

# Legislative Assembly,

Tuesday, 19th December, 1922.

Electoral: Kalgoorlie Seat ...	PAGE 2252
Question: Government Institutions, Contracts for Supplies ...	2252
Bill: Busseton-Margaret River Railway Deviation, 2s., Com. report ...	2252
Dairy Industry, Council's Amendments ...	2252
Dairy Cattle Improvement, Council's Amendments ...	2255
Industries Assistance Board Continuance, 2s. Licensing Act Amendment, Council's Message, request for conference ...	2255
Dog Act Amendment, returned ...	2262
Agricultural Seeds, returned ...	2266
Agricultural Lands Purchase Amendment, 2s. Annual Estimates: Votes discussed—Other Hydraulic Undertakings ...	2266
Bill: Licensing Act Amendment, Conference with Council, Conference Manager's report ...	2268

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

## ELECTORAL—KALGOORLIE SEAT.

### Vacancy declared.

On motion by the Premier ordered: That owing to the death of Mr. John Boyland, late member for Kalgoorlie, the Kalgoorlie seat be declared vacant and the Deputy Speaker be authorised to issue a writ for the election of a new member.

## QUESTION—GOVERNMENT INSTITUTIONS.

### Contracts for Supplies.

Mr. LATHAM (for Mr. Mann) asked the Colonial Secretary: 1, What is the name of the contractor who supplies bacon to Government hospitals, asylums, and like institutions? 2, In which State was the bacon supplied grown and manufactured?

The COLONIAL SECRETARY replied: 1 and 2, These supplies are obtained on 90-days contracts. For the quarter ending 31st inst., the contractors are—Perth: Foggitt, Jones, & Co. (local); Claremont: Claremont Meat Co. (N.S.W.); Fremantle: Fremantle Providoring Co. (local). Under the new contracts operating from 1st prox., the successful tenderers are—Perth: Foggitt, Jones, & Co. (local); Claremont: Foggitt, Jones, & Co. (local); Fremantle: Currie & Murray (N.S.W.). The stipulation "local" in the conditions of contract is not specifically stated as meaning locally grown, the condition merely calling for "local or imported," and the Tender Board cannot say whether the local bacon is actually grown here or is imported in the carcase and cured here. In explanation of the two instances in which tenders for imported bacon have been accepted (see Fremantle and Claremont above), that at Claremont was accepted because no tender for local bacon came within the limit

of 10 per cent. preference to local goods. In the case of Fremantle, no tender for local bacon was received.

## BILL—BUSSETON-MARGARET RIVER RAILWAY DEVIATION.

### Second Reading.

Debate resumed from 6th December.

Mr. PICKERING (Sussex) [2.37]: Since the Minister for Works moved the second reading of the Bill, I have taken the opportunity of looking at the plan submitted by him to the House. I find that the necessity for the deviation has resulted from the development that has taken place subsequent to the original survey of the line. When it was first surveyed, the route was taken to the then terminus of Millars' timber line at the Margaret River. Since then the line has been taken up a further three miles. The position, therefore, at the present time is not as important as it was in those days. Not much objection can be raised to the deviation, if the Minister makes adequate provision for the settlers in the immediate neighbourhood of the Margaret River. It will be seen from the plan that the Margaret River townsite is in juxtaposition to the terminus of the railway as originally surveyed. In consequence of the townsite having been surveyed, a certain amount of settlement has taken place at the terminus of the railway as originally proposed. A public hall, a post office, and other conveniences have been more or less concentrated in that neighbourhood and business is done at that centre. I take it that the Minister for Works will give an assurance that a siding will be placed at a locality contiguous to the post office, agricultural hall and other public conveniences at the Margaret River.

The Minister for Works: You can rely upon it that everything possible will be done in the best interests of the State.

Mr. PICKERING: Quite so.

The Minister for Works: I do not know that what you suggest will be the best, but whatever is best will be done.

Mr. PICKERING: On receipt of that assurance from the Minister, seeing that care will be taken to conserve the existing rights of the people at that spot, I support the second reading of the Bill.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee, etc.

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

## BILL—DAIRY INDUSTRY.

### Council's Amendments.

Schedule of six amendments made by the Council now considered.

In Committee.

Mr. Angelo in the Chair; the Minister for Agriculture in charge of the Bill.

No. 1.—Clause 5, Subclause 2. Strike out the words "prescribed fee not to exceed £1," and insert "a fee of 5s.":

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: The purpose of the amendment made by another place is to delete the provision for a fee not to exceed £1 being prescribed by regulation and to substitute a fee of 5s. I move—

That the amendment be agreed to.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: The Minister might tell us the reason why he has changed his opinion on this question of fee. When last the Bill was before us he was wholly in favour of a fee of £1, whereas he now supports a fee of 5s.

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: Originally the fee fixed in the Bill was not to exceed £1. But the Government have no desire to impose a fee which will serve to obtain revenue, and therefore, I have no objection to the Council's amendment, fixing the fee at 5s.

Hon. P. COLLIER: The Council's amendment indicates an entire lack of confidence in the Government on the part of those responsible for the new idea. In effect they are not willing to allow the Government discretionary powers up to £1 in respect of the registration fee. The fee must not exceed 5s., regardless of whether it will cover the cost of registration. Surely the Government ought to have discretionary power to fix a fee up to £1.

Mr. PICKERING: I hope the Committee will agree to the amendment. These fees are all more or less nominal, the object being merely to provide sufficient money to cover the cost of the inspector's services.

Hon. P. Collier: Without the amendment the Government will be able to restrict the fee to 5s.

Mr. PICKERING: I cannot understand the desire of the Leader of the Opposition to give the Government a free hand in the fixing of fees. The amount should be merely a nominal one, sufficient to bring the dairies under control.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: If a widow with a family of small children desired to earn her livelihood by keeping a small shop she would have to pay a registration fee of 2s. 6d. How different is the treatment proposed to be meted out to a factory producing many thousand pounds worth of goods per annum!

The Minister for Agriculture: But there are thousands of shops to every dairy.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: Still there is the differential treatment of the respective classes. The Minister for Agriculture supported the fee of £1, but a few days later his colleague in another place had it reduced to 5s., possibly in view of the writing on the wall.

Mr. Pickering: What is the writing on the wall?

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: That Nationalism is dead.

Mr. Marshall: It is beginning to smell.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! There is nothing in the Bill about smells.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: Everything possible is being done to tie the hands of the Government. Hon. members forget that Parliament should control the Government.

Mr. Pickering: That is not the position.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: But it ought to be. No Government can finally make a regulation for prescribing a fee until it is approved by Parliament. It would be better to strike out altogether the reference to fees than to provide for a fee of 5s., which will not by any means cover the cost of inspection.

Hon. P. COLLIER: The Government bring down a Bill prescribing a certain fee, but when the Bill reaches another place, the Minister for Education moves an amendment upon the Government's Bill, making an alteration in the fee. This amendment was moved by the Minister in charge of the Council.

The Minister for Agriculture: No, I do not think it was.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: Yes it was.

Mr. Latham: That is right.

Hon. P. COLLIER: What has happened during the transition period between the Bill leaving here and reaching another place? Last week in this House the Premier for hours on end declared he could not afford to give up any revenue. When on the Hospitals Bill, we were not allowed to forget the Treasurer's need of money. Now, when it comes to the registration of a butter factory, something which will affect members on the cross benches, the Government are quite willing to yield, even though it may be a comparatively small sum. In many instances the 5s. will not cover the cost of the inspection of these factories. Each inspection will involve a train journey.

Mr. Latham: There are local inspectors to do the work.

Hon. P. COLLIER: But the local inspector is not likely to be living on the spot where the factory is, and so, even when carried out by the district inspector, the inspection will mean some little time and expense. Yet we are asked to say that a 5s. fee will be sufficient. In instances where the 5s. fee will be sufficient, the Government need charge no more than the 5s. Nevertheless, we ought to give the Government power to demand a fee up to £1 when circumstances justify it. Now that the dairying districts are about to enter upon an era of great prosperity, surely they will be able to pay 7s. 6d. a year if the Government so desire. Millions of pounds will be expended in these districts during the next few years—

Hon. W. C. Angwin: If the Government can get the money.

Hon. P. COLLIER: And there is no guarantee that there will be any return. Yet

when the Government ask for a small fee for services rendered, the member for Sussex (Mr. Pickering) objects. During recent weeks I thought that hon. member had displayed indications of returning confidence in the Government. He appeared to be becoming reconciled to the Government. Yet this week he has lapsed into his former attitude of revealing a total lack of confidence in the Government. I myself have not much faith in them; at any rate, my faith is not monumental, but I am prepared to trust them to the extent of 15s. a year. The Government who cannot be trusted to the extent of 15s. a year should not remain in power; yet the member for Sussex would entrust them with the expenditure of four millions of loan money this year. I have 15s. worth of confidence in the Government, but I would not be prepared to say that my faith goes much beyond that. I oppose the motion. Even small sums will help to stem the financial drift. Last week or the week before, Ministers kept us here for hours over the matter of a half-penny tax. The Colonial Secretary pleaded dire poverty on the Hospitals Bill, and would not even forego an amount of 3d. a week on the 10s. earned by a news-boy. No doubt he will continue that line of argument in the new year. After having fought so resolutely for his three-penny bit, the Minister is willing to give away 15s. The Government should have power to exercise a little discretion. A hard and fast fee should not be fixed. If an unreasonable fee were imposed, Parliament would have power to disallow the regulation.

Mr. LATHAM: The cost of inspection for registration will not be great. At places like Narrogin and Busselton there will probably be an inspector. I hope the amendment will be accepted. It is not a question of giving anything away. It is a matter of fixing a figure until we ascertain from experience what the cost is likely to be.

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: The only expense entailed will be the cost of the certificate and the time required to write in the details. We know the conditions of the various factories operating.

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

No. 2. Clause 8—Add the following proviso:—"Provided that notwithstanding anything to the contrary therein contained, the powers, obligations and duties vested in inspectors under the Shops and Factories Act, 1920, and Amendment Act, 1922, and the Inspection of Machinery Act, 1922, other than the provisions therein relating to the registration and inspection of boilers, may be carried out or undertaken by an inspector appointed."

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: The object of the amendment is to give effect to an oft-repeated request that the duplication of inspections should be obviated. The power proposed to be conferred by the amendment is purely permissive. The mana-

ger of a factory might be appointed an inspector for these particular requirements.

Mr. McCallum: Will he have any special knowledge of this measure?

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: No. I move—

That the amendment be agreed to.

Mr. MUNSIE: What knowledge, apart from that of manufacturing butter, will be required of an appointee under this measure? What will such an inspector be likely to know about inspecting machinery?

The Minister for Agriculture: He will not be required to know.

Mr. MUNSIE: Under this measure he will have all the powers of an inspector under the Inspection of Machinery Act, except as regards inspecting boilers.

The Minister for Agriculture: We might appoint the man in charge of the engines.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: You would not appoint a man to inspect his own factory, surely?

Mr. MUNSIE: The man in charge of the engines should not be appointed an inspector of the machinery in his own factory. Will the appointee under this measure be able to do everything that an inspector of machinery can do with the exception of inspecting boilers?

The Minister for Agriculture: Yes.

Mr. MUNSIE: Then I shall oppose the Council's amendment. An inspector must have a certain amount of knowledge to be able to say whether machinery is safe. This provision will whittle away the powers provided in the existing Act.

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

Ayes	..	..	..	23
Noes	..	..	..	13
Majority for				10

AYES.	
Mrs. Cowan	Mr. Money
Mr. Davies	Mr. Pickering
Mr. Denton	Mr. Plesse
Mr. George	Mr. Sampson
Mr. Harrison	Mr. Scaddan
Mr. Hickmott	Mr. J. H. Smith
Mr. Johnston	Mr. J. M. Smith
Mr. Latham	Mr. Teesdale
Mr. C. C. Maley	Mr. J. Thomson
Mr. H. K. Maley	Mr. Underwood
Mr. Mann	Mr. Mullany
Sir James Mitchell	(Teller.)

NOES.	
Mr. Angwin	Mr. Marshall
Mr. Chesson	Mr. McCallum
Mr. Collier	Mr. Troy
Mr. Corboy	Mr. Walker
Mr. Heron	Mr. Willcock
Mr. Hughes	Mr. Munsie
Mr. Luley	(Teller.)

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

No. 3—Clause 11: Add a subclause (3) as follows:—Any vendor of milk or cream shall have the right to have his milk or cream tested in his presence, or in the presence of his agent at the factory not oftener than once a week.

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: The vendor may have his milk tested before him every day if he likes. I move—

That the amendment be agreed to.

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

No. 4—Clause 20: After the word "Queensland" insert "or other approved Australian."

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: I move—

That the amendment be agreed to.

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

No. 5—Clause 20: Add the following words: "nor sold unless branded or marked with the word 'margarine' as prescribed."

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: I move—

That the amendment be agreed to.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: This is already provided for in the Health Act, but the conditions are more stringent there than they are in this Bill.

Hon. T. WALKER: This may conflict with the Health Act. In order to make the Bill clear and consistent. I move—

The Council's amendment be amended by adding the following words: "Under the Health Act, 1911."

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

No. 6—Clause 25: In paragraph (a) strike out the words "and the fees to be paid in connection therewith."

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: This amendment is consequential upon the first amendment. I move—

That the amendment be agreed to.

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

Resolutions reported, the report adopted, and a message accordingly returned to the Council.

## BILL—DAIRY CATTLE IMPROVEMENT.

### Council's Amendments.

Schedule of two amendments made by the Council now considered.

### In Committee.

Mr. Angelo in the Chair; the Minister for Agriculture in charge of the Bill.

No. 1—Clause 11, Subclause 3: Add the following words:—"If an appeal is upheld, the board may award to the appellant such reasonable costs as the board in its discretion thinks fit."

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: The amendment is a reasonable one. I move—

That the amendment be agreed to.

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

No. 2—Clause 11, Subclause (4): After the word "owners" in line five, insert "risk and."

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: This is only adding explanatory words. I move—

That the amendment be agreed to.

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

Resolutions reported and the report adopted and a message accordingly returned to the Council.

## BILL—INDUSTRIES ASSISTANCE ACT CONTINUANCE.

### Second reading.

Debate resumed from 15th November.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN (North-East Fremantle) [3.32]: This Bill is purely a continuance measure, but I am in hopes that it may be made an amending Bill. I do not know whether it will be possible to alter the title accordingly. Unquestionably the Industries Assistance Board must be continued for at least another 12 months, but there certainly is necessity for an alteration of the Industries Assistance Act. If the amendment which I have placed on the Notice Paper should be disallowed, I trust the Government will see their way to bring in an amending Bill which will include my amendment.

The Premier: Have the select committee reported?

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: Yes. The select committee's report shows clearly that the board throughout their existence have endeavoured, so far as possible, to place the farmers on a sound footing after the losses occasioned to them by the drought of 1914-15. There is not the least doubt that the action of the board has saved the State from very considerable losses; but there is likewise no doubt whatever that considerable losses will be made by the State in connection with loans granted to farmers who suffered from the drought. About 1,149 farmers have been able to clear themselves from the Industries Assistance Board. But for the Industries Assistance Board the great majority, if not the whole, of those farmers would have gone to the wall. The granting of assistance has placed them on their feet again, and many of them are now, according to information the select committee received, in a prosperous position.

