

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: I could not say. Speaking from memory, I think the Fremantle Harbour Trust chairman receives four guineas a sitting and the members two guineas a sitting, and that the fees of the chairman must not exceed £350 per annum, while the fees of each individual member must not exceed £170 or £200. At Fremantle they have to control the pilots, the lights, and the buoys, and have to handle all the cargo and to keep a very big staff, their work and responsibility is much greater than will be the case at Bunbury. That is why the remuneration is fixed at a lower rate at Bunbury. The Fremantle Harbour Trust when formed had full power to fix rates or charges such as berthing dues, wharfage dues, charges, etcetera; but in an amending Bill passed during last Parliament there was a clause inserted giving the Governor-in-Council power at any time he thought fit to alter these charges. Under the Fremantle Act and also under this Bill the Harbour Trust must provide interest and sinking fund on the works handed over. The value of the works handed over is first ascertained, and then the works are vested in the board and the board is asked to pay interest and sinking fund on that valuation. Should the board not strike sufficient rates on berthing, shipping or wharfage dues to meet interest and sinking fund, the Governor-in-Council is empowered to step in and fix the rates to ensure the payment of interest and sinking fund. On the other hand it may happen that the Harbour Trust may strike such heavy wharfage rates that the Government may think they are doing injury not only to the port but to the State generally; and in that case the Governor-in-Council will simply fix the rates and those will be the rates for the time being. This power has not been exercised in the past, yet it is a wise provision that the Governor-in-Council should have the right to override the trust, so to speak, if it is deemed necessary. I think there are no new features in this Bill—indeed there are not—that do not exist in the Fremantle Act. The reason, briefly let me state again, for introducing the Bill

is that a good deal of friction goes on from time to time between the different bodies controlling the Bunbury harbour, and it will be much better to have the harbour under one control so that the body that controls the jetty will have the right to say where a ship is to berth, and not any other body. It is the recognised custom in the Eastern States and has been here, that when a port grows to a certain size it should be vested in a board of management, and I think the time has arrived when the management of the port of Bunbury should be handed over with restrictions and safeguards regarding interest to a trust. This has been promised to Bunbury for a number of years, and I think members who know the port will agree that we are not taking any unnecessary risk in doing it. We will be simply adding to the safeguarding of the port and facilitating the work of the shipping trade generally by handing over the harbour to a local board. I move—

*That the Bill be now read a second time.*

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

*House adjourned at 8.45 p.m.*

## Legislative Assembly,

*Wednesday, 9th December, 1908.*

	PAGE
Questions: Sewerage Treatment Works, Fremantle	786
Metropolitan Waterworks Employees' Holidays	786
Goldfields Water Scheme Pipes	786
Faulty Drainage, claim	786
Assault on a Prisoner	786
Police Benefit Fund	787
Hospital, Nannine	788
Hospital Committee, Meekatharra	788
Electoral, Fremantle office	788
School Classification, Subiaco	788
Immigration Restriction	789
Personal Explanation, Minister's statement	789
Bills: Bridgetown-Wilgarrup Railway, 3a.	790
Wines, Beer, and Spirit Sale Act Amendment, Message, 2a., Com.	790
Nannine-Meekatharra Railway, 2a.	816

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

# QUESTION—SEWERAGE TREATMENT WORKS, FREMANTLE.

Mr. JOHNSON asked the Minister for Works: 1, Are the Sewerage Treatment Works at Fremantle satisfactorily completed? 2, Has the contract price for these works been exceeded? 3, If so, what is the estimated excess cost? 4, What is the total amount claimed by the contractor?

The MINISTER FOR WORKS replied: 1, The contract is not yet completed, but the defects in the concrete work of the tanks have been remedied. Leakage is occurring in connection with scour pipe and appurtenances, and the contractor has asked the department to take over and complete the contract at the contractor's expense. 2, No. 3, Answered by No. 2. 4, Claims have been received from the contractor totalling £1,920. These are disputed, and will be settled as usual by arbitration.

# QUESTION — METROPOLITAN WATERWORKS EMPLOYEES' HOLIDAYS.

Mr. TROY (for Mr. Bath) asked the Minister for Works: 1, What rates of wages were paid to the various grades of employees on the Metropolitan Water Works prior to the issue of the notice cancelling their annual holidays? 2, What rates, if any, were paid for overtime?

The MINISTER FOR WORKS replied: 1, Plumbers and main layers, 10s. and 11s. per day; carpenters, 11s. 6d. per day; best labourers, 9s. per day; casual hands, 8s. per day; engine-drivers, 10s. per day (seven days per week); firemen, 9s. per day (seven days per week); trimmers, 8s. per day (seven days per week). 2, Overtime was paid at ordinary rates, except when out of town, and then time and a quarter was allowed for the whole of the time worked.

# QUESTION—GOLDFIELDS WATER SCHEME PIPES.

Mr. TROY (for Mr. Bath) asked the Minister for Works: 1, In view of the

corrosion of the pipes on the goldfields water main and the frequent occurrence of leaks, has the department made any provision for the manufacture of a reserve supply of pipes? 2, If not, will the Government take steps in the immediate future to have such reserve supply manufactured?

The MINISTER FOR WORKS replied: 1, Up to the present the number of pipes replaced owing to leaks or bursts has only been six. The administration has on hand 9,760 feet, equivalent to 350 pipes, for maintenance purposes, and this is considered sufficient provision for some time to come. No rust holes have so far occurred from internal corrosion. Upwards of 150 rust holes have resulted from outside corrosion, but these have been satisfactorily repaired by patching. 2, It is not considered necessary or advisable at this stage to supplement the provision to reserve supplies already made.

# QUESTION—FAULTY DRAINAGE, CLAIM.

Mr. TROY (for Mr. Bath) asked the Premier: 1, Has the claim of Mr. S. Tanne, of Albany, to damages for the destruction of a crop of potatoes through the construction of a faulty drain by the Works Department been investigated?

The PREMIER replied: 1, Yes. 2, The department considers there is abundant evidence to show that the damage was caused by an abnormal tide, and that there is no ground for a claim in connection with the by-wash constructed by the Government. 3, A letter bearing the date referred to was received, and the Works Department has been in communication with Mr. Tanne's solicitors on the subject.

# QUESTION—ASSAULT ON A PRISONER.

Mr. TROY asked the Premier: 1, Has the attention of the Colonial Secretary been drawn to the alleged brutal assault on a prisoner named Holmes by Constable McArthur, at Sandstone? 2,

If so, what is being done in regard to the holding of an inquiry?

The PREMIER replied: 1, Yes. 2, The charge of assault preferred against Constable McArthur by Alfred Fitzroy Holmes was dealt with at the police court, Sandstone, on the 19th October last, when the case was dismissed. Under the circumstances it is not proposed to hold a departmental inquiry.

