd to compel a person to vote in circumstances of that nature. It is a very different thing to compel a person to get on the roll from compelling one to vote. I am opposed to compulsory voting for that reason.

Hon. H. STEWART: I cannot understand why a trade, which is in no way beneficial to the State, is so hedged around and protected as this is. In all the greatest crises that have occurred in connection with Governments, the simple majority vote has been sufficient; why is it not sufficient in this case? In 1911 the trade was given 10 years in which to prepare itself for what was to happen. Until we get down to the democratic principle of the simple majority this issue of the liquor trade will remain a political matter. The interests of that trade are being set against those of the general community.

Hon. R. J. LYNN: Would you accept the simple majority on all questions?

Hon. H. STEWART: I fail to see why an exception should be made in this case.

Hon. R. J. LYNN: Would you accept it on the question of abolishing this House?

Hon. H. STEWART: I stand for constitutional government. Anything that deals with an amendment to the Constitution requires an absolute majority vote.

Hon. Sir Edward WITTENOOM: This is not a question of whether drink is good or bad for us, or whether there should be prohibition or not. It is a question of whether the three-fifths majority vote should be given, or whether the vote is to be on a simple majority. Several members have said they could not understand why this question should not be settled by means of the simple majority. I can see many reasons against it. The Government have urged people to go into this business so that the revenue of the State might benefit. They have insisted upon the trade putting up proper buildings, and spending large sums of money in connection

with the business. It is not fair that people concerned should have the opportunity of making money out of their investments taken away by means of a simple majority vote. In connection with 14 different hotels which came under my notice as a trustee, the whole of the money in the estates was invested in them and the families were living on the income. Is it right that privileges which people have enjoyed for a number of years should be taken away from them by a simple majority vote? If people are determined to have prohibition, and to do away with a business which has been encouraged by the Government, and which brings in a large revenue to the State, it is surely not too much to ask them to do so by a three-fifths majority vote.

Hon. J. DUFFELL: If the endeavour to get rid of the three-fifths majority is successful, it will be necessary to add to Clause 58 a sub-clause reading—

In the event of prohibition being carried, it shall be an offence for any person to have on his premises any intoxicating liquor. Penalty: £100 for the first offence, £200 for the second offence, and for a third offence imprisonment, without the option of a fine, for a period of not less than six months.

That additional provision is essential to an effective effort to keep liquor out of Western Australia. In the event of the three-fifths majority being defeated, I shall move the insertion of that sub-clause.

Hon. A. J. H. SAW: I oppose the amendment. I gave a pledge to my electors that I would oppose a bare majority on a prohibition referendum. I am opposed to a bare majority, firstly because I think that unless prohibition can be carried by an overwhelming force of public opinion, it will be absolutely impossible to maintain it. American conditions are not analogous to Australian conditions, because America has been educating herself in prohibition for over 70 years. It is more than 70 years since the first State of the American union turned dry. I am not sure that at the present time prohibition in America is proving a success. A whole army is being employed to enforce prohibition, and prohibition is not being enforced. We read that as the result of prohibition in America the gaols are practically empty. A little paper called "The Campaigner" has been sent to me, and it interests me very much. I congratulate the prohibition party on their candour as shown in this paper, but I am afraid they have not fully realised the significance of the figures they quote. They state that in 25 American cities there have been 166,000 fewer arrests for intoxication under prohibition. The figures compared are 404,000 for 1917-18 and 217,000 for 1920-21. The paper also gives for the same years the total arrests for all crimes, and the astounding fact is disclosed, that while under prohibition there were 848,000 arrests for causes other than intoxication in the year 1920-21, there were in the year 1917-18, before prohibition, only 818,000 arrests for causes other than intoxication. So that, in spite of our

being told that the gaols are empty under prohibition, there appear to be more arrests for causes other than intoxication now than there were prior to prohibition. The future of prohibition rests entirely in America. If the result there is a success, no doubt prohibition will in course of time be adopted in other countries, and certainly in all English-speaking countries. So far, however, the issue seems to be in doubt.

The CHAIRMAN: I ask hon. members to confine themselves to the amendment. There will be plenty of opportunity later to discuss prohibition.

Hon. A. BURVILL: I am against a bare majority on the prohibition issue. The matter should not be considered at all from the point of view of the breweries and public houses. It is a matter between electors who drink and electors who do not drink. We could legislate to abolish liquor without taking a referendum at all, if only the public houses and breweries were concerned. An hon. member stated that under prohibition there would be considerable risk of the smuggling in of liquor. That is one reason why I favour the three-fifths majority, because as long as there are considerable numbers of people wanting drink, there will be smuggling of drink. References have been made to an acquired taste for liquor; but with the tightened-up legislation now before us, there should be very little trouble in obtaining a three-fifths majority a few years hence. Any poll taken should be decided by those who vote. Electors who do not go to the poll are not entitled to any consideration.

Hon. H. Stewart: What did you say when you could not get the three-fifths majority as to increasing licenses?

Hon. A. BURVILL: I said the three-fifths majority should cut both ways. In the case of a new license, it is a matter of a bare majority.

Hon. H. STEWART: Our President said the question was how prohibition was to be brought about. With all deference, I do not think that is the question. The question is what is the proper principle on which to decide an important public question, and whether we should shift our ground when we come to deal with the liquor trade. Prohibition has been before the people for 30 years, but there will have to be a great effort made before even a bare majority can be obtained for prohibition. I mentioned how even the Legislature is loaded in connection with this matter to a certain extent. Of course we never do get a bare majority on any question. No democratic argument can be used in favour of the three-fifths majority. When the 1911 Act was passed, there was a general understanding that it represented a period of notice to the liquor trade to be prepared, without compensation, for any eventuality which might arise. In all elections throughout the world a simple majority is considered sufficient. Even with regard to prohibition New Zealand and Queensland have the simple majority, and the Government of New South Wales are practically pledged to

a referendum with simple majority on the liquor question.

Sitting suspended from 6.15 to 7.30 p.m.

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

Ayes	4
Noes	13

Majority against	..	9
------------------	----	---

AYES.

Hon. E. H. Harris	Hon. H. Seddon
Hon. J. Nicholson	Hon. H. Stewart
	(Teller.)