That is a benefit to the State. However, there are also a number, possibly about 700, who went on the board in 1914-15 and are there still. Many of them complain that they are on light land propositions unsuitable for wheat growing, with the result that year after year they find themselves in the unfortunate position of not being able to make ends meet. They blame the Government very much over that matter. Those who have given evidence claim that the Government are responsible for their being placed on those lands. Some of them, who are newcomers to Western Australia, point out that they were not in a position to know the quality of the land, and that they took up their holdings owing to the prominent manner in which the Government placed the matter before them, leading them to believe that wheat could be profitably grown on the land. Of course we know that no person was compelled to take up the land, but undoubtedly the announcements of the Government had a tendency to induce people to take up the light lands. Some of the farmers in question contend that they should be removed from their holdings to suitable lands. That, however, would not get over the difficulty completely. Many of the farmers are largely indebted not only to the Industries Assistance Board but also to the Agricultural Bank—some of them to the extent of between £2,000 and £3,000. So there will be considerable difficulty, from the point of view of the board, in squaring the finances of a large number of farmers who are on light lands. All appearances indicate that some of these farmers will never get clear so long as they remain on their present holdings. The policy of the board latterly has been to endeavour to get these men to take larger areas, and, instead of restricting them to the growing of cereals, to assist them to obtain sheep. In several cases where sheep have been provided they have proved the means of transferring the farmer from the debit to the credit side of the board's ledger. Of course that cannot apply all round. Private firms are generally willing to supply sheep on credit. The firms take the wool until the sheep are paid for. Immediately that point has been reached, the sheep become a security of the Industries Assistance Board for the moneys owing to the State. The Government will have to give consideration to settlers on light lands. In all probability the State would lose many thousands of pounds if these settlers were driven off their holdings. The matter to be taken into consideration is whether the position of such men cannot be put right by increasing their holdings and providing them with sheep.

The Premier: That is being done wherever possible.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: Yes; but I was very much struck with the evidence given by Mr. Richardson, the chairman of the Industries Assistance Board. As most of us are aware, Mr. Richardson is a thoroughly practical man. He states that where it is possible to supply sheep, the board do so if

the settler understands sheep; but Mr. Richardson says it is useless to increase the indebtedness by supplying sheep to settlers who do not understand them, which merely means entailing further loss on the State. I desire to say again what I said here some weeks ago, that the Industries Assistance Board have been very lenient. The members of the board have realised that they were appointed for the purpose of carrying out the pledge of the Government to place, if possible, on a sound financial footing those people who had come to disaster through no fault of their own. I have had an opportunity of examining between 200 and 300 files of the Industries Assistance Board, and I have not come across one solitary instance in which the board have shown harshness in dealing with clients. In my opinion the board have acted more leniently than any private institution or firm would do in similar circumstances. In almost every case where the board have found it necessary to stop assistance, the settler has been very heavily indebted not only to the board, but also to the Agricultural Bank, and has had no prospect of getting out of his difficulties.

Mr. Davies: What is done with farmers in such a position?

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: The same as is done with other persons in similar positions. Such a farmer has to go out, losing everything he has, and seek a living in some other avocation.

Mr. Davies: Are such farmers given a chance on another farm?

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: In some instances that has been done. In other instances, the men concerned have gone out of farming altogether. The evidence given to the select committee by the general manager of the Industries Assistance Board shows that the time has arrived when the board's work should cease. Mr. McLarty's evidence proves clearly that the Agricultural Bank gives greater assistance towards the development of agricultural holdings than is given by any other banking institution in the world. There is no other country in the world which affords so large a measure of assistance towards building a farm as Western Australia does. Mr. McLarty is of opinion that to exceed the amount of assistance now granted through the Agricultural Bank would be a hazardous experiment. At the same time, speaking on behalf of the select committee, let me say that it is advisable somewhat to liberalise the provisions of the Agricultural Bank Act, so as to permit of the management of the bank going a little further than at present. There is evidence that various clients would have a prospect of becoming clear of their indebtedness if they were not restricted by the present limitations of the Agricultural Bank Act. On the other hand, the Industries Assistance Act is too wide. There is no limitation whatever in it. My personal opinion is that the Act is a very good one for any Government. We could not have a better measure on the statute-book than

the Industries Assistance Act from the Government's point of view.

Hon. M. F. Troy: Why?

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: Because it enables the Government to get all their statutory payments, including land rents, bank interest, water rates, etc., out of loan moneys and charge the debit to the farmers.

The Premier: We do not charge those things unless the account is good.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: I am not saying that the farmers are not entitled to pay those charges. The payments are perfectly just. But under paragraph (c) of Section 9 of the Industries Assistance Act the Government assure themselves of payment in every respect. Money is taken out of loan funds to keep up the payments of farmers to Government institutions.

The Premier: Oh, no!

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

The Premier: Not unless the accounts are in credit.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: I did not know that this Bill would be brought on first thing today; otherwise I would have been prepared.

The Premier: Don't bother to prepare.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: Under the Industries Assistance Act there has been paid to Government institutions and others the following amounts: for land rents, £394,493; for Agricultural Bank interest, £421,226; for interest, £44,356; for water rates, £41,636; for State land tax, £6,772; for State income tax, £4,788; for Federal income tax, £6,839; for road board rates, £17,905; to other Government departments for pre-war debts, seed wheat board, £33,838; for Civil Service settlers, £927; for the Tammin settlement, £641; and to the State Implement Works, £37,967. This makes a total of £1,011,396. This shows that the Act is a splendid one for the Government, enabling the transfer from loan moneys of amounts the farmers are liable to pay to the Government. I fully realise that these are just payments and they have to be paid to enable clients to retain their holdings.

The Premier: They are mostly paid from the proceeds of the crops.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: Not always.

The Premier: They are a first charge on the crops.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: That is not always so. The Premier knows that there is nearly £1,500,000 outstanding. At least, that was the amount outstanding in August. It is unfortunate that the board cannot amend the Bill. I do not think the Government or the board have been justly treated by the superphosphate merchants. The manufacturers of superphosphate will not appoint the board as distributing agents.

The Minister for Agriculture: If I wanted to buy 100 tons direct from a company, they would refuse to serve me.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: The Government, through the board, purchased nearly one-third, or approximately 20,000 tons of the manufacturers' output and yet they definitely refuse to appoint the board as distributing agent on

their behalf. That decision means that the Government have to pay commission, amounting to about £3,000 per year, to the agents who supply the board with superphosphate. That means to say that the agents concerned receive £3,000 a year and all they do for it is to render the invoice to the board, the board issue the orders which go direct from the manufacturer and the board pay the accounts. As to the Westralian Farmers Ltd., some reference has been made to their position. A little while ago tenders were called for superphosphate supplies, and the Westralian Farmers offered to supply at a discount of 7s. per ton. Other firms had offered to supply at a discount of 9s. per ton. The board felt that it was not their function to place orders with any particular firm and they accepted the tenders at a discount of 7s. They notified those firms offering 9s. per ton discount that if they liked to offer the 2s. additional discount as well, they could do so. Those firms retained the 2s. discount as was only natural and did not make it available to the board. That difference meant an additional payment of £2,000 for extra commission. It is the duty of farmers to assist the Government as much as it is the duty of the Government to assist the farmers. Had the farmers placed all their orders for superphosphate with the Industries Assistance Board, the board could have supplied them. Instead of doing that, the farmers preferred to transact their business through a particular firm and by doing so the Government have had to advance an additional £2,000. Most of the farmers concerned are men who were in a bad financial position on the board's books. Their action meant increasing the indebtedness to the board by a further £2,000 per year.

Mr. Pickering: The board could have saved £2,000 if the supplies had been got from another source?

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: Yes, and if the board had been appointed distributing agents £3,000 could have been saved. The Government should make inquiries concerning these matters.

The Premier: We have.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: If necessary, the Government should endeavour to get some other firm to start in Western Australia, provided the Government are given the consideration they should receive.

Mr. Teesdale: Hear, hear! Why should these people be given a monopoly?

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: Hon. members know my view on that point. Perhaps it was neglect on the part of the Labour Government that we did not establish superphosphate works when we were in power. The Government should go into this question because it costs them thousands of pounds annually. As to the matter of insurance, this is very profitable. For some considerable time, the board have desired the necessary power to take these risks themselves. Since the inception of the board £142,162 has been paid as premiums on account of insurances. The board have received a small amount of commission and

about £10,000 would cover the whole amount. During the last three years, £8,000 was received, but I do not know what it amounted to prior to that period. The claims paid totalled £48,276. The Premier will see, therefore, that there are considerable profits to be made and if, as he is looking for revenue, he embarked on this business, the proceeds would considerably reduce the indebtedness of the clients to the board.

The Premier: We would require a reserve fund.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: In only one year the claims represented a large amount compared with the premiums paid. In every other year the premiums considerably exceeded the claims paid.

Mr. Pickering: Every year?

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: Yes.

Mr. Lutey: And the board do the work!

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: Prior to 1919 or 1920, very little was paid away in the shape of claims. In 1915-16 the premiums paid totalled £22,216, and the value of the claims paid by the companies was £2,738; in 1916-17 the premiums paid totalled £19,421 and the claims £3,924; in 1917-18 the premiums totalled £14,891, and the claims £6,771; in 1918-19 the premiums totalled £14,415, and the claims £7,585; in 1919-20 the premiums paid were £23,783 7s., and the claims £11,807; in 1920-21 the premiums were £26,365, and the claims £7,270; in 1921-22 the premiums totalled £21,067, and the claims £8,181. In 1919-20 the heaviest claims were paid in respect of fire, the amount represented being £10,094. In other years, the claims did not get within a fifth of what had been paid since the inception of the board. The Premier can see an opening here for effecting considerable savings, and in assisting to wipe out some of the debts.

Mr. Pickering: Did the Government get discount in respect of these payments?

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: Yes; in 1915-16 they represented £9 per week and in 1916-17, to the 30th June, the discount amounted to £468. In 1917-18, £250 was paid to cover expenses. In 1918-19 the discount amounted to £301, and other payments were: 1919-20, £3,003; 1920-21, £3,220; 1921-22, £2,202.

Mr. Lutey: And the board did the work.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: The officers of the Industries Assistance Board do nearly all the work. They make up all the papers in connection with the insurances and the assistance of one additional clerk is all that is required to carry out the whole business. If insurance were carried on, the board would derive all the benefits from the business. The treatment of the creditors has caused a good deal of discussion and I do not think they have received a fair show.

The Premier: You cannot pay out what you do not get.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: The creditors have had a fair sum paid back to them.

The Premier: They had all the cash trade with the board.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: But the trade would be there just the same whether there was an Industries Assistance Board or not.

Mr. Pickering: But the farmers would not have been there, had it not been for the I.A.B. That is the position to a large extent anyway.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: In any case, I do not think the creditors have had fair play. It was the intention of the Act that the surplus should go the creditors, but in 1917 the legislation was altered and this matter was left to the discretion of the Treasurer, who was given the right to say what should be done with the surplus proceeds. It was decided that if a farmer wished to put in a crop, a certain proportion would be retained for that purpose, and very little money has gone to the creditors since then. If a man had a surplus of £300 after paying his statutory obligations, he would notify the board that he desired to put 300 acres under crop for the next season. If he did that, £300 would be retained to pay for putting in the crop. I maintain that that balance of £300 should go to the creditors because it represents their money. When the farmers started, many of them had very little money, and the creditors advanced funds to enable them to get a start. They did that to keep the people on the land, and once those people have paid off their liabilities, is there any reason to believe that the creditors would not act in the same way again? I believe that if these accounts were paid up, the creditors would again assist the farmers in exactly the same way as they helped them at the start. This is not a fair proposition, because under such conditions it is not the State's money, but the creditors' money, which is used to assist a man to put in his next year's crop. The worst of it is that those very men to whom the creditors stuck in times of adversity have deserted the creditors.

Mr. Teesdale: Yes, they cleared out immediately they had a chance.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: According to the evidence of two witnesses before the select committee who were speaking on behalf of the creditors generally, the creditors are willing to compound in respect of individual clients. It would be an advantage to the Government if immediate steps were taken to compound with the creditors, but not as in the case of Messrs. Harris, Scarfe, where the transaction was all to the benefit of the Government, the farmers having to pay up in full.

The Premier: Yes, that was wrong.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: In numerous cases the Government, with advantage to themselves, to the farmers, and to the creditors, could compound with the creditors. I trust the Premier will introduce a Bill giving the board power to do their own insurance. I also hope that as early as possible the Government will consider whether it would not be possible next year to allow the board to be wound up, and to hand over the work of the board to the Agricultural Bank. To-day

the bank has a mortgage on most of the holdings under the board. We cannot expect the bank to pay 6 per cent. for its money, lend it out at 7 per cent. and at the same time have to restrict its business to clients of different financial position, while clients on a better footing go to outside banks. The time has arrived when we should extend the scope of the bank's activities in order that the bank might protect itself. If we take to the bank the Industries Assistance Board clients, we are loading the bank with clients of doubtful financial position, while the outside banks get all the safer clients. The Industries Assistance Board has done good work. I realise that sometimes the board is at its wits' end to know what to do with some of its clients. Although working with the best intentions, the board in many instances has made advances which never should have been made. Its security rests entirely on the season. If the season be a bad one there is no crop, and if there be no crop the money advanced is lost. The assets which the board hold are very small indeed, merely the horses and stock. The whole of the real security is held by the Agricultural Bank, and so I say the work of the board should be taken over by the bank.

The PREMIER (Hon. Sir James Mitchell—Northam) [4.6]: The hon. member is wrong in thinking the security would be improved by handing over the work of the board to the bank. There could be no advantage in respect of security, because the bank's security and that of the board are practically all one. So, too, in respect of the work of the two institutions. Amalgamation of the two would be difficult, because the bank has a long time mortgage against fixed improvements, whereas the board makes a short advance covering the crop. Nothing would be gained by amending the Agricultural Bank Act, because we must have the provisions that obtain to-day under the Industries Assistance Board Act. Of course, there is security outside the real crop, because the stock and implements represent a great deal. Under the proposed amalgamation there would not be one pound's worth more security. Of course, some money was lost in the very early years, for those were the most difficult years of all. Under the system now in vogue, there ought not to be any very great sum lost. I know the creditors have had to wait a long time for their money. I am sorry for it. We have paid some of the creditors. It was before my time. I think 7s. 6d. in the pound was paid for those debts. It is true the farmers have been charged the full amount, but it is equally true that we shall never recover more than sufficient to recoup us. However, I agree that the compounding was not a fair one. That suggested by the hon. member is much fairer. We should pay off the debts of the individual, not take over the whole of the debts held by one firm. I should be glad indeed if we could see our way to clearing off all the outside creditors. But those debts now amount to £220,000, after

all these years. In the meantime four millions have been paid away in cash. It is true the farmer did not play fairly by the men who assisted him before the board was initiated. The farmers left their old creditors and went to other storekeepers, purchasing their goods for cash. That was altogether wrong. To-day there is £1,500,000 owing to the board, and there are 615,000 acres under crop. With that and what is in the old wheat pools we ought to get in as much as is owing. However, in very many individual cases we shall never recover all that we have advanced. I had something to do with the fertiliser purchase of 1916. I suggested that the discount ought to go to the farmer, not to the board. However, the merchants would not agree to that, because the manufacturers would not sanction it. If it were not for the competition between the merchants, we should not get the discount we are getting to-day.

Hon. M. P. Troy: Did you say the competition between fertiliser firms?

The PREMIER: No, between the fertiliser merchants. Without that competition we should not get the 7s. discount which comes to us to-day.

Mr. Harrison: There is no competition between the fertiliser manufacturers.

The PREMIER: No, that is so; all over Australia they are agreed in point of price. The price ought to be the same everywhere in Australia, instead of which it varies according to the States. We get 7s. discount, not from the manufacturers, but from the merchants. As to insurance, certainly we have paid away a great deal more than we have received. Still, the insurance company's have had to take considerable risk.

Mr. Harrison: It has been the most profitable line of insurance in the State.

The PREMIER: It may be so. We paid away £142,000. We got £944 discount and we received in satisfaction of claims, £48,300. It leaves a fairly large margin, but, of course, there has been a fairly big risk taken, and no company would take a risk for nothing.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: The risk has been well paid for.

The PREMIER: Yes, but there has been a risk. Obviously, with crops during the last seven years of an aggregate value of five millions, there has been some risk.