### QUESTION — POLICE BENEFIT FUND.

Mr. HOLMAN asked the Premier,—  
1, Will the Premier state (as the Government see no necessity for holding another election for selecting a contributors' representative to the Police Benefit Fund Board) how many elections have already been held for that purpose? 2, Was open voting employed at the election or elections already held by each voter being compelled to sign his name and number on the ballot paper after voting? 3, Did the Premier promise that such elections would be held consistent with rational methods? 4, Was the Commissioner the member of the board who was to be deposed to make room for the contributors' representative? 5, (a) Was any nomination for candidates called for prior to the election or elections? (b) If not, why not? 6, Was the Commissioner of Police a qualified elector? If not, why was he allowed to be a candidate? 7, Were the envelopes provided to electors for returning the ballot papers after voting addressed to the Commissioner of Police, Perth, thus making him returning officer? 8, I more than one ballot was taken what was the result of those others prior to the last one? 9, (a) If more than one ballot was taken at which one is it alleged the Commissioner was chosen? (b) How many votes were cast and for whom were they recorded? 10, Were there any scrutineers present on behalf of the other 487 electors or candidates at the counting of the votes? 11, Is the scheme which allows the Commissioner of Police (who is not an elector and who exercises a rigid discipline over his subordinates who are the electors) to be returning officer without scrut-

ineers, one of 488 compulsory candidates with 475 of the same persons only as the electors, and when open voting is employed, and whereby the selecting of a representative would have deposed the same Commissioner, the rational scheme promised by the Premier?

The PREMIER replied: 1, Two ballots have been taken. 2, The voters were requested to sign the ballot paper in each instance. 3, The Premier promised that the contributors to the benefit fund should have an opportunity of electing a representative in lieu of the Commissioner of Police. 4, Yes. The second ballot paper asked the members to write the rank and name of the member of the force for whom they desired to vote as a representative of the contributors on the Police Benefit Fund Board, in lieu of the Commissioner. 5, (a) No. (b) Because it was considered unnecessary, and, furthermore, would prove impracticable. 6, The Commissioner of Police was not a candidate, and the second ballot paper was distinctly headed, "Election of member to represent the contributors to the Fund in lieu of the Commissioner of Police." 7, The envelopes were addressed to the Commissioner of Police, Perth, and were placed in the sealed ballot box provided for the purpose, directly as received at the Commissioner's office. The envelopes were not opened by the Commissioner, nor did he act as returning officer or scrutineer. 8, The result of the first ballot was as follows: (a) In favour of a change, 98; (b) In favour of a change so as to provide for two additional members of the Board appointed from contributors, 144; (c) Against a change, 188; (d) Declined to furnish a reply, 5. 9, (a) The second one. (b) Commissioner of Police, 203 votes; Sergeant Moore, 74 votes; Sergeant Thomas, 50 votes; P.C. Campbell, 24 votes; Sergeant Parkinson, 18 votes; Sergeant O'Halloran, 14 votes; Sergeant John Smith, 11 votes; Corporal Cunningham, 5 votes; Sub-Inspector Lappin, 4 votes. Two other officers received three votes: four received two; and eleven received one; whilst eleven informal votes were recorded, making a total of 439. 10, Three scrutineers were selected by the metropolitan police to

count the votes, viz., Corporal Buttle, and Constables Green and Tillotson. 11, The Commissioner of Police did not act as scrutineer. See 10 and 3.

#### QUESTION—HOSPITAL, NANNINE.

Mr. HOLMAN asked the Premier: 1, Is he aware that it is impossible to carry on the hospital at Nannine (which provided accommodation and medical attendance for the people at Buenakurra, Quinn's, Gabanintha, Star of the East, Gum Creek, Barrambi, Eroll's, Wangani, Annean Station, and other centres) under the system proposed by the Colonial Secretary? 2, Is he aware that owing to the proposed alteration the doctor is leaving Nannine? 3, Will the Premier endeavour to retain the hospital and medical officer for these centres by reverting to the old system of subsidy to the hospital committee? 4, If not, why not.

The PREMIER replied: 1, No. 2, No. The terms offered by the Government are considered more than should be sufficient to support indigent cases. 3 and 4, This hospital has been in financial difficulties off and on for many years past, and the Government have now promised to make a special grant to wipe off all liabilities, and make them an annual subsidy sufficient for the maintenance of the hospital and for the treatment of indigent and casualty cases, together with a grant of £200 in aid of the doctor's salary.

#### QUESTION—HOSPITAL COMMITTEE, MEEKATHARRA.

Mr. HOLMAN asked the Premier: 1, Is the Premier aware that the P.M.O. declines to pay the Meekatharra Hospital Committee the amount due for indigent patients? 2, Will he have the necessary instructions issued for the payment of amounts due for the treatment of indigent patients? 3, If not, why not?

The PREMIER replied: 1, No. 2 and 3, No such amounts are due under the arrangement entered into between the Government and the hospital committee. When the hospital was established no promise was made for the payment of indi-

gent cases, the basis of subsidy submitted by the Government and accepted by the committee being as follows:—£250 per annum towards the salary of the medical officer, and 15s. in the £ subsidy, up to £250 per annum. The latter was promised by the Government in full satisfaction of subsidy in aid of the hospital. In view, however, of the present financial position of the Meekatharra Hospital, it has been decided to pay a special grant in aid of maintenance of £150.

#### QUESTION—ELECTORAL, FREMANTLE OFFICE.

Mr. ANGWIN asked the Attorney General: 1, Will the Minister make arrangements for an officer to be in attendance daily at Fremantle to receive claims from persons who wish to be enrolled as electors? 2, What is the estimated annual saving by the Electoral Department by closing the Fremantle Electoral Office?

The ATTORNEY GENERAL replied: 1, Arrangements are being made. 2, The Fremantle Office is not being closed, but is being re-organised with a view to better and more economical working.

#### QUESTION—SCHOOL CLASSIFICATION, SUBIACO.

Mr. DAGLISH asked the Treasurer: Why the Subiaco school has not been made a central school when schools of lower classification and serving less populous districts have been so gazetted?

The TREASURER replied: The object of centralisation is to have one school only within a limited radius for the instruction of the higher classes. Where there are three or four first-class schools together, only one can be selected. In other districts a second-class school might be selected, if it were the largest school in the district. James Street is made the central school for Perth, including Subiaco and Maylands. The nearest central schools are, in one direction, Midland Junction; in the other, Claremont. The only other central schools in the State at present are Fremantle, Kalgoorlie, and Boulder. Both Subiaco and Highgate

have been, on account of their size, treated differently from all other non-central schools, in being allowed to retain the seventh standard. It is only the ex-seventh from these two schools that is taken to James-street.

# QUESTION—IMMIGRATION RESTRICTION.

Mr. HORAN asked the Premier: 1, Is he aware that 44 Austrians and 22 Italians arrived in this State by the "Renskoon" on Saturday last? 2, Does he recognise that people of this type have been a menace to the industrial peace of Western Australia during the current year, principally at Kurrawang and Nallan? 3, In view of the fact that the Commonwealth Government is now considering an amendment to the Immigration Restriction Act will the hon. the Premier immediately communicate with them, and urge such provisions to be made as will allow the language test to be applied to any person when the exigencies of the State so demand?

The PREMIER replied: 1, Yes, the Collector of Customs has informed me that 44 Austrians and 26 Italians arrived by the steamer referred to. 2 and 3. Matters relating to the Immigration Restriction Act having to be dealt with by the Commonwealth Government, it is not for the State Government to interfere in the direction desired by the hon. member.

# PERSONAL EXPLANATION, MINISTER'S STATEMENT.

Mr. JOHNSON (Guildford): Before the Orders of the Day are proceeded with, I desire to address the House on a question of privilege. I want to take exception to some remarks made by the Minister for Mines, when speaking on a motion by Mr. Scaddan regarding the production of papers as to the Mines Regulation Bill introduced in 1904 or 1905. The Minister, according to the report published in the paper, said:—

"The clause to which Mr. Scaddan had taken exception was taken from

the Bill introduced by the present member for Guildford, who went through the draft and collected it." That statement has, I find, also been forwarded to the Minister's paper, the North Coolgardie Herald, for the following paragraph appears therein:—

"The file disclosed the fact that Section 62 was taken from a Bill introduced by Mr. Johnson when Minister for Mines, and the draft of that Bill was gone through by Mr. Johnson. He charged Mr. Scaddan in turn with negligence in this connection, seeing that he was present when both Mr. Johnson's Bill and the latest Mines Regulation Bill were passed."