NOES.

Hon. R. G. Ardagh	Hon. G. Potter
Hon. A. Burvill	Hon. E. Rose
Hon. H. P. Colebatch	Hon. A. J. H. Saw
Hon. J. Cornell	Hon. F. E. S. Willmott
Hon. A. Lovekin	Hon. Sir E. H. Wittenoom
Hon. J. M. Macfarlane	Hon. J. Duffell
Hon. J. Mills	(Teller.)

PAIR.

For—Hon. R. J. Lynn. Against—Hon. J. E. Dodd.

Amendment thus negatived.

Hon. G. W. MILES: I move—

That the following proviso be added to the clause:—"Provided that the proposal shall not be carried unless 30 per cent. or more of the Assembly electors throughout the State vote for the proposal."

This was originally in the Bill, and I think it should be re-inserted in order to preclude all possibility of the question being decided on a catch vote.

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: I do not attach very much importance to the amendment. I will support the clause. A three-fifths majority would be bound to contain 30 per cent. of the whole of the voters, unless there were more than 20 per cent. voting against prohibition. If a poll on this question be held and less than 20 per cent. of those opposed to prohibition take the trouble to go to the poll, they deserve all that they get or, rather, do not get.

Hon. J. CORNELL: I hope the Committee will not agree to the amendment. We have already decided that there shall be no prohibition unless a three-fifths majority of those who go to the poll vote for it. The question should be left to a substantial majority, without any provision for 30 per cent. of the electors voting in favour of prohibition.

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: I hope the amendment will be agreed to. In this I associate myself with the two Archbishops of Perth.

Hon. F. E. S. Willmott: Two Archbishops and the arch-fiend!

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: Connected with this question are two extreme parties, one the trade and the other the prohibitionists. Be-

tween the two is a middle section composed of moderates, of those who never get drunk. Both the extreme sections are highly organised. The middle party is impossible of organisation. Still it ought to have representation, and that without having to ally itself with the trade. The only way to preserve the rights of that middle party is to prescribe that a certain percentage of the electors must vote for prohibition before it can be carried. I have seen a good deal of the evils of drink. Recently I was in Canada and America, and if Mr. Kirwan were here he would corroborate what I am about to say. If you take away the use of alcoholic drinks from the people you will probably set up another abuse as is the case in America to-day. In America prohibition was brought about largely by the efforts of what is known as the Hearst group of papers, some 40 publications controlled by Hearst, a prominent public man in America. I was in America 16 months after prohibition came into operation, and I found that that same group of papers was urging the establishment of hospitals away from the mainland in order that the drug addicts, as they called them, might be cured. You could buy good liquor there if you were prepared to pay the price and you knew how to go about it. You could get afternoon tea with a stick in it if you were prepared to pay, and you could also get "Moonshine," again if you were prepared to pay. But this is not what I would advise anyone to take. It was also possible to get drugs in all forms and the people were taking drugs as a substitute for alcohol. I went with a lady reporter of the San Francisco "Examiner" to a dance hall to see what was happening there and the young people who were there were mostly indulging in drugs. I went to other places, too, and saw the evil effects of drugs. We have not had time to note the full effects of prohibition in America. Of course it may come out all right, but at the present time it is evident that drugs are taking the place of alcohol.

The CHAIRMAN: Does the hon. member intend to connect his remarks with the amendment?

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: Before we have prohibition we must have a substantial majority to carry it because of the effects that may be brought about by its introduction. I will not pursue the matter further except to say that if prohibition is carried, I hope it will be carried by such a substantial majority that we shall not require to attempt to make a change for some years. That is why I propose to vote not only for three-fifths, but that at least 30 per cent. of the electors shall vote for prohibition coming into operation. Then we shall have some stability, and if it is desired to reverse the policy, there must be a 30 per cent. vote of the people in favour of the change as well as the three-fifths majority.

Hon. J. A. GREIG: As America has been quoted, let us take one place where prohibition was carried by a majority of 3,000 and where,

two years later, the majority was 12,000. The other day it was shown by the cabled figures that prohibition had lost. The second figures however, showed a big gain, and the next figures showed a majority of two to one. But I take no notice of the newspaper figures. I want to see the official figures. Take Kansas, which had a majority of 7,000 on the first prohibition poll and where the last vote increased the majority by 424,000. Whatever Mr. Lovekin may say about the result of prohibition in America, the people there appear to be quite satisfied with it, and they increase their majorities on every occasion.

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: You know where the majorities come from.

Hon. J. A. GREIG: From the people whom the hon. member is not prepared to trust. Suppose 29 per cent. voted in favour of prohibition and 20 per cent. voted against it, prohibition would not be carried, because a vote of 50 per cent. had not been recorded.

Hon. A. BURVILL: If we pass the amendment it will amount to putting a premium on indolence.

Hon. G. W. MILES: I was surprised to hear the Minister's reasons for opposing the amendment, seeing that the Government introduced it in another place. The Government have evidently changed their minds since they introduced the Bill a month ago. All we ask is that a 50 per cent. poll shall be taken.

Hon. J. A. Greig: What percentage would stop it?

Hon. G. W. MILES: If we are going to bring about a reform of this kind, the least we can expect is to follow on the lines I suggest in the amendment. If we get down to a 30 per cent. poll, we could have 18 per cent. of the people saying to the rest of the community, "You shall have no more liquor." The same thing applies if we get down to 20 per cent. or 18 per cent. polls. In the last mentioned case seven-elevenths would have their way.

Hon. J. Cornell: It will not be in our time. Let posterity look after itself!

Hon. G. W. MILES: It is not a question of posterity; it is a question of what is a fair thing in the number of people who are to decide such a question.