Mr. Harrison: There is not the risk in Western Australia which there is in the Eastern States.

The PREMIER: We are not insuring in the Eastern States. We have to take the position as it is. I do not know what the insurance rates in the Eastern States are. The board are anxious to do their own insurance, and the House must realise that they will be running a risk. The select committee reported in favour of them doing their own insurance. But the House should realise that the risk will not be covered by the £21,000 paid out last year. It may happen that we shall get through on £10,000, but there will be some risk.

Mr. Pickering: There will be when wheat comes down to 2s. 8d. or 3s. a bushel.



The PREMIER: The hon. member has no right to reflect on the farmers.

Mr. Pickering: There will be a lot less care taken.

The PREMIER: The farmer does his best to protect his crop.

Mr. Harrison: Miles upon miles of fire breaks are ploughed annually.

The PREMIER: The farmer is quite as honest as any other class. The member for North-East Fremantle (Hon. W. C. Angwin) as chairman of the select committee, went very carefully into the question of the I.A.B. It is true there will be fairly considerable losses, and it is true that these have occurred largely on the light land. In 1911 the farmers on light land did fairly well, while those on the heavier land had a failure.

Mr. Harrison: The light lands have done very well this year.

The PREMIER: People say they were put on to these light lands, but it must not be overlooked that they took up the blocks and the department cannot accept any responsibility for their selection. The board have done wonderfully good work, and should be continued in order to give us an opportunity to control production. One-third of the wheat of the State has been produced by farmers under the I.A.B. and largely because they were compelled to put in the full area possible for a man and a team. Farmers under the I.A.B. were not allowed to put in 150 acres; they had to put in 250 or 300 acres as the board considered fair. The result has been that they produced this wealth. A lot of our farmers would not have been on the land to-day but for the board. To borrow money was very difficult during the war and, in fact, it was difficult to carry on at all. It takes a good deal of money to finance the putting in of a crop. Last year I suppose the cost of putting in the crop meant  $2\frac{1}{2}$  millions cash. That is a considerable sum. The board is a very valuable adjunct to the bank. It has resulted in the creation of wealth to the tune of six millions in the last seven years. It has produced an enormous amount of trade which would otherwise not have been produced, and has created work which otherwise would not have been available. The report submitted by the hon. member, with the exception of one mistake, of which he has been notified—

Hon. W. C. Angwin: I could not get the letters in respect to that matter.

The PREMIER: In other respects the report is a very good one. I do not agree with him, however, when he states that the board should cease to exist. I maintain that the board should be continued. It has helped the bank and the securities of the bank. We need the board also for soldier settlement. The management of the board have been careful; they have done good work. They treated the settlers sympathetically, sometimes perhaps too sympathetically, but that is a good fault. Many men who two or three years ago appeared to be down and out are

now prosperous. Over 1,100 have taken their clearances and have gone away "made" men. They have money to their credit; their debts have been paid and their assets are free.

Mr. Pickering: Long live the board and may it be extended to the South-West.

The PREMIER: No doubt the hon. member would like it extended to the South-West, but when the South-West can produce something which will keep as well as wheat, we shall extend it to the South-West. Meanwhile we are helping the South-West by granting financial assistance to butter factories. The member for North-East Fremantle took a wrong view when he advocated the abolition of the I.A.B.

Mr. LATHAM (York) [4.22]: While I subscribed to the report of the select committee who investigated the administration of the I.A.B., I did so for only one reason, namely that I was hopeful we would be able to control the security better by having it under the direct management of the Agricultural Bank. The I.A.B. undoubtedly plays a very important part in our agricultural development, and I am dubious as to what would take its place if we closed it down. The only hope would be to hand over the management to the Agricultural Bank. I do not think sufficient is done by the I.A.B. to ascertain what advances have been made by the Agricultural Bank before granting advances under the I.A.B. If the Agricultural Bank were directly responsible for the management, the difficulty would be obviated. During the investigations of the select committee, we found that a great many losses must be made by the I.A.B., but, when analysed carefully, it is evident that very few losses have been incurred in respect of advances made in recent years. The real trouble arose in the early stages of the seed wheat board. That is what the I.A.B. was primarily.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: No.

Mr. LATHAM: Practically so. Advances had been made to supply seed wheat and feed to deserving settlers who, through unfortunate circumstances, found it impossible to carry on. Then in 1914 the drought occurred, and the Government had to do something and do it quickly. Haphazardly and in all directions advances were made. If a man came along, particularly if he had a friend who could get an interview with the then manager, an I.A.B. advance was made. These are the debts which are creating difficulty to-day. Many farmers were almost bankrupt. If the Government had waited to investigate their claims, many deserving settlers would have been left without assistance. Consequently, a loss will be made, but I do not think the State will be any the worse off for it. Regarding the advances made during recent years, there have been few losses except in respect of soldier settlement. Some of the soldiers had done very little or no farming; they are suffering from disabilities

of the war and cannot be expected to make a success of farming.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: I did not see a soldier's account in excess of £600.

Mr. LATHAM: There are some well over £1,000.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: I mean indebtedness to the I.A.B.

Mr. LATHAM: In their case it is not the fault of the land. Perhaps it is due to the management of the farms. The losses incurred in recent years, however, are small and are due to the soldiers. The member for North-East Fremantle said the only security the I.A.B. had consisted of the seasons. So long as we are dealing with good land within a reasonable distance of railway facilities, there is security additional to the money advanced by the Agricultural Bank. Every one of the blocks carries an equity besides having stock, implements and the plant necessary to work the farm. If a sale were made, the board would have the equity.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: The assistant manager said there was no equity.

Mr. LATHAM: The hon. member is referring to the bad holdings against which advances were made in the early days. We cannot overcome that difficulty; the Government will have to face a loss there. I am speaking of recent advances. There is not a good block of land within reasonable reach of facilities which will not carry an equity over and above the advances made by the Agricultural Bank. When a man gets a good forest block favourably situated, it is as good as giving him £200 the day he receives the approval. Many a man could sell his interest for £200 without doing a hand's turn.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: Then the Government are selling the land too cheaply.

Mr. LATHAM: That is a debatable point. A man who goes out on the land really receives a bonus, and the hon. member would not object to that. Of course the Government would refuse to grant a transfer of a block in such circumstances. Another great advantage is that by having the Industries Assistance Act in operation it has been rendered possible for the Government's agricultural advisers to get to these farmers and explain to them the best methods of farming. We have men here who have made a life study of that work, and their knowledge is available to every farmer to-day.

Hon. P. Collier: It is not necessary to have the Industries Assistance Board in order that the farmers should have that advice. That is like the Chinaman who burnt down his house in order to roast a pig.

Mr. LATHAM: But the farmer is visited every month by the Industries Assistance Board's inspector.

Hon. P. Collier: The inspectors could operate under the Agricultural Bank.

Mr. LATHAM: That would be very expensive. The board are working at a profit. For instance, they make 7s. per ton on all the super supplied in this State.

Hon. P. Collier: They are making losses too.

Mr. Underwood: Heavy losses.

Mr. LATHAM: In the early days the board made heavy losses, as the member for Pilbara had an opportunity of hearing at a meeting of farmers in the Perth Town Hall.

Mr. Underwood: A meeting of farmers' agents.

Mr. LATHAM: It is possible to-day to get the necessary instructions through the inspectors of the Industries Assistance Board, who come in contact with every one of these farmers. If the board is wound up, I hope steps will be taken to ensure a continuance of that instruction. The only complaint I have heard is that the board do not seem able to reply to correspondence expeditiously. There are constant complaints from farmers on that score. I do not know whether the decentralisation scheme is yet in complete order, which might possibly be the reason for the delays. As to the question of crop insurance, while on paper it appears that the insurance companies make a considerable profit, yet the matter wants to be gone into very thoroughly before the State establishes an insurance scheme.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: The board have gone into the question thoroughly.

Mr. LATHAM: There might come along a year with tremendous hailstorms, which would be disastrous to the profits, and the Treasury might be called upon to meet heavy liabilities in such a connection. I hope that before the Premier embarks on a crop insurance scheme he will submit the question to someone who knows considerably more about it than even the members of the board know. I am very concerned to learn what is the policy of the Government with regard to the Industries Assistance Board during the forthcoming season. Up to date I have not been able to obtain a statement from the officials of the board as to whether the Government are prepared to carry on new farmers. I have often heard it said, "Let these people go along on their own, seeing that nobody else gets helped in his business." But the business of the farmer is quite different from any other kind of business. There are people coming out to the State with a little money who are prepared to go on the land. From the State's point of view I consider it would be advisable to make advances to such people, because otherwise we shall have much of our cleared land lying idle. If cleared land lies idle for one or two years, it is much more difficult to crop afterwards. I hope the Minister concerned will make an announcement as to what is going to be done during the coming season in that respect. Do not let us be too late. We ought not to be too late in supplying super, or in granting approvals. Now is the time for the Government to make an announcement whether they are prepared to make advances on good security, good blocks of forest land, for the purpose of seeding operations during the year. The Premier knows every portion of the State very

well, and knows exactly where it is safe to invest public money. I venture to say there is no better investment to-day than that of putting money into the agricultural areas of Western Australia. What worries many new settlers to-day is the lack of knowledge as to whether they can expect further assistance from the Government after getting their land cleared. To get assistance outside to-day is very difficult, merchants not being prepared to supply goods on 12 months' credit. It is a risk, after all, because a dry spell might come. In the case of a man who is clear of the Industries Assistance Board, of course the position is different. In such a case there is additional security for the merchant, but where the only security is the equity, the merchant will not grant credit. Men clear of the board carry with them their stock and their implements, and, fairly frequently, decent bank balances and considerable wheat scrip. In the best parts of this State new comers are greatly worried by this matter.

Mr. Underwood: And old settlers, too.

Mr. LATHAM: Yes, in areas where there has been a dry spell this year. I saw something of that as I was travelling in the train the other day. I hope the Minister in charge will not leave the matter too late. The settlers will require to know long before the time when the assistance is needed, whether they can expect assistance. There are immigrants who have good blocks of land but not a shilling to their name, and they have to go to the merchants and ask for credit.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: They cannot expect the Government to finance them.

Mr. LATHAM: If the idea is that our lands are to be reserved for the rich man, let us tell these people so.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: They cannot expect to have everything done for them.

The Premier: A man should be able to carry on with the assistance he obtains from the Agricultural Bank.

Mr. LATHAM: I do not know whether the Premier is sincere in making that statement. Seed wheat costs 5s. per acre. The settler also wants 60 lbs. or 80 lbs. of super to the acre. He has to pay railway freights. He has to pay for fodder for his horses. I have been informed that it is proposed not to render any further assistance to Imperial soldier and new settlers, and I want a definite pronouncement made on that subject before the session closes. I hope the Premier will go into the matter. I know that his sympathies are with the settlers, and that if the money is available he will render them assistance.

On motion by Mr. Pickering, debate adjourned.

## BILL—LICENSING ACT AMENDMENT.

### Council's Message.

Message from the Council received acquainting the Assembly that it did not insist on its amendments Nos. 3, 5, 20, and 56, that it

had agreed to the modifications made by the Assembly in the Council's amendments Nos. 9, 25, 26, and 37, and that it insisted on its amendments Nos. 7, 27, 42, 44, 47, 49, 50, and 54.

### Standing Orders Suspension.

The PREMIER (Hon. Sir J. Mitchell—Northam) [4.43]: I move—

That so much of the Standing Orders be suspended as is necessary to permit of the Council's message being taken into consideration forthwith.

Hon. members will realise the necessity for having this Bill enacted during the next day or two.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I have counted the House, and there is an absolute majority of members present.

Question put and passed.

### In Committee.

Schedule of eight amendments on which the Council had insisted now considered: Mr. Angelo in the Chair, the premier in charge of the Bill.

No. 7.—Clause 16. Strike out "paragraphs are" and insert "subsection is"; strike out Subclause 3.

The PREMIER: This deals with temporary licenses for the sale of liquor on racecourses and show grounds. Under the Bill a race club can get a temporary license, but is then brought within the control of the Act and, if it transgresses, it can be dealt with. To-day the race club goes to the local licensee and borrows his license, or, alternatively, sells him the right to dispense liquor on the racecourse. Under the Bill no more licenses will be granted for the sale of liquor on racecourses than have been granted in the past, while, on the other hand, there will be much better control over the sale of liquor on racecourses. However, we have already discussed this, and I think the best thing to do now is to ask for a conference. I move—

That a conference with the Council on this amendment be requested.

Question put and passed.

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

The PREMIER: This deals with the reduction of licenses. A compensation fund is to be created for the purpose of providing compensation in respect of hotels closed by the licenses reduction board. Assuming that on the contributions of 2 per cent. on the value of the liquor sold the fund will reach £18,000 per annum for six years, I do not think it will be more than sufficient for the closing of those hotels which ought to be closed. In any case, since we have taken from the people the right to close hotels by local option, and substituted this system, we

ought to stand by it. If the Council's amendment be agreed to, the closing of hotels will be optional with the board. We ought not to agree to that.

Mr. Latham: You mean that the board is to keep on closing hotels, even when it thinks no more ought to be closed?

The PREMIER: The clause will continue in operation for only six years. Parliament, if it thinks fit, can repeal the provision at any time. It ought not to be left to the board to say whether any further hotels should be closed.

Mr. Mann: In Victoria, where the hotels are costly, they have been closed at an average cost of less than £600 per hotel.

The PREMIER: Victorian hotels are very different from those in this State.

Mr. Mann: Take some of those on the gold-fields.

Mr. Johnston: Some of them could be closed for £50.

The PREMIER: Some of our hotels are very substantially built.

Mr. Mann: But some of those on the gold-fields have no accommodation rooms, and have a frontage of only 20 feet.

The PREMIER: Still, some of those which will be closed are of most substantial structure.

Mrs. Cowan: What is the cost of the board likely to be?

The PREMIER: That does not come under the clause. However, it will be considerable. I do not think there will be too much money in the fund for the purpose of closing hotels. At any rate, we have adopted this method, and we ought to stick to it. It should be, not for the board, but for Parliament to say whether hotels should be closed. This system is better than the old one, for under local option frequently the wrong hotels are closed.

Mrs. Cowan: I do not know that.

The PREMIER: But I do. You see the value of experience.

Mrs. Cowan: I know something about it.

The PREMIER: Well, I am sorry to hear that. Owners of hotels are safer under this Bill than under the last one, for the reason that under this Bill only such hotels as ought to be closed will be closed. I move—

That a conference with the Council on this amendment be requested.

Mr. CORBOY: It is difficult to understand the attitude of the Premier.

The Premier: The Committee have taken the same attitude twice.

Mr. CORBOY: The Committee have taken away the right of the people to determine this question, and have replaced it by a board. The Premier says he is not prepared to give that board the discretion the board ought to have.

The Premier: No, they must close hotels.

Mr. CORBOY: It is ridiculous to set up the board and then refuse to give it any power. At the end of five years the board might say, "We have closed every hotel which we consider ought to be closed." Nevertheless, in

the sixth year we are to say to them, "You have another £20,000; you must continue spending it, although you think no further hotels ought to be closed."

The Premier: Parliament can deal with it then.

Mr. CORBOY: It would be better to give the board discretion as to which hotels should be closed. It is foolish to insist upon the board spending whatever money may be in the fund, even after the board considers that its work is complete.

The Premier: We have adopted that principle twice.

Mr. CORBOY: Which is not to say it is right. It is illogical to compel the board to keep on closing hotels even after the board thinks sufficient has been done in that respect.

Mr. PICKERING: Recently, when I protested against too much power being given to Government boards, I was howled down.

The Premier: Nobody howled at you.

Mr. Corboy: But somebody ought to have done so.

Mr. PICKERING: Now the boot is on the other foot, and the board is not to be trusted. I support the Council's amendment. It should be left to the board to decide whether or not any further hotels should be closed. If the board went into my district looking for an hotel to close, they might start on the Caves House. I have been convinced by the arguments advanced that we should have confidence in Government boards. This board will be efficient and able to appreciate its responsibilities.