That has been copied into other gold-fields papers, and I take strong exception to the remarks, inasmuch as Mr. Hastie introduced the Bill. It was drafted by him, and, consequently, the Minister's remarks are inaccurate. While I claim a certain amount of responsibility, as I was a member of the Cabinet at the time, I do not take the responsibility of introducing the Bill. I desire that portion of his remarks to be withdrawn.

The MINISTER FOR MINES (Hon. H. Gregory): I am not responsible for what appears in any paper. Let the hon. member quote *Hansard*.

Mr. Walker: Is this a privilege motion or an explanation?

The MINISTER FOR MINES: Surely I am able to give an explanation. *Hansard* gives what I said as follows:—"The clause the hon. member takes exception to was taken from the Bill introduced when the member for Guildford was Minister for Mines." He went through and corrected the draft Bill.

The SPEAKER: I wish to draw the attention of members to the fact that this is not a question of privilege. The member has risen on a question which is a matter of personal explanation, and, therefore, it cannot be debated. The question of privilege is provided for in Standing Order 137, which says, "Any member may rise to speak 'to order,' or upon a matter of privilege suddenly arising." but Standing Order 116 says, "By the indulgence of the House, a member

may explain matters of a personal nature, although there be no question before the House; but such matters may not be debated." The remarks by the hon. member are in the nature of a personal explanation, and, therefore, cannot be debated.

#### BILL—BRIDGETOWN-WILGARRUP RAILWAY.

Read a third time, and transmitted to the Legislative Council.

#### BILL—WINES, BEER, AND SPIRIT SALE ACT AMENDMENT.

Message from the Governor received and read recommending appropriation for the purpose of this Bill.

#### *Second Reading.*

Debate resumed from the previous day.

Mr. FOULKES (Claremont): I welcome the introduction of this Bill by the Government. It should have been passed many years ago, and I hope that on this occasion it will meet with the unanimous support of members. There is one clause in the Bill which I hope the Government will agree to drop, and that is the last paragraph of Clause 2, which says:—

"Provided also that this section, unless previously repealed, shall remain in force until the end of the second session of the seventh Parliament of Western Australia, but no longer."

I am well aware it is the intention of the Government to introduce a Local Option Bill, but it may possibly happen that although the Government may, during the coming session, introduce the measure, for some reason or other it may not pass, and the result will be that this present measure will be no longer in existence. Supposing, for instance, that the Local Option Bill is brought down to this House in the last fortnight of the year, and may not be received by another place in time to allow it to be gone on with, it will then be too late to reintroduce the measure now under discussion, and to provide for the continuation of this clause. I hope, therefore, this paragraph will be struck out.

Mr. Walker: What is the immediate need for the present Bill?

Mr. FOULKES: The need is this. Fresh licences are being granted every quarterly session, and the more granted the more difficult it will be to deal with the licensed houses when the Local Option Bill becomes law. The member for Kanoona (Mr. Walker) must realise that the greater number of licensed houses there are, the greater the difficulty will be in dealing with the question properly with regard to the closing of certain of them. Some people claim that if any houses are closed, the licencees will be entitled to compensation. I do not agree with that. It is owing to the realisation of that fact that I have on three or four occasions introduced a similar Bill to this one, providing that no more licences shall be granted. I remember very well when the present member for Subiaco (Mr. Daglish) was leader of the Government, he introduced a similar measure to this, and then said it was necessary to have a Bill of this kind in order to clear the ground. He was perfectly correct in his argument, and I am quite sure there is a strong public opinion in this State that the present system of granting licences is not a good one. A certain amount of inquiry takes place before a licence is granted, but in many cases the inquiry is not sufficient. My chief objection to the present system is, that while new licences are being granted, the country does not receive proper compensation for them, or their true value. In some cases licences are granted and the people obtain provisional certificates and sell them within a week or two afterwards, in some cases for as much as £500 or even £1,000. Yesterday a licence was granted by the Northam court, and the person who obtained it was well satisfied that he had received practically a present of £1,000. It was worth that sum to him to receive the certificate. Surely the Treasurer is aware that here is a splendid avenue from which he can raise revenue. It is not right for the country to allow these licencees to be granted and receive nothing for them. The licensing courts are held at some little cost to the State, and in some cases, the magistrates have to travel scores of

miles to hear various inquiries made as to provisional licences. The Government pay the salaries of the clerks who attend the courts, and yet no provision is made for them to be paid by those people applying. I have always been of opinion that every applicant for a licence should pay a very heavy hearing fee. On all occasions in the Supreme Court, a litigant, if he takes the slightest step, has to pay certain fees to the Court. If, for instance, he issues a writ, he has to pay a certain amount, and when the case comes on for hearing there are additional fees. In these licence applications no fees are paid. The Treasurer should make provision for all applications dealing with licences to pay a considerable hearing fee.

*The Attorney General:* This Bill will stop new licences altogether.

*Mr. FOULKES:* I hope so. There is a splendid avenue for fresh taxation in regard to the various proceedings in connection with the licensed houses. I strongly urge upon the Minister in charge of the Bill—I was not in the House when the measure was introduced, and do not know who is in charge—to consider the advisability of dropping the last paragraph to Clause 2. It may happen that the Local Option Bill will not pass.

*Mr. Bolton:* Do you know it will not?

*Mr. FOULKES:* No, and I hope it will be passed. I do not think the Government have yet quite realised the strength of public opinion as to the necessity for altering the licensing laws. I am a close watcher of public opinion on this question, and there is no doubt that the people of the State realise there is an urgent necessity for reform in the licensing laws. Only the other day we saw the returns from the polls in New Zealand on the question. The provision for conferring local option on the people is more and more appreciated every time the question is referred to the people in the dominion. I am sure we shall have the same position of affairs here. As to the provision for wine licences in the Bill, that is a step in the right direction. I am sure all will realise that when applications for wine licences are made to the licensing courts, whether it be for the sale

of Western Australian, Victorian or any other colonial wines, justice will be done between the various States, and there need be no fear that the present Bill is introduced with the view of giving particular advantages to Western Australian wines.

*Mr. ANGWIN (East Fremantle):* I was hoping that when the Government gave notice to introduce this Bill they would have included all licences, instead of, as they did last year, including only a number, as licences which should not be granted until the comprehensive measure was passed. I feel certain the people of the State are more against the granting of wine and grocers' licences than they are opposed to licences being granted to hotels which this Act only provides for. It is my intention again to move when the measure is in Committee that no licences be granted. I shall also endeavour when the Bill is in Committee to increase the cost of wine licences. We find now almost every fruit shop in the place holds a wine licence, and if there are any places in this country which are doing harm they are those shops which, while they sell fruit, also sell wines to boys and girls. I think the time has arrived when hon. members should take into consideration the advisability of removing from such shops the right to sell wines. If they wish to have a wine shop, let them have a wine shop, and a wine shop only, and if a person wishes to sell fruit, he should sell fruit and nothing else. I do not think the sale of wine and fruit should be combined. I am pleased that the Government have introduced this Bill, but at the same time I think they have broken faith with the public. Every person was of the opinion that it was the intention of the Government to introduce a consolidating measure dealing with the whole of the licences. The Government talked about it three years ago. Last year we were told that it would be submitted next session. That has not been done yet, and while hon. members on this side have been abused and accused of trying if possible to bring in State management in regard to licences we find the Government have gone a step further, and while they allow private hold-

ers to have licences they have started to provide money for the building of hotels. I think hon. members, or I hope hon. members, will agree with me that until at any rate there has been introduced a consolidating measure dealing with the licensing question no further licences should be granted to hotels, to clubs, or to fruiterers and such people who desire wine licences. Until we do this I am afraid the Government will keep on promising the introduction of a measure which has been under consideration for so long.