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: Mr. Greig stressed the point of what has happened in America. The vote for prohibition in America, as in Norway, was almost wholly from the rural population. Those people do not want liquor because they themselves make it. Dr. Brown informed me that in California before prohibition was introduced, there were 200 breweries. Since prohibition the public breweries have been closed, but there are about 200,000 private home breweries. Whereas the public breweries turned out beer on a basis of 9 per cent. of alcohol, the home breweries could not make beer with a strength of less than 14 per cent. alcohol. In those parts where the people did not make beer, they secured beer from the other parts of the country, in exchange for chickens, eggs and so forth. Those are the people who want prohibition. The towns do not vote pro-

hibition. In Norway, it was the same. Christiania was not in favour of prohibition, but the rural districts were all for prohibition, because the people there were able to make their own alcohol. There are many paper mills about the country and after the paper is turned out, a crude alcohol is procured from the chemical wash. With this alcohol, beer is produced. These are the two prohibitionist countries at present to which so much attention is drawn. I walked down the principal street of Christiania at between 10 and 11 o'clock at night when the sun was shining brightly and lying about the grass in the middle of the street were numbers of people stupefied by the liquor they had made for themselves. The liquor is sold in many guises. Even in the milk shops they cater for the taste of the people by selling packets of dry yeast which can be put into skimmed milk. They sell a lot of that commodity there. That is the result of prohibition so far. I do not know what will be the effect in a generation or two after the craving has worn off, but the fact remains that at the present time the result in America and Norway is what I have described. I want to see a substantial majority before we change our methods, because it may be found out later that the schemes followed in America and Norway are wrong and we will be simply making the same mistakes.

Hon. J. CORNELL: Mr. Miles put it clearly when he said that, shorn of all verbiage, the proviso means that 50 per cent. of the electors must go to the poll to vote for prohibition.

The Minister for Education: It does not mean anything of the sort.

Hon. J. CORNELL: That is the meaning. We have already decided that the vote must be by a three-fifths majority of the people. One of the factors influencing my vote was the bigness of the subject and the fundamental changes it will work. It cannot be suggested that the position regarding the election of members of Parliament is analogous. If we are to follow the proposals to a logical conclusion, we must provide for compulsory voting. It would be more logical to say that it should be compulsory for every elector to present himself at the poll because, as a matter of fact, we cannot compel the elector to vote. Mr. Greig and Mr. Lovekin have referred to the experiences of America. I do not look at what has happened in other countries to decide what we should do in Australia. After all, drinking is a question of psychology, and the psychology of the American is not the psychology of the Australian or the Britisher. If we did what America did in the war, in all probability we would have Fritz's läger forced down our throats now. We should decide this question for ourselves.

Hon. J. A. GREIG: Despite what Mr. Miles says, it will require a 50 per cent. vote, with 30 per cent. for and 20 per cent. against prohibition, because it cannot be carried except with a three-fifths majority.

Hon. G. W. Miles: You said that if the people stayed away, they would prevent the carrying of prohibition.

Hon. J. A. GREIG: If the people against prohibition stayed away, they would not get the necessary percentage.

Hon. H. Stewart: That does not follow, under the provisions of the Bill.

Hon. J. A. GREIG: Mr. Lovekin put up the finest speech in favour of prohibition that I ever heard, particularly when he talked about the drugs used in America and Norway. If it is necessary for people to have the drugs he has referred to, as the result of this trade, it provides the strongest argument in favour of prohibition.

Hon. A. Lovekin: Is not beer better than morphine?

Hon. J. A. GREIG: We should not place any obstacles in the way of the people if they wish to decide in favour of prohibition.

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

Ayes	10
Noes	10
					—
A tie	0
					—

AYES.

Hon. R. G. Ardagh
Hon. J. Duffell
Hon. E. H. Harris
Hon. J. W. Hickey
Hon. G. W. Miles
Hon. G. Potter

Hon. E. Rose
Hon. F. E. S. Willmott
Hon. Sir E. H. Wittenoom
Hon. V. Hamersley
(Teller.)

NOES.

Hon. A. Burvill
Hon. H. P. Colebatch
Hon. J. Cornell
Hon. J. A. Greig
Hon. J. Mills
Hon. J. Nicholson

Hon. A. J. H. Saw
Hon. H. Seddon
Hon. H. Stewart
Hon. J. M. Macfarlane
(Teller.)

Pairs—Ayes: Hon. A. Lovekin and Hon. R. J. Lynn. Noes: Hon. J. J. Holmes and Hon. J. E. Dodd.

The CHAIRMAN: I give my vote with the ayes.

Amendment thus passed.

Hon. J. CORNELL: Can I move to amend the clause?

The CHAIRMAN: No; you can only move to add to it.

Hon. J. CORNELL: Cannot I move to strike out certain words in the amendment just agreed to?

The CHAIRMAN: No. The hon. member may vote against the clause.

Hon. J. CORNELL: I do not wish to do that. I shall have to move my amendment on recomittal.

Clause, as amended, agreed to.

Clause 59—Effect of prohibition:

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: I move an amendment—

That in line 5 of Subclause 2 the words "in the district" be struck out.

Those words are only applicable where the prohibition poll is taken by the district.

Amendment put and passed.

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: I move an amendment—

That in the proviso the words "or industrial" be struck out and the words "industrial or any other" be inserted.

There may be other purposes for which alcohol is required. As it is permissible for the Government to make regulations we should give as wide a scope as possible.

Hon. H. Stewart: You are so fond of regulations!

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: I am not, but when regulations are necessary, there should be scope to make them.

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: The effect of the amendment would be to enable the Government by regulation to entirely set aside the prohibition vote.

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: That is not intended. Alcohol can be cheaply produced, and may be required for driving motor cars. Sweden last year exported 10,000,000 gallons of alcohol distilled from the refuse of paper plants. This is used to drive motor cars and other things.

The Minister for Education: Is not that an industrial purpose?

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: Would you call my motor car an industrial purpose?

Hon. J. Nicholson: Add the words "or mechanical purpose."

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: If the Government undermined prohibition by way of regulation, they would soon be called to account.

Hon. A. J. H. SAW: Mr. Lovekin proposes to cast a wide net and has advanced no reason for it. Surely "industrial" is sufficient?

Hon. A. Lovekin: Would it cover your motor car?

Hon. A. J. H. SAW: I have no doubt that it would.

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

Clause 60—Effect of Resolution B if carried:

Hon. E. H. HARRIS: Clause 59 provides that if the proposal for prohibition is carried, it shall come into force at the expiration of the year in which the vote is taken. The same should apply in this instance. I move an amendment—

That the following words be added: "at the expiration of the year in which the vote is taken."