Mr. Teesdale: Do you know who they are to be?

Mr. PICKERING: I have no idea. The time is approaching when we shall have to increase the number of hotels in the State because wherever we go we find that a town without an hotel is in a backward condition. I hope the House will reconsider its decision and that the Premier will vote for the amendment of another place.

Mr. RICHARDSON: I hope the amendment will not be carried because there is a vast difference in the principle of the amendment and the clause as we passed it. We set ourselves out to say that there were too many hotels in the State, and the Royal Commission were practically unanimous on that particular question. The Commission decided that compensation should be paid for all hotels closed, and that the duty of closing hotels should be delegated to the board.

Mr. Clydesdale: Must the board continue to close hotels while they have money?

Hon. W. C. Angwin: We can alter the law every 12 months.

Mr. RICHARDSON: There is a difference in the principle. On the one hand we appoint a board and say, "You have a certain amount of money in the fund for the payment of compensation; we know there are too many hotels in Western Australia; you close those first that you deem to be the worst." Under the amendment we would say to the board,

"You may close a hotel or not as you think fit."

Mr. Mann: That is not so.

Mr. RICHARDSON: It is so. Under the clause they shall close hotels.

Mr. Mann: It is at their discretion.

Mr. RICHARDSON: I am surprised to find that a member of the Royal Commission should be in favour of the amendment from another place, because he must know well that there are hundreds of hotels in Western Australia that should be closed.

Mr. McCALLUM: The amendment means that the board will have full discretion as to the extent to which they shall close hotels. The Commission found that there were 919 liquor licenses in operation. It has been estimated that the 2 per cent. to be levied from hotelkeepers will bring in approximately £100,000.

Mr. Mann: There are only 586 hotels.

Mr. McCALLUM: The board in this State will deal with all licenses, and taking into consideration all aspects, it will mean, of course, that there will be less compensation for a wine license than for an hotel license. In outback centres there may be very little compensation paid. I agree that Parliament should control, and that it should be for Parliament to set the policy. The trade will contribute the fund and the limit of the period is six years. It would mean, if this were continued, that the trade would ultimately be wiping itself out.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: You would not allow three men to determine that.

Mr. McCALLUM: I make the suggestion that when the board has reached what it considers to be the limit of reduction, it should then report to Parliament, and Parliament should decide whether the board should go on.

The Premier: That is reasonable.

Mr. McCALLUM: The board might say, "We think we have gone far enough; the public are sufficiently catered for." Parliament could then determine what course to follow.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: In Melbourne compensation was paid probably on the value of hotels. Here it would be for what the premises were let.

Mr. McCallum: This provision has been taken from the Melbourne Act.

Mr. Mann: It will mean that you will close many hotels here.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: You may on the goldfields. I have no faith in the Bill from the point of view of the closing of hotels. This Bill does not give the people any say except from the point of view of total prohibition. This is an hotel perpetuation measure, and is a retrograde step.

The Premier: You ought to withdraw that.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: I will not do so. The Bill directs the board to take into consideration the convenience of the people, and the requirements of the several localities in a district. After considering the convenience of the people the board might find it could

not close more hotels. That being so, the only course for it to pursue would be to report the fact to the Government. If the Government then had any backbone, they would bring down an amendment to Parliament. This board will not close any hotels except on the goldfields.

Mr. Mann: Do you think any should be closed in Perth?

Mr. Hughes: A lot should be closed here.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: I do not know. The Bill will last for only six years. By the time all the expenses of the board have been met there will be very little left for compensation for hotels. The sole object of the member for Perth has been to retain licenses. I hope the Premier will stick to his guns and say that Parliament must decide these questions.

Hon. P. COLLIER: Neither the clause nor the amendment is satisfactory. I support the motion, because I feel that the managers of the conference will be able to find some way out of the difficulty. We are conferring great powers upon the board. It may close hotels where the public require them to be kept open. If it operates on the goldfields with a £100,000 fund, it will probably close 50 per cent. of the hotels there without having exhausted the fund. There are many licensed houses on the goldfields that are worth practically nothing, and the compensation could not run into more than £200 in each case. If the board has money in hand, the Bill compels it to continue closing hotels, although in certain districts there may not be any excess of licensed houses. It is, of course, competent for Parliament to amend the Act before the expiration of the six years, but if the matter is left to the board it may be able to bring about prohibition, whether the public want it or not. The Bill is imperative in that direction.

The Premier: That is so, for a period of six years.

Hon. P. COLLIER: We are a little inconsistent. The board has certain discretionary powers, but on the other hand it is mandatory upon it to go on closing hotels while the money lasts. There should be some basis upon which the board should operate. We are adopting a rule of thumb and an unscientific method. We have not calculated what should be a fair proportion of licenses to the total population. We are merely directing the board to continue to close hotels so long as it has the money. The Bill lacks definiteness. There should be some guiding principle adopted as to the method of closing hotels. The amendment, on the other hand, leaves it to the discretion of the board to refrain from closing any more hotels, whereas in certain circumstances the board should be directed to report to Parliament.

Question put and passed.

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

The PREMIER: This dealt with the bona fide traveller. This person had disappeared

altogether in the original Bill, but was reinstated. That being so, there should be some control over the sale of liquor to the bona fide traveller. I should be inclined to agree to the first part of the amendment, but not to the latter part. I did not realise when we were striking out Section 102 of the principal Act that the hotelkeeper would have great trouble in setting up a defence. It is now proposed to make the bona fide traveller equally responsible for misrepresentation. As to the latter part of the amendment, which enables a bona fide traveller to carry away liquor from licensed premises, I hope the Committee will not agree to the action taken by the Council. Should the bona fide traveller be able to do this in the same way as a lodger?

Mr. Lutey: Yes.

The PREMIER: If the amendment stands the bona fide traveller will be able to carry away a whole hogshead of beer. I move—

That a conference with the Council on this amendment be requested.

Mr. LUTEY: I hope the Committee will agree to the amendment because it is reasonable. A lodger is allowed to take liquor away from a hotel and, as it stands, the Bill will mean that bona fide travellers will not be able to take away refreshments necessary for their journey.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: A good job too.

The Minister for Mines: Whatever he drinks he will take away with him!

Mr. LUTEY: But he should be able to take a little more as well. On one trip on the Great Western railway, I neglected to provide myself with some refreshments with the result that I had to drink ginger ale, although the temperature was 112 degrees in the shade.

The Minister for Mines: And that would do you good.

The Premier: You had two per cent. of alcohol in that ginger ale.

The Minister for Mines: That is why he remembers that trip.

Mr. LUTEY: A traveller requires refreshments when he is in the outback country, and to prevent him having that right, is carrying the matter too far.

Mr. CHESON: I hope the Committee will agree to the amendment. The lodger should not be entitled to privileges more than the bona fide traveller in the outback districts. I admit the bona fide traveller clause has been abused in the metropolitan area, but that cannot happen under the Bill as the bona fide traveller has been abolished in these parts. The amendment will prove beneficial to people in the outback country.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: It is a curious position that members should argue that what a lodger can have, bona fide travellers should have. When we were dealing with club licenses it was said that the club was a person's home, and that it was necessary to have a bar there. The lodger is thought to be someone apart from the ordinary individual, but now some members want it "both ways."

Mr. Cheson: We do not favour the lodger.

The Minister for Agriculture: But the lodger often gets many privileges.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: The desire now is to give the bona fide traveller the same privileges as those enjoyed by lodgers. I am sorry the Premier did not stick to his guns and delete the bona fide traveller clause altogether.

The Premier: Do not blame me. You would not stick to me on that question.

The Minister for Mines: We had a division on it.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: No, the Premier let it go on the voices. I hope the Premier will not agree to the amendment.

Question put and passed.

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

The PREMIER: We should agree to the Council's proposal and I move—

That the amendment be no longer disagreed to.

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

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

The PREMIER: The clause provides that no one shall serve liquor to a child under 16 years of age. Section 116 of the principal Act really achieves the same end and in Clause 87 we raised the age of the child provided for in Section 116, to 16 years. There is no necessity for the clause in the circumstances. I move—

That the amendment be no longer disagreed to.

Question put and passed.

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

The PREMIER: This deals with the employment of Asiatics. The clause says that only those now employed in hotels may continue to be so employed. It means that their numbers cannot be increased.

Mr. Mann: What about the individual who is sick and away from the hotel at the time the Bill is passed?

The PREMIER: If a man were sick and merely absent from his duties, he would not be affected.

Mr. Marshall: Why is the member for Perth battling for the Chinamen?

Mr. Mann: They should be given a fair deal.

Mr. Marshall: You would send Australians away to fight for Chows.

The PREMIER: If these Chinamen are here, they should work for their living, but I do not know that they should be allowed to work in hotels.

# BILL—AGRICULTURAL LANDS PURCHASE AMENDMENT.

## Second Reading.

THE PREMIER (Hon. Sir James Mitchell—Northam) [5.51] in moving the second reading said: "This measure merely seeks to increase the amount available for the repurchase of land under the Act by £300,000. The amount available now is £195,000. The money has been used for repurchasing land for soldiers and for closer settlement. The transactions to date disclose a profit, because of the reinvestment of the principal repaid. Old estates purchased under the Agricultural Lands Purchase Act number 25. Of these eight show a loss of £23,599 and 17 show a profit of £53,401, giving a net profit of £29,802. The cost of these estates has been £385,023 and their area is 456,919 acres. The estates bought for soldiers number 69, having a total area of 334,431 acres, and the cost was £562,204. Of these 62 have been brought under the Agricultural Lands Purchase Act by last year's amending Bill. No profit or loss account has yet been prepared, but such figures would be of little value as no interest is payable during the first year. Last year we purchased 11 estates, consisting of 56,994 acres, at a cost of £82,326. It is anticipated that, if the Closer Settlement Bill is passed, we shall buy a good deal of land adjacent to railways. The way to bring our South-West land under cultivation quickly is to treat it as we treated the Peel estate. We must have the right to repurchase land before it is settled. In the Peel estate we bought 80,000 acres. This has been drained and subdivided and made ready for settlement in every detail. If members visited the Peel estate, they would realise what could be done to transform the South-West very speedily. This money will be used for the purchase of land adjacent to our railways and for settling it in an orderly way, which will bring about increased production and make more profitable our railway results than taxation or any other means could do. I come with confidence to the House and ask for a vote of an additional £300,000 for this purpose. This will mean that we shall have £495,000 for the repurchase of land. We anticipate no loss and we shall gain all the advantages accruing from increased settlement, and further we shall achieve all that members have asked us to do in the direction of improving our railway earnings. I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

On motion by Hon. P. Collier, debate adjourned.

ANNUAL ESTIMATES, 1922-23.

In Committee of Supply.

Resumed from the 13th December; Mr. Angelo in the Chair.

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

Mr. Marshall: Some hon. members would let a Chinaman starve, and a white man and his children starve.

Mr. Latham: You are not angry about it. The PREMIER: I do not think we should allow any other Asiatics to be employed about hotels. There may be one Chinaman and a dozen white people employed there and I do not think it is desirable.

Mr. Marshall: We are not responsible for them coming to the State. The PREMIER: I do not know if the hon. member is responsible for them coming here, but I am not. I move—

That a conference with the Council on this clause be requested.

Question put and passed.

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

The PREMIER: The Bill provides that billiards shall not be played on licensed premises within the metropolitan area after 9 p.m., and outside that area, after 11 p.m. It is suggested by the Council that we should allow billiards to be played anywhere till 11 p.m., although the sale of liquor is forbidden at 9 p.m. It would not be right to interfere with the police in the execution of their duty, and if permission is given to play billiards till 11 p.m., obviously individuals will be waiting about where liquor can be served. I move—

That a conference with the Council on this clause be requested.

Question put and passed.

No. 54.—Clause 108. Strike out this clause. The PREMIER: The Bill provides that a club license can be granted only on a petition. The amendment seeks to leave it to the board to say whether other club licenses shall be granted or not. Really it would be impossible for any club to get permission, and I think we can agree to the amendment. I move—

That the Council's amendment be no longer disagreed to.

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

Resolutions reported and the report adopted.

Request for Conference. On motion by the Premier, resolved that a conference be requested with the Legislative Council and that at such conference the managers consist of Messrs. Latham, McCallum, and the mover.

## BILLS (2)—RETURNED FROM COUNCIL.

1. Dog Act Amendment.

2. Agricultural Seeds.

With amendments.

Vote—Other hydraulic undertakings chargeable to revenue, £31,456:

Mr. HARRISON (Avon) [5.57]: Last week we considered the Estimates of the Water Supply, Sewerage, and Drainage Department for which the estimated expenditure for the current year was £118,091. Under this vote £31,456 is provided. There is a big difference between the two amounts, especially when we realise that this vote is to cover all the agricultural land and all the outback country other than that supplied by the goldfields water scheme. If the provision of further water supplies is properly undertaken, a large area of land will be brought into productive use. On many occasions we have discussed the advisableness of providing fencing and water supplies to those areas which are now utilised for cereal production only, the object being to enable them to carry stock, and increase the output of wool, mutton and beef. Unless water supplies are provided in these districts, it is impossible to tide stock over the summer months. The vote under discussion is explained thus—

Administrative and working costs and (a) interest and sinking fund on debentures for undertakings under Water Boards Act and Land Drainage Act taken over and operated departmentally; upkeep, maintenance, and improvement minor town water supplies; water supplies in country districts and on goldfields; sinking wells and boring; maintenance of boring plants pumping plants, windmills, tanks, dams, etc.

If hon. members will consider the number and variety of the needs of country districts coming under this vote, apart from such needs as are supplied by the Goldfields Water Scheme, they will realise why I draw attention to the matter. The time is ripe for the Government to reap, by a judicious capital outlay, the advantage which adequate water conservation in rural districts will afford to the State. In my own electorate and in the adjoining electorates there has been quite a forward movement during last year, for two reasons. One reason is that the supply of fencing wire has considerably increased. With the erection of fencing, arrangements should be made to conserve the water supply, in order that advantage may be taken of the annual provision of Nature in the shape of grass and fodder plants, which so far have gone to waste from year to year. Further, we must cleanse our lands by carrying stock to follow up the fallowing process, to destroy the weeds which develop and re-seed. To keep the lands clean it is necessary that the fallowing should be followed by stock, and for that purpose water supply is indispensable. I have mentioned my own electorate and the adjoining electorates in this connection, and I should add that I have been approached with requests to endeavour to secure the extension of the Goldfields Water Scheme to the north of Walgoolan and up beyond Westonia. That matter, however, does not enter into this particular vote. Beyond Mer-

redin, out of the present reach of the water scheme we have Lake Brown, Nungarin, and Yorkrakine. In those districts there are certain rock outcrops, where, it is held by those living in the neighbourhood, capital expenditure on water conservation would yield good results, enabling the stored water to be reticulated. The Government should institute inquiries with a view to definitely ascertaining whether reticulation can be effected from such centres. Failing that, the Water Supply Department should educate the settlers to make dams on their own farms, instead of incurring liability to the water scheme.

The Minister for Works: Most of the settlers reckon they know more than the department. They are always running the department down.