Mr. BARNETT (Albany): I consider the thanks of the temperance party are due to the Government for introducing this short measure. Had they attempted to introduce the comprehensive measure which was promised there would not have been the slightest possibility of it becoming law this session. Consequently the existing state of affairs would have continued. I am one of those who was returned to Parliament pledged to support a certain measure of local option, and I claim, no one member has such a knowledge of the wine and spirit trade as I have, and that no one recognises the evils that exist through the practically indiscriminate granting of licences, more than I do, and I am convinced that the diminution in the number of licences will mean less drinking. I agree with the remarks of the member for East Fremantle that it would be wise to introduce a clause prohibiting the fruit shops from being carried on as wine shops. I think the state of affairs at present gives the opportunity to many women and young people to partake of wine, whereas if they had to go into a shop which was exclusively a wine shop they would hesitate first. I trust the amendment suggested by the member for East Fremantle will receive the support of members and become part of the measure. I intend to support the second reading of the Bill.

Mr. HUDSON (Dundas): I intend to oppose this measure as a protest against the manner in which the Government have temporised with the matter of reform of the liquor laws. It is generally conceded throughout the country and I

think by every member of the House that some amendment should be proposed to the existing licensing laws. It is also agreed by a majority of members that the principle of local option should be applied in this State. During the career of the present Government in every speech that the Governor has delivered to members there has been a promise that this reform of the liquor laws would be introduced during that session. That occurred in July, 1907, again in October 1907, and even before that in 1906, when there was a specific promise made. In reply to a question asked by Mr. Bath as to whether it was the intention of the Government to introduce during that session a Bill to provide for local option there was a reply in the negative. That was on 6th September, 1906. The Treasurer also replied at the same time that the intention of the Government was to bring down a comprehensive measure dealing with the whole question next session. We had two sessions last year and this is the second session this year, but next session has not yet been touched. Apparently the Government have not the courage to submit this measure or they have no intention whatever of dealing with the matter, and as a protest against this temporising I intend to vote against the second reading. There is another reason why I intend to vote against the Bill. I think this part of the Bill that prohibits the granting of new licenses, while it does not increase the number of licenses, it nevertheless increases the value of the licenses at present in existence and grants to those who have licenses to some extent a monopoly.

Mr. Collier: That was the argument the Attorney General used two years ago.

Mr. HUDSON: Possibly. Then with regard to the amendment as to wine licenses, I think it would be better to wait for the ruling of the High Court before we introduce legislation as suggested here. If we wait for the ruling of the High Court we will then know our constitutional position. If we do not, it may be that we are raising constitutional difficulties by passing this



measure. I do not however object to the Bill on those grounds but on the other grounds that I have stated. I intend to oppose the second reading.

Mr. GILL (Balkatta): I intend to support this Bill not because I think it is all that we should have but because it is a step in the direction that I would like to see taken. It remains to be seen whether the Government will carry out their repeated promises of the past. However they have taken a step in what I consider to be the right direction by introducing this short Bill and as far as I am concerned I shall give them any support I can in carrying it into effect. With regard to the suggested amendments of the member for East Fremantle I am pleased to hear him indicate that he is going to move in the direction of making the measure apply to all licenses. Undoubtedly to my way of thinking the greatest curses are the storekeepers and the gallon licenses and I hope that the House will take this into serious consideration and support the hon. member in amending the Bill in the direction he has suggested.

Mr. Hudson: How will that affect the second portion of the Bill?

Mr. GILL: I am not particularly in love with wine licenses. It appears to me they are simply a means of catering for the "dagoes" in and around Perth. These people have almost a monopoly, and there is a good deal of truth in the statement that the fruit shops are simply a blind to lure young people into those shops and supply them with wine.

Mr. Holman: They call it "pinkey."

Mr. GILL: Yes, I have heard it described as "pinkey." I hope members will pass this Bill with the suggested amendments of the member for East Fremantle and if the Ministry do not come up to the mark next session with the comprehensive measure, the electors will have an opportunity subsequently of expressing their opinion of the actions of the Government in the future. I intend to support the Bill.

Mr. HOLMAN (Murchison): I consider the measure is not by any means

satisfactory. It is not what we have been promised, not by a long way, and I maintain the Government have had sufficient time to bring down the measure that has been promised for some time. It has already been mentioned that this will create practically a monopoly for the present holders of licenses. I am of the opinion that if we pass this measure the State itself should be allowed to open up a licensed house in any part of the State where it is considered necessary one should be started. There will be many places springing up in Western Australia within the next 12 months where licenses may with advantage be given, where in fact they will be an absolute necessity, and I think the State should be in a position to go to those places and open up a State hotel as has been done at Gwalia. The State hotel at Gwalia has been a shining example of what can be done by State control of the liquor traffic, and I am sorry the Government have not seen fit to further extend that good work which was started there some years ago. The hotel at Gwalia has proved to be a success. There is less intemperance there, the Act is observed better than at any other drinking place, they serve out better liquor, and the general tenor of the house is ahead of the majority of the licensed houses of Western Australia.

The Attorney General: What has been the result at the Caves?

Mr. HOLMAN: The experience at the Caves show a terrible lack of administrative ability on the part of some of the gentlemen on the Government benches.

The Attorney General: You have not been there.

Mr. HOLMAN: No, that may account to some extent for the house not having done much business. However a better example has been set on the goldfields. There have been many complaints about the Caves hotel and the money spent there has been practically thrown away. This must not be used as an argument against State control of the liquor traffic. Even though the licensed house at the Caves has been an absolute failure that is no reason why we should

do away with State control. At Gwalia we have an example of what really can be done. There is a clause in this measure which states that the Government may from time to time suspend the operation of the Act in places which are 15 miles from any hotel. Take for instance Yaloginda, a new goldfield centre near Meekatharra, where there are between 200 and 300 men at the present time: it may be desirable to grant a license to a place like that. It may be some three or four miles from a licensed house and because of that distance it will be impossible to procure a license there. If we are going to pass a measure like this we should make provision so that the State itself can open up other premises for the retailing of spirits for the benefit of the people requiring them. When the measure is in Committee, I will do my best to have an amendment inserted in that direction. The main principle of this measure is only to increase the value of the existing licenses. I am not surprised at the licensed victuallers advocating the return of another supporter of a measure like this because it merely means increasing the values of their properties at the present time.