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

(Clauses 61 to 65—agreed to.

Clause 66—No compensation:

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: I move an amendment—

That the following proviso be added: "Provided that if any funds are remaining to the credit of the compensation fund they may be applied for the purposes of compensation as the board may determine."

Licencees will have to pay the 2 per cent. towards compensation. It will be their money and, so long as a reduction is being made, their money will go to pay compensation. The moment prohibition is carried, according to the clause as printed, no compensation whatever will be paid, and the money which these lessees will have subscribed will be practically forfeited to the Government. That would be most unfair.

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: I am opposed to the amendment. The Act of 1911 set out that the compensation would be given in time, that is in the 10 years. The only excuse which can be set up for compensation now is that we propose to close houses in a different way to that contemplated in the 1911 Act. Under that Act no poll could be taken on the question of either prohibition or reduction. There could be no reduction for 10 years; that was the compensation. It was clearly set out that at the end of 10 years any licences taken away as a result of local option should obtain no compensation. It is said that the compensation is provided by the trade. I do not attach much importance to that. The provision of the 2 per cent. was undoubtedly made an excuse for cutting down the license fee to 5 per cent. If the trade provides the compensation we may be sure that it will come out of the pockets of the people.

Hon. G. W. Miles: There is a limit to the profits that can be made.

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: I begin to wonder if there is a limit, when we find that a bottle of whisky contains 23 nobblers, and in some cases each nobbler is sold for 1s. Mr. Lovekin now wants to provide compensation in the case of hotels that are closed by the will of the people.

Hon. J. DUFFELL: The amendment applies only after prohibition has been carried. There may be certain moneys left in hand and these will be held by the Government. When prohibition is carried the Government will be holding these funds. I am sure the Leader of the House would not agree to the confiscation of such moneys, which would have been provided by the trade for a special purpose. The money belongs to those who supplied it.

Hon. J. CORNELL: Those hotels which were closed as the result of local option received no compensation. This Bill introduces another principle, one of closing hotels by means of a board, and of compensation being paid by the trade. When the people vote prohibition and the hotels are closed, if there is any money left in the compensation fund, it should be returned to those who contributed

it. If the Government retained it, that would be an act of piracy.

Hon. A. J. H. SAW: I regard this amendment as the thin edge of the wedge in the direction of compensation following upon prohibition. It seems to me that the temperance people have been jockeyed out of their rights under local option by this Bill. It was understood that no compensation would be paid in the case of any houses closed under local option, and if the will of the people is that the liquor trade shall cease no compensation whatever should be paid.

Hon. V. HAMERSLEY: This compensation fund will be contributed by the trade. It would amount to confiscation for that money to be devoted to any other purpose. If it is not required for compensation purposes, it should be returned to those who gave it.

Hon. H. STEWART: I agree with the remarks of Dr. Saw. The anti-liquor people are being jockeyed out of their rights, and I am afraid, when this Bill becomes law, they will find it different from what they expected. There are no limits to which those supporting the trade will go in the requests they make. If prohibition were carried and there was a balance left over from the compensation fund, it would be held in trust against the time when the vote was reversed. The present Government at all events would not utilise it. I am opposed to the amendment.

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: I have no intention of introducing the thin edge of the wedge, as suggested. I only want justice between the people concerned. If a sum of say, £20,000, is in hand when prohibition is carried, I want it to be left to the discretion of the licenses reduction board to divide it between those houses that have been closed as a result of prohibition. If the houses had been closed by the licenses reduction board they would have participated in the compensation fund in any case. The clause can be tightened up on recommitment so as to prevent any suggestion of the thin edge of the wedge as to compensation.

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: Mr. Lovekin has absolutely mistaken the case when he says the money will be confiscated by the Crown. Nothing of the sort can occur. The Act contemplates that after prohibition has been carried, a contrary vote may be carried and licenses re-issued. The vote would then operate to reduce licenses. Except by an Act of Parliament, the money could be applied to no other purpose than that of compensation. I can conceive that if prohibition were carried, and if money were in the trust fund, it might be considered after a time that it was unnecessary for the money to remain in the trust; but the money could only be taken out of the trust by an Act of Parliament.

Hon. G. W. MILES: The Minister for Education said previously that this provision had been used as an argument for reducing the tax payable to the Government to 5 per cent. Mr. Lovekin's amendment is that the money will belong to the people who contri-

buted it. Dr. Saw puts up the argument that in 1911 it was understood that no compensation would be paid to the trade by the Government. The fund in view is money contributed by the licensees. I hope the Committee will support Mr. Lovekin's amendment.

Hon. J. A. GREIG: Under the Bill the Government are to collect the 2 per cent. Why cannot the trade collect it themselves and distribute it themselves? The publicans say their section is like other sections of the community—there are too many scabs in it who will not pay. I should like to see the money contributed to charity, by way of consolation, if prohibition eventuates.

Hon. H. SEDDON: A point lost sight of is that the money will be collected from year to year. If prohibition were carried this year, it would not come into force until next year. The board would have available only the money collected in the preceding year.

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: There is a good deal to be said in favour of Mr. Lovekin's amendment, seeing that Clause 54 directs that in order to provide for the payment of the compensation which may be granted by the board, a trust fund to be called "The Compensation Fund" shall be formed in the Treasury. The clause further provides what is to be done with the fund during the operation of this part of the Act; but there is nothing said as to what shall be done with the trust fund when the trust comes to an end. It is implied that the money shall be held for the purpose of compensation under the measure. If prohibition comes, and there are no further claims for compensation, obviously it is only fair that the trust fund should revert to those who contributed it. Some re-casting of Mr. Lovekin's amendment may be necessary.

Hon. A. Lovekin: Yes.

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: I shall be prepared to support the proviso in a slightly altered form.

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

Ayes	15
Noes	5
Majority for				10

AYES.

Hon. R. G. Ardagh	Hon. J. M. Macfarlane
Hon. C. F. Baxter	Hon. J. Mills
Hon. J. Cornell	Hon. J. Nicholson
Hon. J. Duffell	Hon. G. Potter
Hon. J. A. Greig	Hon. E. Rose
Hon. V. Hamersley	Hon. F. E. S. Willmott
Hon. E. H. Harris	Hon. J. W. Hickey
Hon. A. Lovekin	(Teller.)