Mr. HARRISON: Departmental officers who have been all over the State know the holding capacity of the various soils. They have had that difficult question to contend with, and in some instances they have solved it. I ask for the assistance of the department in determining whether capital outlay for water supply on the farms would be warranted. If a farmer has his own permanent water supply, that increases the value of the property considerably. On the other hand, if the aid of the water scheme is called in, pipes will be run through farms already in possession of a water supply of their own, and a general rating system will have to be introduced. Going beyond the agricultural areas, let me point out that developments in the mining areas warrant the extension of the scheme and the granting of additional facilities. If the Minister for Mines is going to grant assistance towards prospecting, inquiries should be made into the state of preservation of the wells already sunk. Such data should be made available to intending prospectors. Only a short time ago there was a report from a party of assisted prospectors to the effect that they had been compelled to return owing to lack of water. As far as history goes back it tells us that land is of no value without a permanent water supply. That is an essential for those engaged in obtaining from Nature the yearly increment produced by climatic and soil conditions. In eastern countries, where there are deserts, the first essential is water; and here the same need obtains in only a slightly less degree. Settlers cannot live without a water supply. Metropolitan members have recently spoken ill of their own water supply, but the difficulty in that respect strikes me as insignificant compared with the people outback who are engaged in either mining or agricultural pursuits. One finds women folk compelled in some instances to drive many miles in order to obtain water for laundry work. There are districts in which water will have to be supplied by train, costing shillings per 100 gallons in rail freight, and on top of that shillings per 100 gallons in cartage by the men obtaining it from the siding. Water so obtained is absorbed by the horses employed in agricul-



tural pursuits. Frequently the greater part of the settler's time is actually spent in travelling backwards and forwards between his holding and the railway for water. When I heard metropolitan members speak last week of their difficulties, I could not help thinking of the time when I spent every second day in carting water, just to keep my horses going. Experiences of that kind make one realise the absolute need for an adequate system of water supply. The farmers should follow that up, and help themselves to get away from this water difficulty, which recurs annually without practical redress being secured. At Yorkrakine I had pointed out to me a vast rock basin situated at a high level. It was suggested that certain works could be put in there, but the capital cost involved seemed to me heavy. There is a wide gap between two walls of rock. If that could be blocked up, a vast body of water could be retained. A departmental officer, if he is an engineer and knows his business, could soon determine the difficulty of the work, its cost, the quantity of water to be retained, and the feasibility and cost of reticulating the water. All those data should be ascertained. Now I come to the question of reticulation of country town sites. which matter, I think, comes under this vote. At both Kellerberrin and Merredin it is essential that extensions should be made from the Goldfields Water Scheme in order to increase the capacity of those centres for fire fighting. Further supplies of water are needed in order to ensure a pressure of water in the event of an outbreak of fire. I refrained from speaking on the previous vote because I felt sure that this particular matter came under the present vote. It is claimed that there is need for a supply on both the north side and the south side at Merredin. The residents ask for larger pipes to admit of the fixing of hydrants to supply the hose in case of fire. There are Government buildings at Merredin, and the Merredin fire brigade have no chance of coping with an outbreak unless given a more adequate pressure of water. Lake Brown and Goomarin are still suffering from lack of water. I have already mentioned that Walgoolan and the area beyond Westonia are asking for connection with the Goldfields Water Scheme. Korbel and Belka are also in need of water supplies, and suffering for the want of them. I have been making applications to the department for assistance in behalf of these districts. As regards the metropolitan water supply, I noticed that various members, especially on this side of the House, stated that a trust or board should be established to control metropolitan water supply, sewerage, and drainage. Some years ago I suggested the same plan, and I am only too pleased to learn that so many members are now of a similar opinion. I believe that higher efficiency would result from it, and that an incidental effect would be to cause the consumers of the water to take a greater interest in the subject. It would be a good

thing for Western Australia if members of this House would foster a public opinion demanding that the metropolitan area should deal with its own particular difficulty in the matter of water supply. Then there would not be so much discussion in this Chamber year by year as to quantity and quality of the metropolitan water supply. Let the metropolitan district float a loan for a supply from the hills if metropolitan residents want it.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: Why should not your people float a loan for the supplies you are demanding?

Mr. HARRISON: How is it possible for them to do that?

Hon. W. C. Angwin: That is a horse of another colour.

Mr. HARRISON: Did the metropolitan area float a water supply loan in its early stages? Only a large and concentrated population can carry out such a financial operation.

Progress reported.

*Sitting suspended from 6.15 to 7.30 p.m.*

#### BILL—LICENSING ACT AMENDMENT.

Conference with Council.

Message from the Council received and read notifying that it agreed to a conference on amendments Nos. 7, 27, 42, 49, and 50, made by the Council in the Licensing Act Amendment Bill, and had appointed Messrs. Colebatch, Lovekin, and Holmes as managers, and fixed 7.30 p.m. as the time, and the President's room as the place, for the conference.

*Sitting suspended from 7.35 to 10.55 p.m.*

Conference Managers' Report.

The PREMIER (Hon. Sir James Mitchell—Northam) [10.55]: I desire to report that the managers appointed by the Assembly met the managers from another place and arrived at the following agreement:—

No. 7, Clause 16: The conference agrees to the retention of Subclause 3, subject to the omission of the word "Committee" in line 2.

This refers to temporary licenses being taken out by clubs, or committees, or other organising bodies.

No. 27, Clause 41: Conference agrees to the omission of the words "if in its opinion having regard to the matters referred to in Section 50 (82) a reduction is necessary," subject to the addition to the clause of the following provision:—"Provided that after June 30, 1926, the board—unless otherwise required by Parliament—may refrain from any further reduction of licenses if in its opinion, having regard to the matters referred to in Section 50, such further reduction is unnecessary."

This means a compromise. The board will operate for three and a half years, and at the end of that time it will continue its work of reduction at its discretion unless Parliament otherwise orders. The report continues—

No. 42, Clause 77: The conference agrees to the first three lines of the Council's amendment and agrees not to insert the words "traveller or."

This places upon the bona fide traveller, who claims to be one, the responsibility of proving that he is a bona fide traveller. It also permits the hotelkeeper to claim that he has taken reasonable precautions to find out that the person representing himself to be a bona fide traveller is one. It also means that the bona fide traveller will not be allowed to carry away liquor, although the bona fide lodger can do so. The report continues—

No. 49, Clause 96: The conference agrees to the retention of this clause subject to the insertion after the word "licensee," in line 7, of the words "elsewhere than in the North Province of the State."

This means that Asiatics, who are not registered as employees in hotels, will not be allowed to take employment there except in the northern portion of the State. The report continues—

No. 50, Clause 101: The conference agrees to the retention of the clause as passed by the Legislative Assembly, subject to the insertion after the word "premises," in line 8, of the words "by other than bona fide lodgers."

After closing hours a bona fide lodger will be able to play billiards and other games in hotels, but this will not apply to any other person. We objected to other than bona fide travellers going to hotels after hours, because the police could not control the sale of liquor if people were allowed to play games in hotels after that time. We, therefore, compromised in this way. I move—

That the report be adopted.

Mr. McCALLUM (South Fremantle) [11.4]: There was considerable difference of opinion respecting two paragraphs of the report. I reserved to myself the right to make my position clear so far as the compromise respecting the employment of Asiatics is concerned. Unless we had been prepared to make some concession we would have sacrificed the Bill. In order to save it, I reserved to myself the right to explain to the House, and those with whom I am associated as a Labour man, the attitude I adopted in this regard. The compromise limits the operations of the clause to the North Province, which will be exempted from the provisions of the Bill. I see in that a pernicious principle. I fought hard against it, for I am loth to see any Parliament within the Commonwealth of Australia adopt such a principle. I did my best to induce other members of the conference to turn down the proposal whereby a portion of Australia was to be mapped out as the section in which Asiatic labour would be per-

mitted as opposed to white labour. It was only the fear of losing the Bill that caused me to accept the exclusion of the North Province from this clause. I hesitated a long time as to whether I should sacrifice the Bill rather than agree to that compromise.

The Premier: We got a great deal.

Mr. McCALLUM: I fought to the last; until I saw that the whole Bill would have to go if I did not agree. I could see we had made some advance, but I regretted exceedingly that any portion of Australia should lay down the principle that a line of demarcation should be drawn, on the other side of which the employment of Asiatics at a given calling was permitted. It was only the fact that we had gained 99 per cent. out of 100 of what we were after, and were being deprived of only 1 per cent., that caused us to consent to allow this position to be brought about. Perhaps next session we shall be able to make another attempt to bring the North Province into line with the rest of the State. I am told that this will affect only ten or a dozen Asiatics. It is stated that white men cannot work in kitchens in the North, but that argument is ridiculous in face of the fact that white men work in the stake-holds of steamers travelling all over the world. The forces at the conference were too great and I was unable to get a decision that corresponded with my own wishes. It was agreed that I should have the right to explain my views to the House. I am prepared to accept the ground we have gained and make an attempt to get the rest when opportunity offers.

The Premier: I agree with you.

Mr. LAMBERT (Coolgardie) [11.10]: This is too vital a matter to allow it to pass without some comment. It seems extraordinary that the sponsors for the employment of Asiatics should adopt this course. It is a deplorable thing that this Chamber should be asked to lay down the principle that Asiatics should be permitted to be employed on licensed premises. As the member for South Fremantle (Mr. McCallum) has pointed out, those responsible for the inclusion of this provision stated distinctly that it would affect only ten or a dozen Chinamen. Where is the hardship in excluding that number of Asiatics from employment?

The Minister for Mines: Are you moving a vote of no-confidence in the member for South Fremantle?

Mr. LAMBERT: It is not a question of a vote of no-confidence. The member for South Fremantle is not the only one who should explain his position on this vital matter, which involves the question as to whether it is essential to have Asiatics working in any occupation in the North-West of this State.

Mr. Teesdale: That is all past, anyhow.

Mr. LAMBERT: Does the hon. member agree with it?

Mr. Teesdale: No, I do not, but still the Bill with the compromise is better than nothing.

Mr. LAMBERT: That does not affect the position. The question is whether we will allow another place to dictate to us on a vital principle affecting the national policy of a White Australia. If the Chinese or Japanese see that it is necessary to provide in the Bill an important stipulation allowing Asiatics to be employed in one part of the State, what will be said?

The Minister for Agriculture: But Asiatics are employed in Perth to-day. You have made a distinct step forward in connection with this policy.

Mr. Lutey: But we are asked to legalise it.

Mr. LAMBERT: Does the Minister for Agriculture agree that Chinese should be employed in the North Province?

The Minister for Mines: That is not the point.

Mr. LAMBERT: Does the Minister for Mines agree with it?

The Minister for Mines: This is not question time.

Mr. LAMBERT: At the risk of losing the Bill, we should show that this principle is so vital that we will not be dictated to by another place.

The Minister for Mines: My good fellow, if you lose the Bill you will still have Asiatics employed all over the State!

Mr. LAMBERT: In the elasticity of our dignity and decency as a Parliament, we should not permit this.

The Minister for Mines: Do you want Asiatics employed throughout the rest of the State?

Mr. LAMBERT: Does the Minister agree with the employment of Asiatics in other parts?

The Minister for Mines: No, but I want the Bill to be passed. I would rather have the Bill as it stands, than lose the lot.

Mr. LAMBERT: I do not know that we made a step forward when we provided for such a dangerous and pernicious principle.

Mr. J. Thomson: It is legal now.

Mr. LAMBERT: It would not be legal for one day if the members of the Opposition had an opportunity to alter it. The report should be referred back to the managers for further consideration. Is it competent, Mr. Deputy Speaker, for me to move that the report be referred back?

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: No.

The Premier: We will be in Committee soon and you can discuss it then.

Mr. LAMBERT: Under what Standing Order does the Deputy Speaker rule it is not competent for a private member to refer such a report back to the managers?

The PREMIER: On a point of order, may I point out that we will discuss the items in the report seriatim when we are in Committee in a few minutes. This matter can be debated at length then.

Mr. Marshall: What is the ruling of the Deputy Speaker on the point raised by the member for Coolgardie?

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: There is no Standing Order dealing with it. The matter

has gone as far as the Standing Orders will permit. When a deadlock occurs, the question is referred to a conference. In this case the managers have presented a report on which they were unanimous and that report is before the House for adoption—

Hon. T. Walker: Or rejection.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: The member for Coolgardie is in order in suggesting that the report be referred back to the conference but I, as Deputy Speaker, cannot accept the amendment he suggests.

Mr. LAMBERT: I respectfully suggest that the report should be referred back to the managers. I am cognisant of the fact that we have made a step forward in the Bill, but considering that there are only a few who will be affected if we do not permit the continuance of their employment, it would be degrading for the House, without straining their constitutional powers and privileges, to override a principle laid down by the House that will not allow Asiatics to be employed in this particular calling. I suggest that the principle is too vital for the Premier to agree to exempting any part of the State, particularly the North-West.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN (North-East Fremantle) [11.17]: It would be advisable to accept the report of the managers. If we do not, the Bill will be lost.

Mr. Teesdale: Lost for the sake of 10 Chows!

Mr. Munsie: It is better to lose the Bill, than legalise their employment.

Mr. Teesdale: But they are legally employed now.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: I have reasons why we should accept the report, but I do not wish to give them. It is better to adopt the report, otherwise the Bill will be dropped.

Mr. MUNSIE (Hannans) [11.18]: If the report of the managers be adopted, according to the Premier we will have the right to discuss the amendments in Committee. If the report be adopted, however, shall we have the right to alter any of the recommendations in Committee?

The Premier: You will lose the Bill if you do.

The PREMIER (Hon. Sir James Mitchell—Northam) [11.19]: If we do not accept the report of the managers, we will lose the Bill, because we are at the last stage, after many trials. As to the remarks of the member for Coolgardie (Mr. Lambert), we have gained a great deal in the clause as it stands now. Asiatics who are in the State must be permitted to earn a living. When we say that unless those at present working in hotels are registered they shall not be allowed to work in future, we accomplish a good deal, even though we except the North Province from those conditions. That is a very big step forward. It would be ridiculous to lose what has been gained just because we are not to get all we should like to get. These Asiatics

are here; no others can come in. Those here must be permitted to earn their living. To-day they can do so without any restriction whatever.

Mr. WILLCOCK (Geraldton) [11.22]: Once we have adopted the report of the managers, what will be the use of our going into Committee?

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: In Committee any of the amendments may be amended. We adopt the report now so that we can go into Committee to deal with the amendments. The adoption of the report does not mean that we carry any of the amendments. All of them may be rejected in Committee, but not at this stage.

The Minister for Mines: The amending of any of these amendments now would mean the losing of the Bill.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Only in Committee can the amendments be dealt with.

Mr. WILLCOCK: If we were to amend any of the amendments at this stage, the whole report would be lost?

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Yes.

The Minister for Mines: This is the final stage. We cannot proceed any further.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: It is the end of the Bill if we amend any of the amendments.

Mr. WILLCOCK: Well, what is the use of our going into Committee? I do not feel disposed to vote for this report. I would vote against the whole Bill rather than definitely brand the North as a black man's country.

The Minister for Mines: It is a pretty rotten attitude for you to adopt towards your own colleague.

Mr. MUNSIE (Hannans) [11.25]: A little while ago I asked whether we had the right to amend the amendments in Committee. You, Sir, did not reply. As I see it, this is the position: If the report be adopted it will not be possible for us to amend any of the amendments without losing the Bill.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: That is the position.

Mr. MUNSIE: I will vote against the adoption of the report. I commend the member for South Fremantle on his attitude. We have been told during the last six or seven years that the North is the menace to Australia; yet here we are, members of Parliament, prepared to admit that we must have black labour in the North.

The Premier: We do not admit anything of the sort.

Mr. MUNSIE: The adoption of the report will be a full admission of that. The Bill provides for the employment of Asiatics other than registered Asiatics.

The Premier: They are employed to-day.

Mr. MUNSIE: Yet the Premier says he does not endorse black labour for the North, although he is prepared to accept the Council's amendment which exempts the North from the provisions of the Bill.

Mr. Teesdale: It is leaving things as they are. It is no innovation.

Mr. MUNSIE: By the adoption of the report we shall be saying Asiatics cannot be employed in the South, but that their employment in the North is legal. Why should another place dictate to us all the time? When the Labour Government were in power the Council refused to allow us to do anything at all. However, on this occasion I am not prepared to sit back for them or anybody else. It is the duty of the House to back up the member for South Fremantle and refuse to allow another place to dictate to us on the legalising of Asiatics in the North.