Mr. HEITMANN (Cue): Although it may happen, as the last speaker mentioned, that this Bill may increase the value of properties, I am inclined to think that it is more desirable than granting licences here, there and everywhere throughout Western Australia. We have a striking illustration of the unwise proceedings on the part of the licensing benches in times gone by. There are towns in the State where in the good old days there were many licences granted, with but little consideration given as to whether they were necessary or not, and in the roaring days these houses were able to exist and do well, but to-day we find—and I think it is one of the biggest faults in our licensing laws—these houses, eight or ten of them in one town I could mention, trying to exist where there is only room for three or four properly conducted. As long as we have houses doing good business we can force the

licensees to give accommodation at their hotels and to supply the best liquors, and we would be doing nothing harsh, seeing that the licensees have the business; but to-day if we were to force these licensees to have improved conditions it would mean the closing of a good many of the hotels, though possibly that might be desirable. On the other hand, as soon as good times go by, the man prepared to conduct his house properly and give good accommodation and sell good liquors in good times, cannot devote his labour or his time, and so in bad times he is followed by a man who can afford the time and can devote his labour to a hotel which does not command a good business; and then by-and-by we find the place in the hands of people utterly unscrupulous and prepared to adopt all kinds of means to make a living. One can show that there are many licensed houses in Western Australia that can be termed nothing more nor less than brothels. I speak conscientiously, and I can say that one of the biggest evils in connection with the licensed houses in Western Australia is that we have too many public houses, far beyond the requirements of the State, and it is quite natural that the class of individuals keeping the surplus hotels falls to the state of the individual who is not particular as to how he conducts his business. The member for Albany (Mr. Barnett) considered that the thanks of the temperance party were due to the Government for bringing in this Bill. I would suggest then when he speaks again he should include the publicans, because from my election experience I have found that the publicans and the temperance people run together where a Labour man is concerned in the election. It has been my experience on more than one occasion, and I think it has been the experience of more than one member in this House. I think that the people should control the liquor traffic. We are all convinced that it is absolutely necessary to have a comprehensive measure introduced as soon as possible to deal with the question, and I hope that the people will be given a good deal more power than they have at present, and I would even go to the extent they do

in New Zealand and give the people absolute power to say whether it should be one licence, two licences, or no licence at all. If we give that power I do not think we would go far wrong. As to its increasing the consumption, or *sly-grog* selling, I think that would not go far if the Act were administered as it should be. I do not agree with the measure in all its details, but on the principle of the thing I accept the Bill as a step in the right direction. I disagree with the preference given to the State in connection with the sale of wines. The member for Claremont (Mr. Foulkes) said he thought it would be quite sufficient to leave the measure in the hands of the licensing benches, but I am inclined to think that is hardly safe. When the case now before the High Court was before the police magistrate, I remember reading that he stated very emphatically he was not going to grant a licence for people to sell wines from all parts of Australia; and he indicated that he wanted to confine the sale of wines to Western Australian wines. Although we desire to foster our own industries in our State I think we should have some Federal spirit. It is impossible to regulate a man's palate, and if he wants South Australian or Victorian wines I think a man should have them. And instead of giving the power to the licensing benches to say whether a man should sell wines from one State or another, I think we should include in the meaning of "Australian wine licence" the words "wines produced from any part of Australia." I hope this will be altered in Committee, and instead of giving preference to one particular wine we should make it an Australian licence, and do away with giving power to the magistrate to say whether the licensee should sell wine from one State or another.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

#### *In Committee.*

Mr. Daglish in the Chair; the Treasurer in charge of the Bill.

Clause 1—agreed to.

Clause 2—New licenses not to be granted:

Mr. ANGWIN moved an amendment—

*That in line 2 the words "publican's general licence, hotel licence, or wayside house" be struck out.*

His object was to provide that no licences be granted. It would only mean that in addition to the licences mentioned in the clause, club licences, grocers' licences, wine and beer licences, and wine licences, would not be granted until the comprehensive measure was considered. If we did not strike out these words the cry would be raised before the licensing courts that, seeing it was impossible to get hotel licences, club licences should be granted.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: If the amendment were carried other licences would be included beyond those mentioned by the hon. member, such as billiard table licences, temporary licences, boarding-house licences, lodging-house licences and packet licences. In fact it would entirely obliterate the power to grant licences which undoubtedly were of a most necessary character. There was no doubt the member would like to abolish liquor altogether and perhaps that might bring about a desirable result, still it might bring about the very opposite. It was clear that the amendment was wholly impracticable. If the member were to move to strike out "gallon licences" even then there would be an objection, because the gallon licence properly applied was a licence to a grocer who was able to sell liquor by the gallon, and if the privilege was abused, then the owner of the licence could be prosecuted. Even in the case of gallon licences, if they were stopped, the trade of a grocer might be so handicapped that his business might be killed.

Mr. Taylor: The greatest curse in the suburbs are the gallon licences.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: Could a member suggest a grocer's shop being opened without a gallon licence? The proposal was to stop the granting of gallon licences in the future, and no one appreciated more than the licensing benches the abuses to which these licences were put, and the licensing benches only granted these licences to grocers carrying on business in a large way, and to men of a respectable character. These licences

were closely scrutinised by the licensing benches.

Mr. ANGWIN realised that what the Minister said was correct, but he wished to force the hands of the Government, who had been fooling the people long enough over this licensing question, and if something drastic were placed in the Bill, people outside would see that some alteration was being made. It was far better to have a hotel in any district, than to have a wine licence or a grocer's gallon licence, or a club there. He wished inserted in the Bill a provision that gallon licences could not be obtained until the comprehensive measure was brought forward.

Mr. JACOBY: If the amendment were carried it would destroy what was proposed to be effected under Clause 4, and the subclause; in fact it would upset the whole Bill.

Mr. TAYLOR: Having heard the statement of the Attorney General as to the parent Act, that if the amendment were carried it would prevent the licensing benches granting licences in any form, was that so?

*The Attorney General:* If the proposed amendment is carried.

Mr. TAYLOR: There was no desire to bring about that state of affairs, and he regretted that no member was going to move to strike out "gallon licences." He would like no further gallon licences granted pending the passing of the comprehensive Bill next session and it was to be hoped the Government would bring down the comprehensive measure abolishing all gallon licences to grocers, unless the shops were a good distance from a hotel. It would be better for the people on the whole to have a hotel, than to have a gallon licence or a club. We knew that gallon licences were abused disgracefully. The amendment was too far-reaching. Perhaps the hon. member who moved it would withdraw, and in another way try to effect the desired object. He was absolutely opposed to gallon licences being granted unless the premises were situated five or ten miles from a hotel; his desire being to practically abolish these gallon licences for they had a cruel effect

on civilisation. There were so many interests involved, that it was difficult for the Legislature to wipe them out, but he hoped that there were sufficient members not interested who would take up a proper attitude when the comprehensive measure was introduced.

Mr. ANGWIN: With the leave of the Committee he would withdraw the amendment to enable the words "gallon licence" to be inserted.

Amendment by leave withdrawn.

Mr. CARSON moved an amendment—

*That after "licence" in line 3, the words "or any gallon licence" be inserted.*

A gallon license was practically a grocer's license, and for that reason it should be discontinued for it was more abused than any licence under the Act. People went to grocers for a gallon of liquor and asked to have it put down as sugar, and so on.

Mr. Walker: Is that done?

Mr. CARSON: Often.

Mr. HEITMANN: While admitting that we could afford to disallow the granting of further licenses until the comprehensive measure was passed, he was not prepared to endorse what had been said by the member for Mount Margaret, and the member for Geraldton, as to the effect of gallon licenses. There might be abuses; but they were as nothing compared to the way in which publicans abused their licenses, by doctoring liquor. It was better for a man to purchase a gallon of liquor, which in 99 cases out of 100 was in the same condition as received from the wholesale houses, than to obtain a bottle of whisky from a publican, and find it was methylated spirit. Very little harm was done by the abuses mentioned by the member for Geraldton, even if a man could obtain a bottle of beer at the grocers, because the liquor obtained from the grocer was nearly always good.