NOES.

Hon. A. Burvill	Hon. H. Stewart
Hon. H. P. Colebatch	Hon. A. J. H. Saw
Hon. H. Seddon	(Teller.)

Amendment thus passed.

Clause, as amended, agreed to.

Clause 67—"Poll not to be taken on a day fixed for a Parliamentary election":

Hon. H. STEWART: I move an amendment.—

That "no" be struck out and "the" inserted in lieu.

The effect will be to take the poll on a day when there is an election for the Assembly or for the Council. If this amendment is carried, I shall move that the words "or Commonwealth Parliament" be struck out. What I propose will save duplication of work, and will ensure a free expression of opinion and a good poll.

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: The amendment is not altogether consistent with the decision of the Committee on a previous clause, providing for five-year periods, whereas our Assembly elections are triennial.

Hon. H. STEWART: That matter can be adjusted if the amendment in principle appeals to the House. We could provide that the poll under this Bill, if occurring in the same year as the Assembly or Council election, shall be taken on the day of such election. There is an Assembly election every three years, and a Council election every two years. Moreover, we might amend the clause so as to make it permissive instead of mandatory. At all events, the amendment is sufficient to test the Committee on the principle involved.

Hon. V. HAMERSLEY: I hope the amendment will not be agreed to. We have had experience of this in the past. We do not want these questions mixed up with Parliamentary elections and clouding more important issues.

Hon. J. CORNELL: I came here this afternoon with an open mind on this question. However, since the Committee has been so anxious, not only for the three-fifths majority, but also for a poll of 30 per cent. before prohibition can be carried, I think we might well hold the poll on a day when there will be no need to worry about getting a satisfactory roll up of the electors.

Hon. J. A. GREIG: In the interests of economy, I support the amendment. I do not fear the question of prohibition clouding the issues at an election. The only question concerning liquor which will be put to the candidates is, "Are you in favour of a three-fifths majority for prohibition?" The prohibition issue itself will not be intruded into an election.

Hon. H. SEDDON: I support the amendment. I have gained the impression that fairness is being overlooked in favour of certain interests. The clause as it stands, will work for the liquor interests. Every candidate will be asked his attitude towards prohibition. To-day, if a man is known to be against the liquor trade, all sorts of obstacles are devised to keep him out of Parliament. In this respect I can quote my own experience. We are likely to get a much better poll on election day than on any other day. Not only will the amendment result in

economy, but it will bring about a better expression of the will of the people, and there will be no quibble as to whether the proposal was carried on a snatch vote.

Hon. A. J. H. SAW: I will oppose the amendment. Not only am I in favour of an intelligent vote on prohibition, but I am in favour, also, of an intelligent vote on every issue at the Parliamentary elections. If the poll be held on election day, it will overshadow all other issues before the electors, for the whole community will be agitated by speakers on prohibition. To the liquor trade and to the extreme temperance party I say, "a plague on both your houses on election day."

Hon. H. STEWART: Mr. Hamersley said the poll would overshadow more important matters considered at the election. Judging from the way in which the liquor trade is protected and bolstered up, apparently there can be no question of greater importance to the well being of the State than this question of prohibition. Therefore, in the opinion of many it will not be overshadowing more important electoral questions.

Hon. E. H. HARRIS: I will vote against the amendment because I believe it would be better in the interests of clean politics if Parliamentary elections were kept free from all liquor questions. Also, if the poll were to be decided on election day, the respective parties would use the whole of their influence and finance to sway the elections, which would thus be fought on the liquor issue, and not on the merits of the respective candidates.

[Hon. Sir Edward Wittenoom took the Chair.]

Hon. H. STEWART: If the poll be held on election day, all that the people need do is vote on the question of prohibition. I do not think it can possibly be made an issue at the elections.

Hon. C. F. BAXTER: There are other measures that are equally, if not more, important. Is not the financial position just as important? Some members do not realise how important these matters are, and if this issue were brought up at election time, the election would be fought on it, and that only.

Hon. J. MILLS: I support the amendment. I give credit to the electors for having sufficient intelligence to dissociate the question of prohibition from their politics. It would be a very serious matter financially to hold an election just to find out the feeling of the people on this question. I suppose such an election would run into an expenditure of £50,000, and in order to avoid that I shall vote for the amendment.

Hon. F. E. S. WILLMOTT: I am going to vote against the amendment. If we have this tacked on to an election, what next may we expect? Perhaps the length of ladies' skirts or any other such question that a crank may like to bring up. I lived for years in London amongst cranks who, on every possible occasion, called on others to listen to the result of the workings of their brains.

Hon. J. Nicholson: And is this the outcome of it?

Hon. F. E. S. WILLMOTT: If we are not careful we shall be in the same position as Switzerland, where everything must go to a referendum. Having discovered the futility of referendums, they held a referendum in order to get rid of the referendums and they failed even there.

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

Ayes	6
Noes	14

Majority against .. 8

AYES.

Hon. J. Cornell	Hon. H. Seddon
Hon. J. A. Greig	Hon. H. Stewart
Hon. J. Mills	Hon. A. Burvill

(Teller.)

NOES.

Hon. R. G. Ardagh	Hon. A. Lovekin
Hon. C. F. Baxter	Hon. J. M. Macfarlane
Hon. G. W. Miles	Hon. G. W. Miles
Hon. H. P. Colebatch	Hon. J. Nicholson
Hon. V. Hammersley	Hon. E. Rose
Hon. E. H. Harris	Hon. F. E. S. Willmott
Hon. J. W. Hickey	Hon. J. Duffell

(Teller.)

Amendment thus negatived.

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: I move an amendment—

After “or” in line 4 the words “either House of the” be inserted.

The clause provides that the poll is not to be taken on the day fixed for the election of members of the Legislative Council or the Legislative Assembly or the Commonwealth Parliament. There may be an election for the House of Representatives or the Senate. Therefore the amendment will make it more clear.

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

Clause 68—agreed to.