The Minister for Mines: You are not doing that.

Mr. MUNSIE: Yes we are.

The Minister for Mines: On your attitude they would be legalised throughout the State, whereas the member for South Fremantle would legalise their employment, but only in the North.

Mr. MUNSIE: To-day the Chinese are permitted on the goldfields. I admired the Premier for striving against another place to get what we wanted. Personally I do not feel disposed to back down. I admire the attitude of the member for South Fremantle (Mr. McCallum).

The Minister for Mines: He has not backed down.

Mr. MUNSIE: I know he has not done so, and I for one am prepared to support him and not allow him to back down. I will support him even if it comes to a division. I will not adopt this report with the knowledge that I cannot alter it in Committee. The only chance I have to alter it is now. It is up to us to say that we are not going to legalise the employment of Asiatics in the North-West.

The MINISTER FOR MINES (Hon. J. Scaddan—Albany) [11.32]: The position in which the last speaker is placing himself at the moment is that if he disagrees with this report, he loses the Bill, and thereby loses so much as the member for South Fremantle (Mr. McCallum) fought for in the Conference and obtained. The existing law is that Asiatics may be employed in hotels without let or hindrance in every part of the State.

Mr. Munsie: Place the responsibility where it belongs, not on me!

Mr. Hughes: If we adopt the report, we lose the white Australia policy.

The MINISTER FOR MINES: We have these Asiatics employed in our hotels now. When the white Australia policy as advocated and fought for by the member for South Fremantle is adopted, they will be excluded from Western Australian hotels except as regards a very small portion of the State. Is it not infinitely preferable, then, to obtain what this Bill gives? Let us secure the exclusion of Asiatics from the whole of the State except the North-West. If the position were that we could amend the Bill and have still further consideration of the measure there

might be some justification for the attitude of the member for Hannans (Mr. Munsie). But the only course for this Chamber is to accept what has been secured by the member for South Fremantle or allow existing conditions to remain.

Mr. Lambert: No. Refer the report back.

The MINISTER FOR MINES: The hon. member interjecting forgets that from the moment the two Chambers appoint managers, each Chamber must agree entirely with the report of the managers or else lose the Bill.

Mr. Lambert: We will have the other Chamber known as the "Chinkie" Chamber.

The MINISTER FOR MINES: That does not help us towards arriving at a decision in this matter. The other Chamber also has to accept the report in its entirety, or be responsible for the loss of the Bill. We are in exactly the same position.

Mr. Munsie: We are asked to endorse the employment of Asiatics in the North-West, a thing which I am not going to do.

The MINISTER FOR MINES: I ask the hon. member to answer this question, is it not better to endorse the continuance of employment of a few Asiatics in the North than to be responsible for continuing their employment throughout the State?

Mr. Munsie: This is the first time we have ever dealt with the matter in this House, and I will not agree to the proposal.

The MINISTER FOR MINES: The hon. member has had the opportunity of dealing with the question whenever licensing measures have been before Parliament. The member for South Fremantle fought to the last ditch in order to obtain something. Now he finds members on his side of the House adopting an attitude by which what he has gained will be lost and nothing gained in its place.

Mr. Lutey: There is a principle involved in this.

The MINISTER FOR MINES: The principle seems to be that if one cannot afford to give a man a whole loaf one should give him nothing.

Mr. Lutey: The clause legalises the employment of Asiatics.

The MINISTER FOR MINES: The employment of Asiatics is legal to-day. By accepting the report we shall be excluding them from employment in hotels except as regards a very small portion of the State. Hon. members have to consider whether they will accept 99 per cent. of what they want and one per cent. with which they disagree, or because they cannot secure the additional one per cent., lose the 99.

Mr. Marshall: Will the people of this State know who is debarring them from that 1 per cent.?

The MINISTER FOR MINES: The hon. member can ascertain from the division lists of another place exactly how members there voted. The Assembly managers, led by the Premier, disagreed up to the last possible point. Whatever the opinions and desires of the member for Hannans (Mr. Munsie) may be, he will have to face a similar Chamber

when another amendment dealing with this matter is introduced later on.

Mr. Munsie: Let us face it.

The MINISTER FOR MINES: To my mind it is much better in the circumstances to obtain 99 per cent. than to lose the lot.

Mr. Lambert: The sooner we face that other Chamber the better.

The MINISTER FOR MINES: I have heard that said for years past, but we have always faced another Chamber with our backs. It is all very well to say such things here, but when it comes to meeting another Chamber in the only place where we can meet it, the position is very difficult. I know the feelings of the member for Hannans on this subject. I also know what the Premier feels, and the feelings of the member for South Fremantle. The difference between the member for Hannans and the member for South Fremantle, while the one is quite as earnest as the other—

Mr. Munsie: I know that.

The MINISTER FOR MINES: The difference is that the member for South Fremantle, says, "I will take the 99 per cent. rather than lose the lot."

Mr. Munsie: The member for South Fremantle made his position clear to this House.

The MINISTER FOR MINES: Yes, and the member for Hannans has made his position clear. But where will the hon. member place us if by his action we lose the Bill, and lose the 99 per cent. which the member for South Fremantle has gained?

Mr. Munsie: I am prepared to take the responsibility.

The MINISTER FOR MINES: I want hon. members to know exactly what it means. I contend it is infinitely preferable to adopt the attitude of the member for South Fremantle and take the 99 per cent., rather than adopt the attitude of the member for Hannans and lose everything while gaining nothing. That is the point.

Mr. LATHAM (York) [11.38]: In view of the fact that I was concerned in the conference I wish to make my position clear regarding this particular matter. I looked at it in this light, that some years ago the Commonwealth Parliament passed an Alien Immigration Restriction Act declaring that no more Asiatics should be permitted to come here. But the Commonwealth did not say that we should starve such Asiatics as are here. I assisted the member for South Fremantle in his endeavour to carry his point. In the result, this Chamber has given away nothing but has gained a great deal. Under the clause, the employment of Asiatics in hotels will be permitted in only one portion of the State, namely, the North, and only such Asiatics as are registered can be employed. In the North Chinese are already employed in various duties. I quite agree that it would be preferable to get rid of every Asiatic here. In the meantime the Assembly managers decided to accept a compromise.

Mr. Lutey: By this clause you say that the North is a black man's country.

Mr. LATHAM: No. The clause merely says that Asiatics may be employed in hotels in the North, where white women will certainly not come into competition with them. In the North Province the employment of Asiatics will cause least harm.

Mr. Lambert: That is not the point.

Mr. Corboy: It admits that the North is different from the South.

Mr. Money: Well, it is.

Mr. LATHAM: It is slightly different. In the metropolitan area white women are entering into competition with the Chinamen.

Mr. Lambert: A lot of the public love the yellow Chows.

Mr. LATHAM: In the North Province women do not enter into competition with the Chinese cooks. We are restricting the scope of the Chinese considerably. I am not in favour of the employment of Chinese in hotels; I should like to see white men employed.

Mr. Lambert: Let us refer the report back to the managers.

Mr. LATHAM: I am going to vote for the adoption of the report.

Mr. HUGHES (East Perth) [11.41]: The question at stake is whether we are prepared to admit that there is a difference between the northern and southern portions of the State in respect to the White Australia policy.

Mr. Underwood: You do in the Arbitration Court.

Mr. Munsie: We do not.

Mr. HUGHES: Let the House accept the responsibility for what it does, and never mind the court at present. If we accept the amendment dictated by another place, we shall be admitting the thin end of the wedge into the White Australian policy.

The Premier: Oh, no.

Mr. HUGHES: We shall be admitting that it is not a good thing to have Chinamen employed in the southern portions of the State, but that it is a good thing to have them employed in the northern part of the State.

Mr. Latham: They must have an opportunity to earn a living while they are here.

Mr. HUGHES: Then how will they get on in the South? Why differentiate between Chinamen in the South and Chinamen in the North? Is not the Chinaman in the South to earn a living, too?

Mr. Lambert: Why not be a bit more concerned about good Australians earning a living?

Mr. HUGHES: We have always maintained that the white man can work in the North and we stand for a White Australia.

Mr. Teesdale: You are barring them only in hotels down here.

Mr. HUGHES: I hope the day is not far distant when we shall bar them elsewhere. Our friends want to get in the thin edge of the wedge by admitting them to the North. We are getting in the thin end of the wedge by barring them in the South.

Mr. Willcock: We have barred them all over the State.

Mr. HUGHES: If we vote for the report, it will be an admission that Asiatic labour is necessary in the northern parts of the State.

Mr. J. Thomson: Asiatics are employed now—at pearling.

Mr. HUGHES: Of course they are.

Mr. Munsie: Do not you want to stop them wherever you can?

Mr. HUGHES: That is not a fair comparison.

Mr. J. Thomson: It is.

Mr. HUGHES: Parliament has not stated that they shall, or shall not be employed at pearling.

Mr. Mann: We have just dealt with the Pearling Amendment Bill, under which Asiatic labour is permitted.

Mr. HUGHES: That is a different thing. We are going to declare that in one part of the State Chinamen should be employed.

Mr. J. Thomson: That is rubbish.

Mr. HUGHES: No doubt the hon. member would like to see Chinamen all over the State.

Mr. J. Thomson: I would not.

Mr. HUGHES: Of course I should not pit my opinion on rubbish against that of the hon. member.

The Premier: No one wants Chinamen all over the State.

Mr. J. Thomson: If you want to see a white woman in Derby or Broome, well—

Mr. HUGHES: It is a question whether we stand for the White Australia policy or not.

Mr. J. Thomson: It is not. It is rubbish to talk like that.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. J. Thomson: I have been there.

Mr. HUGHES: With the rubbish or in the North? Although we have gained a lot under the Bill, the fact of us being called upon to admit by our votes that it is necessary to employ Asiatics in hotels in the North, and unnecessary in the South, makes the price too high. We should not be asked to pay for a little success such a price as is represented by an amendment establishing the obnoxious precedent of admitting that the White Australia policy is good for only a portion of the State. I am not prepared to pay that price. Sooner than let such a precedent be created and the thin end of the wedge inserted in the White Australia policy in that way, I would allow all the amendments and all we have gained to go by the board. I shall vote against the adoption of the report.

Capt. CARTER (Leederville) [11.47]: The main thought in the minds of members on the Opposition side of the House is that which they themselves have raised or manufactured, namely the legalising of the employment of Asiatics. I have yet to learn that the report of the conference means the legalising of the employment of Asiatics.

Mr. Munsie: Of course it does.

Mr. Lambert: Then what does it mean?

Capt. CARTER: It means that whereas to-day Asiatics may be employed over 95 per cent. of the area of the State, in future they may no longer be employed on licensed premises except in about 5 per cent. of the State, and it is not mandatory to employ them there. This amendment will not legalise the employment of Asiatics.

Mr. Munsie: Of course it will.

Capt. CARTER: And it will not make it mandatory on licensees to employ them. It merely states that in the northern area they may be employed. I give place to no man in my desire to see the White Australia policy upheld.

Mr. Lambert: Well, show it.

Capt. CARTER: I have shown it in many practical ways in which perhaps the hon. member has not shown it.

Mr. Lambert: Do not talk that damned nonsense to me

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: The member for Coolgardie must not use that language.

Mr. Lambert: I rise to a point of order.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: What is the point of order?

Mr. Lambert: I shall not allow the hon. member, in his garrulous nonsense, to speak like that.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: What is the point of order?

Mr. Lambert: I take exception to the remarks of the hon. member that he has probably shown his desire to uphold the White Australia policy in certain ways in which I have not.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I do not think that is a good point of order.

Mr. Lambert: Oh, you don't?

Capt. CARTER: I ask that the member for Coolgardie now withdraw what he said about my talking damned nonsense.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: That language is unparliamentary and I ask for a withdrawal.

Mr. Lambert: I withdraw.

Capt. CARTER: I admit the member for Coolgardie is a good judge of that sort of nonsense.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. Lambert: That is distinctly in keeping with your soldier-like ideas of decency.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Will the hon. member proceed with the business before the House.

Capt. CARTER: I was about to say, when I was so rudely interrupted, there is no intention under the decisions of the conference to legalise the employment of Asiatics.

Mr. Munsie: There may not be any intention, but we shall be doing so.

Capt. CARTER: We shall not be doing so.

Mr. Munsie: I am satisfied that we shall be.

Capt. CARTER: I commend the member for South Fremantle (Mr. McCallum) for the attitude he has taken up. He has fought for a principle to-night. As any good tactician would do he has accepted nine-tenths of his gains instead of striving for the whole. Surely the House will not reject the whole Bill for the sake of a small part, for this would mean throwing out a measure that we have striven for over many sessions. For the illogical reasons that have been put up by members opposite are we going to lose the result of the work of this session? If we were all honest in our desire to retain the White Australia policy there would be fewer Asiatics employed in the State than there are to-day. Only a few weeks ago I was astonished, when receiving answers to my questions here, to learn the number of Asiatics employed in Western Australia. Members would be equally astonished if they would refer to the figures. I agree that as they are here we have certain responsibilities towards them. One of the most practical ways of showing our appreciation of a White Australia policy, and our desire to retain it, is to support the white man every time. We can well accept this compromise, which has been arranged after a great struggle by the representatives of all parties in this House.

Mr. LUTEY (Brownhill-Ivanhoe) [11.53]: I intend to vote against the motion for the adoption of this report. I would sooner see the Bill lost than agree to this particular amendment. This House has taken a stand, but the conference has differentiated between the north and the south of Western Australia. Under the existing legislation new Asiatics are debarred from working in the various trades. We have established a precedent in that direction, and we did the same thing in this Assembly after deliberating the point now under review. We should be stultifying ourselves if we accepted the amendment of the Council. I would sooner lose the Bill than bow the knee to members of another place.

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

Ayes	..	..	..	..	25
Noes	..	..	..	..	12
Majority for					13

#### AYES.

Mr. Angelo	Mr. Mann
Mr. Angwin	Sir James Mitchell
Mr. Carter	Mr. Money
Mr. Corboy	Mr. Pickering
Mr. Denton	Mr. Piesse
Mr. George	Mr. Richardson
Mr. Gibson	Mr. Sampson
Mr. Harrison	Mr. Scaddan
Mr. Hickmott	Mr. Teesdale
Mr. Johnston	Mr. J. Thomson
Mr. Latham	Mr. Underwood
Mr. C. C. Maley	Mr. Mullany
Mr. H. K. Maley	(Teller.)

## NOES.

Mr. Chesson  
Mr. Clydesdale  
Mr. Hughes  
Mr. Lambert  
Mr. Lutey  
Mr. Marshall  
Mr. McCallum

Mr. Munsie  
Mr. Walker  
Mr. Willcock  
Mr. Willson  
Mr. Heron

(Teller.)

Question thus passed.

On motion by the Premier the Council's Message recommitted.

In Committee.

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

The PREMIER: The first paragraph of the managers' report is as follows:—

No. 7. Clause 16.—The conference agrees to the retention of Subclause 3, subject to the omission of the word "committee" in line 2.

I move—

That the conference recommendation be adopted.

Question put and passed.

The PREMIER: The second paragraph of the report says—

No. 27. Clause 41.—The conference agrees to the omission of the words "if in its opinion, having regard to the matters referred to in Section 50 (82) a reduction is necessary," subject to the addition to the clause of the following proviso:—"Provided that after the 30th June, 1926, the board—unless otherwise required by Parliament—may refrain from any further reduction of licenses if in its opinion, having regard to the matters referred to in Section 50, such further reduction is unnecessary."

I move—

That the conference recommendation be adopted.

Question put and passed.

12 o'clock midnight.

No. 42. Clause 77—Conference agrees to the first three lines of the Council's amendment and agrees not to insert the words "traveller or."

The PREMIER: I move—

That the Conference recommendation be adopted.

The compromise will mean the re-enacting of Clause 102 of the Bill and consequently bona fide travellers will not be permitted to carry away liquor from licensed premises.