The TREASURER: The member had failed to put up a good case for inserting the words "gallon licence." No doubt gallon licences were abused; all licences were more or less, but he had yet to learn that they were abused to the extent which one could infer from

the remarks of members. The grocer who held a gallon licence had not the same facilities for doctoring his liquor as the publican had, and furthermore, if we took away from the grocer his right to sell a gallon of liquor, we should be giving a greater monopoly to the publican.

*Mr. Heitmann:* And you have to pay 50 per cent. more to the publican for the liquor.

The TREASURER did not want to see the publican have a greater monopoly than he had at present, and he agreed that the State did not get sufficient out of the publican, especially when new licences were granted. That was a matter that would receive earnest consideration when drafting the comprehensive Bill. The Government did not desire to be too drastic, but we desired to prevent any large increases in licences until we gave consideration to the whole question. We did not want to prevent the wine-growers of Western Australia from building up a trade in their own State. Surely large quantities of the local wines sold. At any rate if hon. members could be believed in regard to the abuse of these wine licences there must be a good quantity sold.

*Mr. Angwin:* Not in this State.

The TREASURER: Then in which State?

*Mr. Angwin:* It is sold here, but it is not West Australian wine.

The TREASURER: Well, we had the protection clause.

*Mr. Bolton:* We have not had that protection.

The TREASURER: At all events it would be available now, for special protection was provided for West Australian wines. It would be wiser to leave the clause as it stood. He was opposed to the amendment because it seemed to him it would be taking them too far. He did not know what truth there might be in the statement with respect to the building up of liquors by grocers.

*Mr. Taylor:* It is absolutely correct.

The TREASURER: It was not clear why a vendor should do these things when he had a license to sell.

*Mr. Taylor:* He only sells a bottle instead of a gallon.

The TREASURER: If that were so he should certainly be prosecuted. But even if a grocer were to sell single bottles instead of gallons it would not be causing any very great injury to the general public. It would be an injury rather to the publican from whom, according to law, a single bottle should be purchased.

*Mr. Bolton:* We are only affirming that there should be no increases in the gallon licenses.

The TREASURER: Would hon. members object to a gallon licence for a new mining or agricultural district?

*Mr. Heitmann:* There are provisions in the Act for these new places.

The TREASURER: It seemed that the original clause went far enough. He did not propose to support the amendment. In his opinion the public should have the privilege of getting liquor from the grocer in quantities sufficient to avoid undue competition with the publican. He had yet to learn that there was any great amount of retailing by the glass going on in grocers' stores. No complaints of the kind had reached him officially. Did this practice obtain it would certainly constitute an abuse which he would like to stop. The object of the Government was to restrict the spread of the main licences for hotels.

*Mr. JACOBY:* It had to be borne in mind that not only was the gallon licence used by storekeepers, but also by wholesale vendors of liquor. To stop the use of these licences would be likely to cause a great deal of inconvenience. When a wine-grower wished to come into town and establish a wholesale depot he had to take out a gallon licence. The competition of the Eastern States called for strenuous efforts on the part of the local growers, and any interference with the gallon licence might serve to prevent some of them from establishing depots in the City with a view to pushing their business. Some hon. members seemed inclined to think that these licences were used by the grocer for the purpose of breaking the law. He for one did not believe it was so. In any case that was a question for the police;

for surely it was the duty of the police to see that the law was observed, just as it was the duty of the licensing bench to see that only reputable people secured these licences. He hoped the amendment would not be carried.

**Mr. FOULKES:** The member for Geraldton would do well to stick to his amendment. The Attorney General had said that the licensing benches were always particular as to whom they granted these licences. He (Mr. Foulkes) wished to emphasise this point. The Treasurer had said that these gallon licences were carefully supervised by the police. Hon. members, however, should know that it was far more difficult to supervise a gallon licence than it was to supervise a publican's licence, seeing that the holder of a gallon licence did not necessarily store all his liquor on his premises. These gallon licences did a great deal of harm. The Attorney General had said that it was well-nigh impossible for a storekeeper to carry on his business except he had a gallon licence. As a matter of fact that was not the case. Scores of these storekeepers were able to carry on good and profitable businesses without having a gallon licence. These gallon licences did a great deal of harm and served to encourage secret drinking. Many people would not go to a public house; they did not wish to let their neighbours know that they were addicted to drinking, and so they got their liquor from the grocer. It was all very well to say that these were only a minority; he for one wished to protect the minority. It was necessary for the Committee to remember that they were not dealing with licences already granted. The proposal was to stop any fresh gallon licences being granted.

**Mr. Walker:** And so create a monopoly.

**Mr. FOULKES:** It could scarcely be called a monopoly, because these people were not entitled to compensation. The general opinion throughout the country was that they had a sufficient number of gallon licences already granted.

**Mr. ANGWIN:** From the remarks made by the Treasurer it now seemed that the Bill was intended to be relatively permanent.

**The Treasurer:** Till next session of Parliament.

**Mr. ANGWIN:** If it was the intention of the Government to introduce a new licensing Bill next session of Parliament there surely would be no great hardship imposed upon anyone by the stoppage of any further issue of gallon licences until that time. He hoped hon. members would not agree to the amendment. Undoubtedly grocers' licences caused a great deal of injury. This class of licence was one which he would like to see struck out of the new Bill when it was introduced. It was a matter of impossibility for the police to properly supervise those licences.

**Mr. COLLIER:** While it was wise to restrict the possibilities of obtaining intoxicating liquor, no harm would be done by carrying the clause as it stood. The statement about people going to grocers shops and obtaining beer, while booking it up as sugar, was merely one of those kerbstone rumours which had no foundation in fact. If a person wanted to obtain beer at a grocer's shop because he had a desire for the liquor, and was unable to get it at that shop that would not deprive him of the desire, for he would get it somewhere else. It was better for a man to get a gallon of beer at a grocer's shop and drink it at home rather than that on Saturdays he should be trailing round the hotels and drinking there. Personally, if he wanted ale, he would sooner get it at a grocer's shop than at a hotel. No harm would be done by allowing people to get their beer at their grocers.

**Mr. OSBORN:** An attempt was being made by the temperance people to put down the drink traffic altogether, but he had no sympathy with that. Members had put forward nothing more than a hogey when they spoke of the manner in which beer was obtained at grocers' shops. Probably the member for Geraldton (Mr. Carson) was correct when he said what he did on that question for evidently, judging from his remarks, he had done it himself. He was not to be blamed for that, but the fact remained that if a man did not get whisky or brandy, or any liquor, at a shop he would

get it at a hotel. Members would realise that all the hotels now had what was called a bottle department, and if it were impossible for a man to get his liquor at the grocers' shops he would get it there. The only thing that might be done in the direction of restricting the gallon licences was to increase the fees for them. At present the grocer received greater benefit from those licences than did the hotel-keeper, and it was only fair that he should be charged a higher fee than he now paid. As to the charge of indiscriminately granting gallon licences, his experience had been that it was very difficult to get those licences. It had also been said that no care was taken to find out who the applicants were, and whether they conducted their business properly, but that was incorrect, for the licensing benches in the metropolitan area used every discretion in connection with the applications. The proper way to cope with the drink question was by example. If members themselves would altogether refrain from drinking they would be able to teach their next door neighbour a great deal more and probably do more good, than by adopting any other course, for they would be able to show that it was not necessary to drink anything at all. It would be far better for members to do that than to attempt to prevent the unfortunate individual, who was unable to order a case of whisky from the wholesale merchant, from getting smaller quantities of liquor elsewhere. Hundreds had to obtain liquor in small quantities because their financial position did not admit of their ordering it in bulk. It was usual for a man on pay-day to put aside, say 2s. 6d. for beer. If it were to be made impossible for him to obtain liquor with that sum then he could not get it at all, and a great hardship would be inflicted upon him. It was not right to say that because a man was in a sufficiently strong financial position to order liquor in bulk he should be the only man allowed to drink it. The experience he had gained showed that when a man was put on the prohibited list he generally became more intoxicated than he had ever been before in his life. Let us legislate for the whole of the peo-

ple, and not for a particular class. It was to be hoped the amendment would not be carried, but that the matter would be left in the hands of the licensing benches for whom he had the greatest respect.