Clause 69—Amendment of Section 93:

Hon. H. SEDDON: I move an amendment—

That the following words be added:—
“the said section is further amended by inserting at the commencement thereof the following words:— ‘The owner of any licensed premises and the secretary of any registered club shall deposit with the clerk of the Licensing Court a plan of the licensed premises or the club premises, as the case may be, prepared to the satisfaction of the court; and,’ and by inserting after the word ‘licensed premises,’ in line 2, the words ‘or club premises.’”

At the present time, there is no provision made in the Bill for lodging plans for building or structural alterations. It is necessary that some such provision should be made.

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: There is no necessity for the amendment. The licensing court can obtain plans for buildings or alterations, before permission is given for the work.

Hon. H. SEDDON: No provision is made for this in the Bill and it is certainly desirable that it should be made.

Amendment put and negatived.

Clause put and passed.

Clause 70—Amendment of Section 94:

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: I move an amendment—

That in paragraph (a), “Penalty: £50 are substituted for” be struck out, and after “£20” the words “are omitted” be inserted.

The amendment provides for a penalty of £50 being substituted for one of £20. I consider the penalty should be £50 for the offence dealt with in Section 94 as well as for the other offence set out in Subclause 3.

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: The effect of the amendment would be to increase the penalty for the offence referred to in Subclause 3 from £20 to £50. The Bill proposes that for offences against Section 94, which relates to licensees refusing entertainment, or to receive any person as a guest, a penalty of £50 shall be provided. The Bill sets up a new offence which is regarded as of lesser importance than the offence covered by Section 94, hence the provision for a penalty of £20. Mr. Lovekin proposes to increase that penalty for £50. Subclause 3 deals with the case of a licensee who fails to provide meals at the prescribed rate.

Hon. G. W. MILES: While I quite agree to the penalty of £50 in the first case, are we in order in increasing a penalty in this Chamber?

The CHAIRMAN: I think we are in order in increasing penalties.

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: In view of the Minister's remarks, I ask leave to withdraw my amendment.

Amendment by leave withdrawn.

Clause put and passed.

Clause 71—Amendment of Section 97:

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: Why is provision made for goldfields districts and not for coalfields districts?

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: The clause provides that in fixing the hours for closing hotels, we shall preserve the existing times which are, on the goldfields, 11 p.m., and on the coalfields, 9 p.m.

Hon. H. STEWART: I move an amendment—

That in line 12 of Subclause 1, the words “And not less than £50” be added.

The amendment follows the lines already adopted in the Bill, for Clause 80 provides that the penalty for supplying liquor under a false description shall be: For a first

offence, £20, and for any subsequent offence, £50 and not less than £20. Where offences are regarded as serious enough to involve the liability to forfeit a license, it is only reasonable to provide that for a second breach of the Act the penalty shall not be less than the maximum for the first offence.

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: We have already doubled the minimum penalty which for a second offence will be £20. I think that is going quite far enough.

Hon. H. STEWART: For a second offence of so serious a nature, the maximum for a first offence should be the minimum for the second offence.

Amendment put and negatived.

Hon. J. CORNELL: Regarding the opening and closing hours for hotels on the goldfields, the Royal Commission blew in and blew out. There was not a goldfields man on it or anyone who had lived on the fields for any length of time. Some provision should be made to enable men going on and coming off the arduous work in the mines and under such climatic conditions to get a drink. The only shift which will participate under this proposal is the day shift. There is no chance for the men who come off at midnight or at 8 a.m. to get a drink. If ever I felt like a drink, it was when I came off work at 8 a.m., with the thermometer at 115. Owing to the housing conditions on the goldfields, there is only one way to get sleep in the summer time, and that is to take more liquor than one should do.

The Minister for Education: We do not intend to alter the Act to enable men to do that.

Hon. J. CORNELL: I have heard no argument why the goldfields hotels should not open before 9 a.m. or why they should close at 11 p.m. I think they should be permitted to open at 8.30 and close at 12.30 a.m. This would only be giving the working miners the consideration which has always been extended to them.

Hon. A. Lovekin: A newspaper man has to work at night.

Hon. J. CORNELL: I move an amendment—

That in line 7 of Subclause 2 the word "nine" be struck out with a view to inserting "eight thirty."

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

Ayes	9
Noes	11

Majority against .. 2

AYES.

Hon. R. G. Ardagh	Hon. A. Lovekin
Hon. J. Cornell	Hon. J. M. Macfarlane
Hon. G. W. Miles	Hon. J. Mills
Hon. E. H. Harrie	Hon. J. A. Greig
Hon. J. W. Hickey	(Teller.)

NOES.

Hon. C. F. Baxter	Hon. A. J. H. Saw
Hon. A. Burvill	Hon. H. Seddon
Hon. H. P. Colebatch	Hon. H. Stewart
Hon. J. Duffell	Hon. F. E. S. Willmott
Hon. V. Hamersley	Hon. J. Nicholson
Hon. E. Rose	(Teller.)

Amendment thus negatived.

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: This Bill when introduced made no provision for the bona fide traveller, but in the Legislative Assembly Clause 75 was inserted which defined a bona fide traveller. Having defined him, however, the Assembly did not give him the privilege of having a drink. I think it was intended that he should be allowed to get a drink on Sunday. In order to give effect to the amendment of the Legislative Assembly, I move an amendment

That after "bona fide" in line 2 of Subclause 3 the words "traveller or" be inserted.

Hon. A. J. H. SAW: I have an amendment on the Notice Paper to restrict the activities of the bona fide traveller to a certain extent, but I gave notice of that thinking the bona fide traveller was already provided for. Inasmuch as he is not provided for, I intend to oppose the amendment. Under the present Act the bona fide traveller is the greatest menace to temperance and to the observance of the law.

Hon. F. E. S. Willmott: The true bona fide?

Hon. A. J. H. SAW: The class termed bona fide under the definition in the existing Act. Whether a man should be entitled to get liquor in a hotel on Sunday is open to argument, but as the Bill provides that a man shall not get liquor within an area of 20 miles of the Perth Town Hall, I do not see why a man in other part of the State should get liquor on Sunday. The reason why hotels are closed on the Sabbath is to prevent that day from becoming a day of debauchery instead of a day of rest. So long as the opinion of the community is that the Sabbath should be respected as a day of rest and should not be given over to debauchery, so long shall I support the strict closing of hotels on that day.