Question put and passed.

No. 49. Clause 96—Conference agrees to the retention of this clause subject to the insertion after the word "licensee" in line 7 of the words "elsewhere than in the north province of the State."

The PREMIER: I move—

That the Conference recommendation be adopted.

This will mean that except in the North Province of the State Asiatics will not be employed in future other than those who will be registered under the measure.

Mr. McCALLUM: There will be considerable discussion throughout the State on this question, particularly amongst the people represented by members sitting on the Opposition side of the House. I appreciate very much the position of the two Opposition members who voted with the Government for the adoption of the report, knowing that they desired to save the advance made in the Bill towards the goal for which the Labour movement stands. I admit that that desire is not confined to the Labour movement, because I have to acknowledge that the Premier and the member for York helped very considerably in arriving at that decision.

Mr. Teesdale: This is how some members appreciate it!

Mr. Heron: We have a right to our own opinions.

Mr. McCALLUM: It is entirely due to the attitude of members in another place that we had to compromise. The Premier and the member for York had no desire to compromise and both urged the adoption of the clause as it left this Chamber. It is only with the object of retaining the progress that has been made that I am convinced the votes just recorded were cast. When the Licensing Commission were investigating the position of the liquor trade, we made inquiries wherever we went as to the employment of Asiatics. There was no portion of the State visited where any objection was raised to the employment of white people in preference to Asiatics.

Mr. Munsie: It is because the Upper House is trying to thrust their will upon us, that we should make this protest and we should throw the onus on that House.

Mr. McCALLUM: It is purely prejudice that exists in the minds of some people that has caused this position to arise. At one time, practically every hotel in Fremantle employed an Asiatic cook. When the representatives of the union approached the licensees with the object of substituting white labour, the employers said that they could not get reliable white cooks and that the only reliable cooks were Asiatics.

Mr. Hughes: You mean servile.

Mr. McCALLUM: When the union representatives gave the employers a guarantee that they would provide reliable labour, the employers took them at their word. From that time, no Asiatic has been employed in any hotel in the Fremantle Licensing district. In the metropolitan area, there are six Asiatics employed to-day. Last session I endeavoured, when we were discussing the Licensing Bill then before the Chamber, to provide that hotels employing Asiatics should be forced to notify the public to that effect.



Mr. Munsie: So they should. Those who employ Asiatics in the manufacture of furniture have to brand their output to show that it was made by Chinese.

The Premier: You cannot brand food at hotels.

Mr. McCALLUM: That is so, but I wanted the windows abutting on streets branded with the face of a Chinaman to show that that hotel was employing a Chinese. I gave notice of motion to have such a provision in the Bill. Last session, however, we did not reach the portion of the Bill dealing with that matter. I can claim that I was responsible for the recommendation of the Royal Commission being brought forward. The Government agreed to the proposal and the Premier, in particular, was desirous of getting the clause through as it stands. When we were discussing the matter at conference we were told there was no possible hope of the clause going through as it stood and the only way to get it dealt with was by way of this compromise. One member said that if the clause were agreed to as it stood, he would leave the conference. That was the end of it.

Mr. Wilson: Then he won!

Mr. McCALLUM: No, he did not win because he wanted the whole clause struck out. That particular member, however, changed his front when the suggestion was made that we should exclude immediately all other portions of the State except the North Province. That would enable all the Asiatics to drift up to the North-West and secure employment there. When that proposition was advanced, the member in question changed his attitude, and would not agree to any such proposition. The only hope we had of getting the clause through was by agreeing to the exemption of the North Province. I take the strongest exception to Parliament agreeing to a proviso which in its fundamentals will set out that there is any section of Australia where white people cannot be employed. That is the principle laid down in the proviso. In effect it says that cooking in the North-West cannot be done by white labour.

The Premier: It does not say that.

Mr. Munsie: It means it just the same.

Mr. McCALLUM: It is the proposal set out in the clause as amended and states clearly that work in hotel kitchens in the North-West is not a job fit for white labour. It is only a question of comparison for there are other jobs which are more objectionable than those associated with hotel kitchens. If cooking in hotels is not fit for white people, then there are other jobs which are much less suitable.

Mr. Heron: But that is what they want us to say.

Mr. McCALLUM: I am convinced of that.

The Premier: I do not know who the devil wants to be a cook anyway.

Mr. Willcock: There are lots of them.

The Minister for Works: They say the devil made cooks.

Mr. McCALLUM: I know there are plenty of people who want to be cooks and there are

plenty of people who could not live if there were no cooks. I tried my best to get the clause in the form in which it left this Chamber, but it was impossible to achieve that result. I do not agree with the argument that this is a precedent for legalising the employment of Asiatics. On the contrary it makes illegal the employment of Asiatic cooks in all other parts of the State, whereas to-day it is legal to employ them in any part of the State. We have made that advance, and we say that with the exception of the North it is illegal to employ an Asiatic as a cook on licensed premises. I regretted having to compromise. I held up the conference as long as possible, but I was not prepared to sacrifice 99 per cent. of the Bill for one district. I have seized this first opportunity offering since I have been here to wipe Asiatics out of that employment except in the North, and I hope that before long we shall be able to achieve the 100 per cent.

Mr. WILLCOCK: I still urge the Committee to reject the amendment, no matter what effect it may have. It implies that white men cannot do the cooking up there. Many years ago the shearers demonstrated that white men could and should be employed in the North. If we allow differentiation between one part of the State and another, there must be some necessity for it.

The Premier: Nothing of the sort.

Mr. WILLCOCK: Well, why tinker with a great principle if it be not necessary? The view of those behind this amendment is that the North is not for the employment of white men.

Mr. Teesdale: We are not doing anything new; we are merely leaving things as they are.

Mr. WILLCOCK: But the shearers and the Australian Workers' Union were not content to leave things as they were. White cooks are able to satisfy the shearers up there.

The Minister for Mines: You will admit that white men are capable of selling fruit and vegetables.

Mr. WILLCOCK: Certainly.

The Minister for Mines: Well, a white man would have a pretty hard task doing it against Chinamen in Barrack-street.

Mr. WILLCOCK: I have never bought fruit and vegetables from Chinamen.

The Minister for Mines: But I know many who do.

Mr. WILLCOCK: Yes, and I know men who go to the Weld Club and take a drink from a Chinese harman. The Chinaman is a dirty person, wherever you meet him. I cannot forget the old doggerel:—

Now this child of the Mia

Begot by the Squire

By the Chinese cook was courted;

For the squatter somehow

Seems to love the Chow

Because he's cheap and dirty and imported.

We should not have these people preparing our food. We have definitely limited their employment in the furniture trade.

Mr. Munsie: And they have to stamp the furniture they work upon, so that people shall know.

Mr. WILLCOCK: One cannot find a young Chinaman in the furniture trade.

Mr. Underwood: No, because of the Commonwealth law.

Mr. WILLCOCK: Despite the Commonwealth law some of them get into the Commonwealth. The principle contained in the Bill that, provided an Asiatic is already employed, we shall not debar him from continuing in his employment, is quite sufficient of a concession. Yet now it is proposed to drive them all up North.

The Premier: Nothing of the sort.

Mr. WILLCOCK: Well, those employed on licensed premises.

Mr. Underwood: To every licensed house there are 20 other places where a Chinaman can be employed.

Mr. WILLCOCK: I should not have him employed anywhere.

The Minister for Mines: Well, there is plenty of scope for your propaganda in Barrack-street.

Mr. WILLCOCK: The Minister himself would wipe out the Chinese if he could. We should not give any greater concession than we have already provided in the Bill.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: I am as much against the employment of Asiatics as is any other member. Still, we have to realise that the clause provides, not that Chinamen shall be employed, but that they shall not be employed anywhere but in the North-West. To-day they can be employed in every hotel in Western Australia. As soon as the Bill passes, their employment must be restricted to the North. I am not prepared to sacrifice the work of the House because this provision has been agreed to by the conference managers. It would be wrong to sacrifice the Bill merely because this clause does not go the whole hog. Some are anxious to introduce Asiatics into the North, and it is held that the clause will further that. I do not agree that it is so. At present Asiatics are employed all over the State, including the goldfields.

Mr. Munsie: Not on the goldfields.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: I have seen Japanese in employment on the goldfields.

Mr. Munsie: Not on licensed premises.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: They were employed on the goldfields. This provision prohibits the employment of Asiatics in every portion of Western Australia except the North-West. Therefore we have nothing to gain by defeating the Bill because of this one clause. The member for South Fremantle has done well. He has worked hard and fought well to get the full provision which we desired. He has failed to achieve that. It was a matter of striking out the clause altogether, and having Asiatics employed throughout the State, or else losing the Bill. The whole question now is whether we shall accept the Bill or reject it. I am not prepared to sacrifice the measure just on this one point.

Mr. CORBOY: I consider the principle of defining an area of the State as more suited to the employment of Asiatics than that of whites as a wrong one. I am just as strongly opposed to the encouragement of Asiatics in this country as is any member of this Chamber. I have always practised that belief, and so have my people, who in my lifetime have never dealt with a Chinaman. I am absolutely opposed to Asiatics being in the country at all. If to-day there was an embargo in this State on the employment of Asiatics in hotels, and if we had before us a proposal to lift that embargo as regards the northern portion of the State, I would resist the proposal by every means in my power. But, instead of that being the position, Asiatics are, as a matter of fact, permitted to be employed in hotels throughout the State; and I now have the opportunity of prohibiting their employment in all parts of Western Australia except one province. I consider I would be foolish in losing the opportunity. While regretting that the member for South Fremantle was not more successful in his efforts, I intend to vote for the adoption of the report and thus get half a loaf, the whole loaf being unobtainable.

Mr. MUNSIE: Let me again emphasise the point made by the member for South Fremantle. Undoubtedly, every time the question of employment of Asiatics comes up, a certain section are found saying that Asiatics cannot be done without. The member for South Fremantle pointed out that this contention was raised as regards Asiatic cooks in Fremantle, where, however, they are now done without. A similar argument has been put forward in behalf of dozens of other places in Western Australia. We do not employ a Chinese cook in Parliament House, and the man who is not satisfied with the victuals cooked here by white people is not fit to be in the country at all.

The Minister for Mines: You are all the time confusing Asiatics with Chinamen. There are other Asiatics besides Chinese.

Mr. MUNSIE: The Minister knows that 99 per cent. of the Asiatics employed as cooks are Chinese.

Mr. Mann: You are wrong there. There are many Japanese cooks.

Mr. MUNSIE: Take the Perth hotels.

Mr. Mann: Take the country hotels.

Mr. MUNSIE: The vast majority of the Asiatic cooks employed are Chinese. Even if they were Japanese, I would say the licensees had no right to employ them.

Mr. Lambert: The Japanese are a still greater danger.

Mr. MUNSIE: I have as strong an objection to the Japanese cook as I have to the Chinese cook.

The Minister for Mines: This is not a question of cooking, but of employment in hotels.

Mr. MUNSIE: I admit that in the North-West some Asiatics are employed as barmen. They should not be there at all.

Mr. Mann: Where are Asiatics employed as barmen?

Mr. MUNSIE: If the hon. member has ever been in Broome, he has been served by Japanese barmen.

Mr. Mann: No. They are all white men and white women.

Mr. MUNSIE: The next step will be a demand for the employment of Asiatics as barmen in the North-West. Why do certain employers want Asiatics in the North-West? Simply because the Asiatic is cheaper than the white man. It is time this House refused to be dictated to by another place on a matter of principle, affecting the policy of a White Australia, and not merely a white Western Australia.

Mr. Underwood: That is not a Labour policy.

Mr. MUNSIE: No. That principle is believed in by every section of the Australian people except the Upper House of this State.

Mr. Marshall: They ought to be proud of themselves, those 14.

Mr. MUNSIE: It is time they were put in their place. I shall take care to have the action of the Council managers at this conference made known to the people. We know that certain representatives of the North want to get employees a few pounds cheaper. It is just as well for the people to know who those representatives are.

Mr. Underwood: The people in the North Province have done good work for this State.

Mr. MUNSIE: The hon. member cannot put the argument off in that way. I have often said on the floor of this House that the men who pioneered the North-West deserve everything they have got. I am not decrying them. I know the hardships they had to put up with. But the hon. member cannot put off the argument in that fashion.

Mr. Underwood: Why use it, anyhow?

Mr. MUNSIE: I am not using it. The hon. member is using it. But the best people who pioneered the North-West do not want the Chow and the Jap. This provision is an absolute disgrace to Australia.

Mr. UNDERWOOD: There has been a continuous change for the last 10 years in the North-West, the Asiatics going out of employment, particularly on stations, and women, Australian or British, coming in as cooks.

Mr. Munsie: I travelled through 180 miles of station properties and not a white man or woman was employed. All the employees were niggers and Japs.

Mr. UNDERWOOD: The hon. and dogmatic member for Hannans has travelled through 180 miles of country that extends for thousands of miles!

Mr. Munsie: I went through thousands of miles.

Mr. Lutey: Better dogmatic than apologetic.

Mr. UNDERWOOD: Notwithstanding the assertions of the member for Hannans, the number of Asiatics in the North-West is decreasing materially. This is due to the fact

that Asiatics are denied admission into Australia. The Deputy Leader of the Country Party stated that white women could not work in the North-West. I am pleased to say that women are taking the places of Asiatics as station cooks.

Mr. Munsie: Yes, and as hotel cooks.

Mr. UNDERWOOD: Quite so. I do not intend to enter upon a discussion of the Asiatic question. The policy of Australia is the non-admission of Asiatics.

Mr. Munsie: With the exception of our Upper House who want black labour.

Mr. UNDERWOOD: This is not the Labour Party's policy. If it was, it could not to-day be the policy, because the Labour Party have not the power to enforce it.

Mr. Munsie: We were the first to advocate it.

The CHAIRMAN: The member for Hannans will have an opportunity later on to contradict any statement with which he disagrees.

Mr. UNDERWOOD: The policy of a White Australia was advocated before there was any Labour Party in Australia. When members of the Opposition contend that they are the only people who want a White Australia, they are going on pure assumption.

Mr. J. Thomson: They imagine it.

Mr. UNDERWOOD: Not at all, but it might cut some ice at election times—

Mr. Munsie: And outside election times, too.

Mr. UNDERWOOD: But only with very unthinking voters.

Mr. Hughes: Who are the champions of black labour to-day? Those opposed to labour. To which party does black Barwell belong?

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

Mr. UNDERWOOD: This recommendation would affect at the most only 13 Asiatics. This being so, why throw the Bill out? There is a big principle involved, namely, whether we shall employ Asiatics all over Western Australia or confine their employment to the North Province. Those who vote to employ them all over Western Australia as against confining them to the North Province will not be voting against Asiatic labour.

Mr. CHESSON: I protest against this recommendation. Members will be voting to allow licensees in the North to employ Asiatics and will be supporting the contention of some members of the Council that the North-West is a black man's country.

The Premier: Asiatics have been employed there for years.

Mr. CHESSON: I know the northern portion of the State as well as most people. The member for Pilbara (Mr. Underwood) argued that the Labour Party were not responsible for the White Australia policy.

Mr. Underwood: Not the only people.

Mr. CHESSON: I remember when none but Kanaka labour was employed on the plantations of Queensland. It was argued that white men could not work there. Only since the advent of Federation and through the efforts of the Labour Party have the Kanakas

been excluded from the Queensland plantations.

Mr. Underwood: They were excluded before that.

Mr. CHESSON: It has been proved that white men can work in those plantations and can produce better results than coloured labour. It has been proved in the North-West that white people can do the cooking in a cleaner and better way than can Asiatics. The shearers have also proved that white men can work in the tropics. I protest against the statement that cooking on licensed premises in the North can be done only by Asiatics. I hope we will not agree to what has been done by the managers on this question.

Mr. LAMBERT: There are some members in another place so blind to Australian sentiment that they advocate the employment of black labour within the Commonwealth. Some have stated it is essential for the development of the north that we should employ black labour.