Mr. WALKER: If these licenses were to be left in the hands of the licensing magistrates, why not all others? He was more than ever becoming convinced that the question was one of the most difficult to deal with that could be brought before us. The variety of opinions expressed by members of the Committee was sufficient to convince us there was only one cure and that was to do away with the drink altogether.

Mr. Osborn: You will never do that.

Mr. WALKER: Such a time was coming.

Mr. Osborn: They have done away with licences in New Zealand with the result that there is more drink there than anywhere else.

Mr. WALKER: That statement was not correct, and he knew it, for he had been through the prohibition districts of New Zealand on many occasions.

Mr. Nanson: It is not impossible to get drink there.

Mr. WALKER: It was possible to evade any law, and so long as drink was manufactured and sold across a border it would always be smuggled in by someone. The only chance was for the whole of the country to be a prohibition one. However, there were always people who would appeal to the diseased appetites of their fellows.

The Minister for Mines: The experience at Mildura was not too good.

Mr. WALKER: A question to be decided was, what was most likely to induce the spreading of this particular evil. Anyone who observed human nature, and watched the course of a drunkard, from his development as a sober man—for every drunkard started by being a sober man—would realise that the disease became established when he indulged in private drinking. It grew more rapidly than at any other time. At hotels drink was sold most frequently to those who were there, not so much for the mere sake of drinking as

because they had convivial dispositions. It was not on these men that the evil grew, for it was nothing more than a social custom.

*Mr. Jacoby:* The shouting business caused more drunkenness than anything else.

*Mr. WALKER:* That could be stopped. But where a man started to drink in private he did so more for the sake of the drink and the habit grew on him.

*Mr. Butcher:* That is a disease.

*Mr. WALKER:* How did it grow to be a disease?

*Mr. Butcher:* It is innate in the man.

*Mr. WALKER:* Some of the best natures in the world had turned into drunkards by the adoption of the secret habit of drinking. None could say there were natures born with the opium disease, but let any man start secretly testing the qualities of opium and almost certainly he would become addicted to the habit and a victim of it. It was not right to say that the habit of drinking was inherited. The most sober man in the world could become a drunkard.

*Mr. Jacoby:* The want of strong will is inherited in his nature.

*Mr. WALKER:* The strongest willed man could become a drunkard. When it was necessary to argue upon this subject rightly we should know something of the action of alcohol upon the nervous system. This was a feature, and he would recommend it to those persons who had wine to sell.

*Mr. Jacoby:* I object to the personal element being brought into the discussion. I object to the hon. member inferring that I am taking up a certain position with regard to the retention of the clause, because I have wines to sell.

*Mr. Taylor:* You will not be able to vote on the question; you are interested.

The CHAIRMAN: I do not know what the hon. member is referring to.

*Mr. Jacoby:* The member for Kanowna said that I have a certain view in this matter because I have wines to sell; I object to that.

The CHAIRMAN: You should have raised the point at the time the member used the expression.

*Mr. Jacoby:* He has just this moment used it.

The CHAIRMAN: No; he commended a certain course to those having wines to sell; he did not allude to any member.

*Mr. Jacoby:* He referred to me personally.

*Mr. WALKER:* The hon. member could be satisfied with his assurance that he did not especially bring him in. It was to be regretted that the member for Swan was now wearing the cap, because he (Mr. Walker) had in his mind more particularly an argument he used in referring to the clause that there were those who were anxious to start wine selling in Perth.

*(Sitting suspended from 6.30 to 7.30 p.m.)*

*Mr. WALKER:* The effect of this secret drinking was brought about more by the gallon licences than by any other agency. There were several interruptions when he said the disease of drunkenness was brought about by drinking in isolation. The interjections were that strong-willed people did not suffer in that respect, imputing it as a sort of weakness or crime to have this disease grow upon one, and he was pointing out that some of the best men and the strongest willed men in the world; men with the greatest brain power, and women too, had become affected by the poison, alcohol. It was one of the effects of alcohol poison, that it paralysed the brain and nerve centres. That was its action. It was the high nerve centres that gave a man will-power. It was not the strong, stalwart individual who escaped; it was the man who was the least sensitive who could stand the drinking of alcohol without it taking an evil effect. Did it ever occur to hon. members to watch the decanters on the shelves of the public houses, or go into a cellar and observe the beer barrels? No matter how one filled the decanter with whisky, and placed it beside another filled decanter, the decanters did not commence to argue with each other, nor did they want to fight. If they filled the decanters to the brim, they still kept quiet. They could also fill the beer barrels to the bung-holes and they also kept quiet and peaceful. Why was it that the beer barrels or



the decanters did not get drunk? It was because they had no brains.

*The Chairman* : I would like to point out that the hon. member's remarks are somewhat foreign to the amendment before the Chair. The Committee can only discuss this particular amendment.

*Mr. WALKER* : The desire was merely to point out that the best way of poisoning the people and reducing them to the state he had mentioned, was by permitting these liquors to be sold in such a way where women could get them in isolation.

*Mr. Collier* : That is a libel on our women.

*Mr. WALKER* : It was not intended as a libel, it was intended for pity for some of our women. However much we desired to protect the sex, the constitution of women was such that they were more finely organised than men, and if alcohol poisoned them, it made them worse victims than it did others. If he had the power to keep alcohol out of the home, or out of women's homes; if he were an autocrat, he would do it. Unfortunately he had not the power but he was placed in the House where he could do something to try and get this alcohol out of the homes. What members were asking in the amendment was, that there should be no more gallon licenses granted, and he submitted if that would not work anything near the reform desirable, it would do something. Members had heard the testimony of one who knew something of the subject—the member for Geraldton. That member had dealt in the business, and knew it was the custom of the trade to supply into the houses of the people these intoxicants under another name. The moment a woman had to ask for liquor under another name, that liquor had got into her nature. An hon. member rightly asked, if it was not supplied that way, would she not take a more degraded way of obtaining it? Degradation had already attained its aim and end, when she would deceive her husband to get the liquor into the house, and the woman who had been degraded in that way could not be much more degraded

by getting it openly in the public house. His object was to make it difficult for the woman to get hold of it, as he would make it difficult for a man to get hold of it. If people had to run the risk of publicity: if they had to summon a little courage to do it, they would hesitate first. The weak woman would certainly not do it. She would do without the liquor and this he contended would render drunkenness more difficult. At present no other step was necessary than to order the liquor from the grocer and it came quietly along with the groceries. Therefore the woman nursed the snake that poisoned her. The object of the Committee should be to make it difficult to cultivate the disease. The amendment was in the right direction, and he would accord it his support.