Hon. J. Cornell: What about men working on that day?

Hon. A. J. H. SAW: They can get drink in their own homes if they want it.

Hon. J. Cornell: If they are rich enough.

Hon. A. J. H. SAW: It is all nonsense to suggest that a man cannot have liquor in his own home if he wants it. So long as we allow a traveller to obtain liquor, so long will the system lend itself to abuse. I do not often go into a metropolitan hotel on Sunday, but I am informed that the law is fairly strictly observed and that the police are active to prevent illicit trade in the metropolitan area on that day. That does not prevail in the country districts. I venture to say there is no day in the week when the bars in country hotels are more full than they are on Sunday.

Hon. C. F. Baxter: What part of the country?

Hon. A. J. H. SAW: In every part of the country that I have been in, and I have stayed in many of the towns of the State. The bona fide provision in the Act is the greatest promoter of infringements of the law. For that reason I would welcome the abolition of the bona fide traveller clause in this Bill. There is no reason why a man who can travel for half an hour in a motor car should be able to get all the drink he wants on a Sunday.

Hon. J. W. HICKEY: Although the bona fide traveller clause may be abused in some places, I should like to see provision made for those people who travel long distances on Sunday being able to get refreshments when they reach a town; or return to the town they have left early in the morning. I hardly think Dr. Saw knows as much about the back country of this State as he professes to do. The licensing laws are very stringently observed in the country, and the police are very strict about their observance.

Hon. J. MILLS: Dr. Saw is under a misapprehension. In those cases in the country districts where drinking is done on Sundays it is done by people who deliberately break the law, and not by bona fide travellers. A traveller in the country should be able to obtain refreshments on a Sunday, but drinking under cover of this clause should be prohibited.

Amendment put and passed.

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: I move an amendment:

That the following words be added to Subclause 5 "Or in any other district which may be proclaimed a goldfield."

Hon. E. Stewart: There are already goldfields in the State that have not been proclaimed.

The Minister for Education: I do not see the necessity for the amendment.

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: I will withdraw it.

Amendment by leave withdrawn.

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: I move an amendment—

That the following subclause be added:—"Notwithstanding anything contained in this section or the next following section to the contrary, a licensee shall be entitled during the hours when his premises are closed for the sale of liquor, to keep the same open for and to conduct thereon an eating house: provided that this subsection shall not apply to any bar room on his licensed premises or modify or affect the provisions of Subsections 1 and 2 of this section or Subsection 1 of Section 98, or the provisions of Sections 99 and 103 of this Act.

This subclause is taken from Clause 73, to which it does not belong. I am now moving that it should be placed in its proper position, as amended in accordance with my amendment on the Notice Paper.

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

Clause 72—Amendment of Section 98:

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: I move a consequential amendment—

That after "bona fide," in line 6, "traveller" be inserted.

Amendment put and passed.

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: In proposed Subsection 4 "boarder" is described as "a person who habitually from day to day obtains his meals on the licensed premises." In that connection "from day to day" means "every day." I move an amendment—

That in proposed Subsection 4 "from day to day" be struck out.

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: I think "habitually" needs some interpretation. "From day to day" would not mean every day. "Habitually" might mean every Sunday—coming in every Sunday to get a meal because one can then get a drink.

Amendment put and negatived.

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: I notice that proposed Subsection 4 makes the hours during which boarders at an hotel can obtain drink with meals from 12 to 2 in the afternoon and from 6 to 8 in the evening. In the case of clubs, under Clause 117, the hours in the evening are from 6 to 9. Why the difference?

The Minister for Education: This only refers to Sundays.

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: So does Clause 117.

Clause, as amended, put and passed.

Clause 73—Register of lodgers:

Hon. E. H. HARRIS: Proposed Subsection 1 provides for the keeping of a book to be called "the register of lodgers." The word "traveller," it is to be noted, has been inserted in Clause 71. I now move an amendment—

That in proposed Subsection 1, after "book" there be inserted "in the form prescribed."

Later I shall move that "and travellers" be added to this proposed subsection. The object is to provide power to the police to prescribe the form in which the register of lodgers and travellers shall be kept.

Amendment put and passed.

Hon. E. H. HARRIS: I move a further amendment—

That "and travellers" be added to proposed Subsection 1.

Hon. J. A. GREIG: Though personally I would like to see it provided that the lodger should sign his name himself, instead of the licensee merely entering it, I do not think the licensee should have to enter in the book the name of every traveller who simply comes in for a drink.

Amendment put and negatived.

Hon. E. H. HARRIS: I move an amendment—

That in proposed Subsection 2 after "book," in line 1, there be inserted "every bona fide lodger shall sign his name and" The object is to prevent manipulation of signatures. People staying at an hotel are entitled to certain privileges. In the Eastern States there are certain hotels at which one may call on a Sunday, and immediately upon getting inside the door one tenders half-a-crown and receives a key, which, one learns, is the key to one's room. Upon leaving the hotel one hands back the key and gets back one's half-crown. The same thing could be done here under this Bill.

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: I see no objection to the amendment, but it would read much better if inserted at the end of the clause.

Hon. E. H. HARRIS: I ask leave to withdraw my amendment.

Amendment by leave withdrawn.

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: I now move an amendment—

That the following be added to proposed Subsection 2:—"and the book shall be signed by such lodger."

Amendment put and passed.

Hon. J. CORNELL: Subclause 5 is very drastic, inasmuch as it provides that if a person is found on licensed premises after closing time, which is 9 o'clock in the metropolitan area, a prima facie case is made out against him unless his name is in the lodgers' book.

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: It is not evidence of his having done anything wrong. It is only prima facie evidence of his not being a lodger. It applies to nothing but the question of being a lodger. I move an amendment—

That proposed Subsection 7 be struck out.

Amendment put and passed.

Hon. E. H. HARRIS: In respect of paragraph (d), should not the word "authorised" be inserted before "person"? Why should a licensee produce his register for any person who may ask to see it?