Mr. Teesdale: No one said that here.

The Minister for Mines: No one in this Chamber stands for it.

Mr. LAMBERT: I am speaking of another place.

Mr. Munsie: Whose dictation we are accepting here.

Mr. LAMBERT: Before whose dictation we are humbly grovelling.

Mr. Teesdale: They have some rights, surely.

Mr. LAMBERT: I do not grudge them their rights.

Mr. Teesdale: You give me a go. You have had three goes already.

Mr. LAMBERT: The hon. member can have a go when he likes, politically or otherwise.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! Hon. members must not issue challenges to one another.

Mr. LAMBERT: We do not want another clown in the circus.

The CHAIRMAN: I hope you are not referring to any member here.

Mr. LAMBERT: Oh, no!

The CHAIRMAN: It would be a gross reflection on members if you did.

Mr. LAMBERT: I also desire to have a go. The member for Pilbara has admitted there are only 13 Asiatics involved, and yet he argues in favour of the decision of the conference. How can members support the necessity for providing for the employment of 13 Asiatics? I can usually listen to the Minister for Works when I have sufficient forbearance.

The Minister for Works: To what are you referring? I have not said a word to you.

The CHAIRMAN: Will the hon. member proceed.

Mr. LAMBERT: The Minister is as courteous as usual in his dumb insolence.

The CHAIRMAN: Get on with the subject.

Mr. LAMBERT: Those who support this exemption should show the necessity for it.

The Minister for Mines: You show that the North should not be exempted.

Mr. LAMBERT: It is the action of another place to which I object. Why did the managers agree to this proposal? Are 13 Asiatics going to upset the whole position? Will they affect the pastoral industry or the pearling industry? Are they going to be allowed to undermine the great national sentiment for which every Australian stands? This Assembly should stand to its guns whether the Licensing Bill is passed or not.

The Minister for Mines: When are you going to bite? You are barking loudly enough.

Mr. LAMBERT: To-morrow the fact that we have excluded Japanese and Chinese in the North from the operations of the Bill will go to Japan and to China as well. Every point affecting Japanese in Australia is immediately disseminated throughout the length and breadth of Japan.

The Minister for Mines: The chances are they are picking up your speech by wireless now.

Mr. LAMBERT: It will be a more valuable contribution to the debate than the Minister's remarks.

The Minister for Mines: They will be sure to understand it. It is more like their own language coming from you.

Mr. LAMBERT: They would certainly not understand the Minister. I care little whether the Japanese understand my language or not. I understand the Australian sentiment, and the obligations cast upon this Chamber to support it. If there is a loophole for misconception, it should be removed.

The Minister for Mines: Mrs. Cowan is with us, but Miss Conception is not a member here.

Mr. LAMBERT: It is a poor tribute to the intelligence of the Minister that he should interject in such an irrelevant way. He is better employed chewing gum as he is doing than making these interjections, for he cannot throw me off my track or shorten the length of my protest. In reply to an interjection I asked the member for Roebourne whether he agreed to the employment of Asiatics in the North, and he replied in the negative. The member for Pilbara said that he was not in favour of the employment of Asiatics and that where Asiatics had once been employed, white women were working to-day. As a matter of fact, if this Chamber accepts the provision and permits the employment of Asiatics, is it a reasonable exhibition of common sense and common decency that, considering the glamour of the East, we should pretend to control and administer the North? We could never answer the accusations that could be levelled against us that, under the elasticity of our licensing laws, we permitted Asiatics to be employed in our hotels.

Mr. J. Thomson: They are doing it now.

Mr. LAMBERT: I know that, but some stupid people take sugar with their porridge!

Mr. Teesdale: On a point of order. Is the member for Coolgardie in order in imitating the voice of another hon. member seeing that he has not such a musical voice himself?

The CHAIRMAN: The member for Coolgardie may proceed.

Mr. LAMBERT: What was the hon. member's point of order?

Mr. Teesdale: As to whether your voice was like a buzz saw or—

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The member for Coolgardie may proceed.

Mr. LAMBERT: The member for Roebourne is like an Asiatic run amok, mentally and physically.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The member for Coolgardie must not reflect upon another hon. member.

Mr. LAMBERT: It was not a reflection, it was a compliment.

Mr. Teesdale: I will leave it to the Committee to say whether it was a compliment, physically in particular.

The Minister for Works: What has this to do with the Bill in any case.

Mr. LAMBERT: It is a regrettable fact—

The CHAIRMAN: Order! Do keep to the subject!

Mr. LAMBERT: I hope hon. members will agree to enter an emphatic protest against the exactions of another place. On the one hand, we have 13 Chinamen being employed in the North Province, and on the other hand, the possibility of our being accused of being sufficiently elastic in our national conscience to admit that white men cannot work in the North-West.

The Premier: That forms no part of the matter at all.

Mr. LAMBERT: It forms a very important part. When another party was in power and when the Premier was a member of the Opposition, a Licensing Bill was vetoed in another place. I would rather see 20 measures vetoed than I would agree to sacrifice a principle that is so vital to Australia. I would like to ask some of those hon. members who have forced this position, whether they would like the little brown and yellow men about their homes, mixing with their families and hovering round their wives and daughters. I would not for one moment tolerate their hypocrisy and humbug. I would hold them up to public ridicule at every opportunity. I would ask those hon. members whether we cannot develop the North with Australians and whether it is essential to call in the little brown men to help the developmental scheme for that part of Australia. Are they sufficiently immune and callous to the interests of this country, to sacrifice all national decency for these considerations? It is no use the Minister for Works standing on the floor of the House, tossing up his keys and making a noise with them. If he starts that nonsense, I will keep the Committee here all night.

The Minister for Works: If the hon. member wants to talk to me like that, I will show him that I can keep him here all the morning.

Mr. LAMBERT: If the Minister desires to take some exercise with the assistance of his bunch of keys he may do so, but it is not

fair to any hon. member who is speaking on an important subject.

The Minister for Works: My action was a jolly sight more decent than the exercise of your tongue.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! If hon. members will not keep order I will—

The Minister for Works: Well, I will not allow that larrikin to insult me.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The Minister for Works must withdraw that statement.

The Minister for Works: I withdraw it.

Mr. LAMBERT: I ask that the Minister withdraw his remark.

The CHAIRMAN: It has been withdrawn.

Mr. LAMBERT: I did not hear it.

The CHAIRMAN: I asked for the withdrawal and it was immediately withdrawn.

Mr. LAMBERT: The Minister for Works is an older man than I am.

The Minister for Works: I would be ashamed to be your father.

Mr. LAMBERT: If I desire to register a most emphatic protest against a dangerous and pernicious principle, it is not becoming of the Minister, who is an old man, to behave himself in the way he has done.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: I object to that. It is not for the member for Coolgardie or for any other member to tell me what I am to do. If the member for Coolgardie cannot make a sensible speech without such interruptions as he has indulged in, then the best thing for him to do is to go outside.

Mr. LUTY: On a point of order, is the Minister for Works in order in juggling keys and playing handball with them in this Chamber.

The CHAIRMAN: I cannot find anything in the Standing Orders dealing with this matter, but I think it showed very bad taste. I hope it will not continue.

Mr. LAMBERT: I hope the Minister will hearken to that well merited rebuke.

The Minister for Works: Talk sense about the Bill.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! If the Minister will only give the member for Coolgardie a chance, he may get on with the subject.

Mr. LAMBERT: I quite appreciate the fact that you, Mr. Chairman, see that I am slightly laboured in my observations. No man desires less than I do to speak in this Chamber, particularly when it means keeping hon. members here at such an early hour in the morning. I feel keenly the attitude adopted by some members. I desire to absolve those referred to by the member for Hannans who stated that there are many worthy pioneers in the great North-West who do not wish to see the little brown men employed in those parts. They have pioneered that country without Asiatics to their credit and to the credit of the State. But we have in another place members prepared to sacrifice the life of the Government, to deprive the Government of the revenue expected under the Bill. They would do anything rather than give way on this vital principle. I regret it is not within the province of the Pre-

mier to fight that element in the Council and hold up to scorn their love for the little yellow men and brown men.

[1 o'clock a.m.]

Mr. TEESDALE: One would think the occupants of this bench were responsible for what has been done to-night. Never before have I seen appear at such disadvantage two or three members of the Opposition. Their attitude is wholly unreasonable, for one of their party has done extremely well at the conference. Those others are nothing but a set of ingrates. They have no thought for him. It is a wretched rotten return to one of their number, to one who has suffered so much for his ideals, notwithstanding which his colleagues, or a few of them, are beating the air and tying themselves in knots to-night. I have the greatest respect for the attitude of the member for South Fremantle. (Mr. McCallum). He has gone through purgatory over this business. He has shown splendid control of himself, and indeed he exhibited positive statesmanship when, on seeing the possibility of the Bill being thrown out for 25 per cent. of what was desired, he decided to accept the 75 per cent. attainable. Members of another place have just as much right to their opinions as have we. I am as intolerant of the Asiatics as anybody can be, but there are very few left in the North, and there are up there many white people fully determined to get rid of the remainder. The Asiatics in the North are fast disappearing, and are being replaced by white workers. I know a big hotel up there where three white women are doing satisfactory work in positions previously occupied by Asiatics. Let us be satisfied with 75 per cent. of a victory and show our appreciation of what has been done by our representatives to-night.

Mr. MUNSIE: A couple of sessions ago we passed a Shops and Factories Act. In that measure members of the Assembly debarred the employment of Asiatics as night watchmen. When the Bill reached another place it was amended to allow those employing Asiatics as night watchmen in Perth to continue to employ them. The sole argument put up by another place was that it affected only a few Asiatics and, therefore, did not matter. To-night members of another place have turned a complete somersault and are demanding that the few Asiatics affected, as being employed on licensed premises, should be provided for. Their attitude is entirely opposed to the policy of a White Australia. I have never claimed that the Labour Party were the only party in favour of a White Australia. To-day all political parties, with the exception of a few individual members of certain parties, are sincere in their advocacy of that ideal. The Premier of South Australia, we know, is an advocate of black labour for the North.

Mr. Lambert: He got it in the neck on Saturday.

Mr. MUNSIE: Probably he is perfectly honest in his conviction. The White Australia principle was first advocated by the Labour Party and has now been generally adopted. It has come to a pretty pass when a portion of Australia is to forsake that policy, merely because one or two in another place insist on the legalising of the employment of Asiatics. It is a disgrace to the public life of the State.

The PREMIER: If the amendment be defeated, the Bill will be lost. I do not agree with what the member for Hannans (Mr. Munsie) has said. I give place to no man in my desire for a White Australia, but it is nonsense to turn down all that we have got under the Bill. We are not legalising the employment of coloured men in the northern part of the State. They are employed quite legally now. Every Asiatic in the State to-day is entitled to be employed in an hotel. But only an Asiatic now employed in an hotel will be able to secure registration under the Bill. No one has said that white men cannot work in the North.

Mr. Lutey: You are submitting to the Council's interference, though, and that will hit us later on.

The PREMIER: If we are sincere in our desire to restrict the employment of Asiatics, we must accept the amendment, because it goes so far. There is frequently a wide difference between theory and practice.

Mr. Lutey: Theory was put effectively into practice as regards the Kanakas.

The PREMIER: Hon. members must make allowance for the weakness of human nature. Everybody has his own views on this question. In this world, if we expect to gain what we desire we must proceed by easy stages. I only hope it will never be my misfortune to pilot another liquor Bill through this Chamber. There seems to be no moderation about anybody on the liquor question. In this particular matter, however, I hope hon. members will realise that we gain a great deal. Let us take what we can get. If the clause goes, the Bill goes.

Mr. Marshall: That will not be much loss.

The PREMIER: I trust the Committee will not agree to any alteration of this amendment.

Mr. LUTEY: I take a particularly serious view of this matter. We are asked to endorse the assumption of the Upper House that white people are not fit to work in the kitchens of hotels in the North. The amendment, if accepted, will hit us hard in future. Some members of the Legislative Council favour black labour. I would rather see the Bill lost than this clause accepted, for the provision would be quoted as a precedent for allowing Asiatics to be employed in the Northern Territory. The 99 per cent. gain under the clause is a bagatelle compared with the White Australia policy. The miners of Victoria, at Clunes, and the miners of New South Wales, at Lambing Flat, laid the foundations of a White Australia policy when they refused to have any Chinese on those fields. The member for Claremont should

get up and justify his position instead of confining himself to interjections. The Opposition would be justified in keeping the Committee here for another 24 hours in order to resist this proposal.

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

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

Majority for .. .. 10

#### AYES.

Mr. Angwin	Sir James Mitchell
Mr. Carter	Mr. Money
Mr. Corboy	Mr. Pickering
Mr. Denton	Mr. Piesse
Mr. George	Mr. Richardson
Mr. Gibson	Mr. Sampson
Mr. Harrison	Mr. Scaddan
Mr. Hickmott	Mr. Teesdale
Mr. Johnston	Mr. J. Thomson
Mr. H. K. Maley	Mr. Underwood
Mr. Mann	Mr. Mullaney

(Teller.)

#### NOES.

Mr. Chesson	Mr. Marshall
Mr. Clydesdale	Mr. McCallum
Mr. Heron	Mr. Walker
Mr. Hughes	Mr. Willcock
Mr. Lambert	Mr. Wilson
Mr. Lutey	Mr. Munzie

(Teller.)

Question thus passed.

No. 50. 101-104. The conference agrees to the retention of the clause as passed by the Legislative Assembly, subject to the insertion after the word "premises" in line 8 of the words "by other than bona fide lodgers."

The PREMIER: I move—

That the conference recommendation be adopted.

This amendment means that bona fide lodgers but not bona fide travellers will be able to carry liquor away from licensed premises during prohibited hours. Travellers will be permitted to obtain liquor, but not to carry it away.

Question put and passed.

Resolutions reported. the report adopted, and a message accordingly returned to the Council.

House adjourned at 1.24 a.m. (Wednesday).

## Legislative Council,

Wednesday, 20th December, 1922.

	PAGE
Leave of Absence	2282
Bills: Busselton-Margaret River Railway Extension, 1R.	2282
Land and Income Tax Assessment Amendment, 2R., Com., recom., report, 3R.	2282
Licensing Act Amendment, Assembly's message	2284
Adjournment—Special	2308

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

### LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

On motion by Hon. J. Cornell, leave of absence for six consecutive sittings granted to Hon. J. W. Kirwan (South) on the ground of urgent private business.

### BILL—BUSSELTON-MARGARET RIVER RAILWAY EXTENSION.

Received from the Assembly and read a first time.

### BILL—LAND AND INCOME TAX ASSESSMENT AMENDMENT.

#### Second Reading.

Debate resumed from the previous day.

Hon. G. W. MILES (North) [4.35]: I have not yet made up my mind whether to vote for the second reading. One of the objections I have to the Bill is the exemption it gives to members of Parliament. It is wrong. The only way we can rectify it is by rejecting the Bill. Members of Parliament living outside the metropolitan area will pay no income tax at all. Seeing that, a year or two ago, the salaries of members were increased from £300 to £400, I am opposed to any further concession. Also I do not like this exemption up to £200. I do not know that it is necessary, since the taxpayer on £4 10s. weekly, and having one child, pays no tax at present. The man with £5 weekly and two children is in the same position, and so too is the man on £5 15s. weekly, and having three children. In these circumstances I am not inclined to vote for the second reading. We are told that the exemptions passed in another place will entail a loss of revenue of £30,000, and that in another Bill it is proposed to make up that loss by imposing an extra burden on another section of the community. I do not think that fair, especially having regard to the existing exemptions and deductions. Mr. Lovekin last night quoted the anomaly set up by the refusal of the Commissioner of Taxation to read into the Act the manifest intention of Parliament. It was clearly understood that dividend duty was to be deducted from the net income, and that the