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: I do not know why we have these words "any person." If the hon. member will leave it, I will endeavour to find out.

Clause, as amended, put and passed.

Clause 74—agreed to.

Clause 75—Repeal of Section 100:

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: I desire to amend the clause, but not with a view to any alteration in the principle laid down, which is that no liquor shall be served to bona fide travellers within 20 miles of the Perth Town Hill, and that outside the 20-mile limit no liquor shall be served except to

persons who have travelled 10 miles. I move an amendment—

That in paragraph (a) all words after "within" be struck out.

If that be carried I will move to insert the words "an area bounded by a circle having a radius of 20 miles from the Town Hill, Perth." The paragraph as it stands enumerates a lot of licensing districts within which no liquor shall be supplied. The amendment will simplify the clause.

Hon. J. DUFFELL: Suppose a person travels into the city from a point 20 miles beyond the Perth Town Hill. Will he be able to get a drink?

The Minister of Education: Only at a lodging place, with a meal; not as a bona fide traveller.

Hon. J. DUFFELL: It is not quite fair.

Hon. E. H. HARRIS: It is decentralisation.

Hon. J. DUFFELL: A traveller coming into Perth will not be able to get a drink, although he may have come 30 miles. He should be able to get refreshment on his arrival. If it be fair one way it is fair the other.

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: I keenly desire to do away with the bona fide traveller provision altogether. However, when the Bill was passed by the Assembly in its present form, doing away with the bona fide traveller within 20 miles of the Perth Town Hill and, in respect of places beyond that limit, extending the prescribed distance to 10 miles, I recognised in it a substantial reform.

Amendment put and passed.

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: I now move—

That the following be inserted, "An area bounded by a circle having a radius of 20 miles from the Town Hill, Perth."

Hon. F. A. BAGLIN: I move an amendment on the amendment—

That "20" be struck out and "15" inserted in lieu.

I agree with the desire that the metropolitan area and thickly populated localities shall be dry on Sundays. However, for that purpose a 15-mile radius would serve as well as one of 20 miles. There are just outside the 15-mile radius hotels which cater for the travelling public, notwithstanding which, under the amendment, the travelling public will be forced to go to the full 20 miles. Moreover, in point of fact, having passed the 15-mile radius, those requiring a drink will have to go 30 or 40 miles before they can get it. It may suit motorists to go 20 miles, but what about the man with the horse and sulky?

Amendment on the amendment put and negatived.

Amendment put and passed.

Hon. H. SEDDON: I move an amendment—

That after "Perth" the word "Freemantle" be inserted.

Amendment put and negatived.

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: I move an amendment—

That in paragraph (a) all the words after "within" in line 2 be struck out, and the following be inserted in lieu: "elsewhere than within an area bounded by a circle having a radius of 20 miles from the Town Hall in Perth."

Amendment put and passed.

Hon. A. J. H. SAW: I move an amendment—

That in line 3 of paragraph (b) "ten" be struck out and "fifty" inserted in lieu. As the clause now stands it will be possible to get a drink in the metropolitan area within a radius of 20 miles. The clause provides that any person can travel 10 miles from, say, Bunbury, or any other provincial town, and be entitled to obtain refreshments. The amendment will help to make the *bona fide* traveller the genuine article.

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

Ayes	6
Noes	13
					—
Majority against ..					7
					—

AYES.

Hon. A. Burvill	Hon. H. Seddon
Hon. J. A. Greig	Hon. H. Stewart
Hon. J. W. Hickey	Hon. A. J. H. Saw (Teller.)

NOES.

Hon. F. A. Baglin	Hon. J. M. Macfarlane
Hon. H. P. Colebatch	Hon. G. W. Miles
Hon. J. Cornell	Hon. J. Mills
Hon. J. Duffell	Hon. J. Nicholson
Hon. V. Hamersley	Hon. F. E. S. Willmott
Hon. E. H. Harris	Hon. E. Rose
Hon. A. Lovekin	(Teller.)

Amendment thus negatived.

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: I move an amendment—

That the proviso be struck out.

The proviso has now no meaning and must therefore be deleted.

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

Clause 76—Amendment of Section 101:

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: This clause is no longer necessary.

Clause put and negatived.

Progress reported.

House adjourned at 10.56 p.m.

Legislative Assembly,

Tuesday, 21st November, 1922.

	Page
Swearing-in of new Member	1665
Questions: Geraldton Harbour Works	1665
Bruce Rock Water Supply	1665
Immigration Return	1665
Auditor General's report	1666
Motion: Government business precedence	1666
Bills: Electoral Districts, 1A.	1666
Public Education Acts Amendment, report	1666
Hospitals, 2A.	1666
Pensioners (Rates Exemption), Council's Amend-	1670
ment	1670
Land Tax and Income Tax, 2A.	1697
Land and Income Tax Assessment Amend-	1697
ment, 2A.	1697
Annual Estimates: Votes discussed—Works De-	1679
partment, Mines Department	1679

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

SWEARING-IN OF NEW MEMBER.

Mr. SPEAKER: I have received the return of the writ for the East Perth by-election. It appears from the endorsement thereon that Mr. Thomas John Hughes has been duly elected. I am prepared to swear in the hon. member.

The member for East Perth (Mr. Hughes) accordingly took and subscribed the oath, and signed the roll.

QUESTION—GERALDTON HARBOUR WORKS.

Mr. WILLCOCK asked the Minister for Works: In view of the fact that the investigation of the plans of the proposed harbour works at Geraldton has been completed for four or five months, when does he expect a decision to be arrived at in connection with the commencement of the work?

The MINISTER FOR WORKS replied: The matter is under consideration.

QUESTION—BRUCE ROCK WATER SUPPLY.

Mr. LATHAM asked the Minister for Railways: In view of the extreme shortage of water for the townsite of Bruce Rock, will the Railway Department truck water from Merredin for railway purposes so as to make available the small supply for the residents?

The MINISTER FOR RAILWAYS replied: In view of the additional cost which would be incurred, it would be opposed to economical working to haul water for railway purposes whilst water is available in the dam.

QUESTION—IMMIGRATION RETURN.

Mr. McCALLUM (without notice) asked the Premier: When will the return, for which