*Mr. CARSON* : It would be surprising to the Committee to learn—he spoke from practical experience—that this was one of the worst forms of licenses that it was possible to grant. If the Committee decided to restrict publicans' general licenses, why not restrict the other also? He did not believe in the measure before the Committee. There should be a consolidating measure, so that people might be given local option, and thus deal with the question themselves. In the absence of that, however, he wanted to see the measure before the Committee carried through, because it would lead the Government to bring forward the consolidated measure subsequently.

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

Ayes	..	..	..	18
Noes	..	..	..	22

Majority against .. 4

AYES.

Mr. Angwin	Mr. O'Loughlen
Mr. Barnett	Mr. Scaddan
Mr. Bolton	Mr. Swan
Mr. Carson	Mr. Taylor
Mr. Foulkes	Mr. Underwood
Mr. Gill	Mr. Walker
Mr. Heltmann	Mr. A. A. Wilson
Mr. Holman	Mr. Troy
Mr. Johnson	
Mr. McDowall	

(Teller).

	NOES.	
Mr. Butcher		Mr. Male
Mr. Collier		Mr. Mitchell
Mr. Cowcher		Mr. Monger
Mr. Davies		Mr. N. J. Moore
Mr. Draper		Mr. S. F. Moore
Mr. Gregory		Mr. Nanson
Mr. Hardwick		Mr. Osborn
Mr. Hayward		Mr. Price
Mr. Horau		Mr. F. Wilson
Mr. Hudson		Mr. Gordon
Mr. Jacoby		(Teller).
Mr. Keenan		

Amendment thus negatived.

Mr. NANSON moved an amendment:

*That in Paragraph 3, all the words after "provided also" be struck out, and the following inserted in lieu:—"That the operation of this Act shall be suspended in any place where no licensed premises are situated within a radius of five miles or upwards."*

The paragraph provided that the Governor-in-Council could from time to time suspend the operation of the Act where no licensed premises were situated within a radius of 15 miles. The amendment was in two portions. His first desire was to move the discretionary power in regard to the granting of new licenses from the Government and continue it in the hands of the licensing benches. The second object of the amendment was to reduce the radius from 15 miles to five miles. In many country districts a radius of 15 miles was excessive because of the course followed by the roads. A radius of five miles should meet the case.

The TREASURER: The amendment could not be accepted. The main object of the Bill was to practically suspend the granting of all licenses. This paragraph was merely put in to meet exceptional circumstances. Where there might be demonstrated beyond doubt the need for a new license in some centre such as a new goldfield, then power was given to the Governor-in-Council to suspend the operation of the Act. The Government must first consider that the need was urgent, and then the usual formality of the application to the licensing bench must be gone through.

Mr. Walker: It is a fine billet for the Government to grant licenses for pubs.

The TREASURER: The Government did not grant the license; the bench did

that. The Government merely suspended the Act when there was need for it. The clause was better than the amendment suggested.

Mr. Holman: Would it not be almost a direction to the bench to grant a license?

The TREASURER: Not at all. It would simply amount to this, that good cause was shown for a certain district to have facilities if in the opinion of the licensing bench they were desirable.

Mr. BOLTON opposed the amendment because it would provide facilities for getting additional licenses; and should that be necessary there was no need for the Government to keep wasting the time of the House session after session on such tiddlywinking measures as this. It should be a lesson to the Government not to waste this time, but to show the public their sincerity in a better way by bringing down a comprehensive Bill.

Mr. NANSON: The clause set up two licensing authorities, the Government in the first instance, and the licensing bench afterwards. It was a new departure to leave a matter of this kind at the discretion of the Government, who already had more than enough on their hands in dealing with a multiplicity of affairs. We should not go further and give them this additional power to decide whether in certain cases the provisions of this measure should be abrogated or not. If members thought that the radius was small he would not insist on it. He did not think it was altogether a desirable thing, in the interests of the Government themselves, to place this discretionary power in their hands. He did not know that the matter of licensing, so far as the licensing benches were concerned, had been dealt with in such an unsatisfactory manner that the matter could not be left in their hands now. Why was it that this special power was reserved to the Government? Why should we have this wide departure in our licensing laws?

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

Ayes	..	..	..	12
Noes	..	..	..	28

Majority against .. 16

## AYES.

Mr. Butcher	Mr. O'Loghlen
Mr. Holman	Mr. Taylor
Mr. Horan	Mr. Walker
Mr. Hudson	Mr. A. A. Wilson
Mr. Jacoby	Mr. Underwood
Mr. Johnson	(Teller).
Mr. Nanson	

## NOES.

Mr. Angwin	Mr. Male
Mr. Barnett	Mr. McDowall
Mr. Bolton	Mr. Mitchell
Mr. Carsou	Mr. Monger
Mr. Collier	Mr. N. J. Moore
Mr. Cowcher	Mr. S. F. Moore
Mr. Davies	Mr. Osborn
Mr. Draper	Mr. Price
Mr. Foulkes	Mr. Scaddan
Mr. Gill	Mr. Swan
Mr. Gregory	Mr. Troy
Mr. Hardwick	Mr. F. Wilson
Mr. Hayward	Mr. Layman
Mr. Heilmann	(Teller).
Mr. Keenan	

Amendment thus negatived.

Mr. FOULKES moved an amendment—

*That the words, "Provided also that this section, unless previously repealed, shall remain in force until the end of the second session of the seventh Parliament of Western Australia but no longer" be struck out.*

No doubt the Treasurer hoped to have a comprehensive local option Bill carried next session, but for some reason or other the Bill might be thrown out in another place. This proviso should be struck out and the comprehensive measure could repeal this Bill.

*The Treasurer:* I agree to that.

Mr. HUDSON: Was it understood that this Bill was to continue in operation until the new Bill was brought down by the Government next session and passed, and that the new Bill would repeal this measure? If that was so what security had we that the Government would bring down a comprehensive measure. The member for Mount Margaret in 1906 had great faith in the Government and thought they would bring down a comprehensive measure, for that member then said:—

"However I may disagree with the Attorney General in politics I believe that when the hon. gentleman gives his word in any walk of life, it is his object

and desire to carry it out and I believe that if he is a member of the Government next year he will bring down that comprehensive measure; and this small measure being in force 12 months only, will just enable the Government to deal in a practical manner with existing licenses."

What assurance had we that the Attorney General would bring down a comprehensive measure next session?

The TREASURER: There was nothing in what the hon. member had read. The Attorney General had simply said that it was his desire to bring down a comprehensive measure, and it had been the desire of the Attorney General to bring down that measure ever since. If the hon. member wanted a guarantee of the future action of the Government, the best guarantee he could have was to accept the amendment, suspending the granting of licences, which would force the hand of any Government to bring down a comprehensive measure.

Mr. NANSON could not follow the reasoning of the Treasurer that the striking out of the provision would give the best possible guarantee of a comprehensive Bill being introduced. If we struck this proviso out it would remove any guarantee we had. Supposing the monopoly party, who were in favour of limiting licences, happened to have more influence with the Government in power than the temperance party, we might find that the Bill would go on indefinitely until another party could force the Government to introduce a licensing measure. We had had experience of delay in introducing the comprehensive measure, and it was because of the difficulties experienced in the past that the provision should be inserted to force any Government to take action.

Mr. WALKER: It would be observed that this proposal did not destroy any licenses now existing, and of course licenses in existence could be transferred. It would establish a monopoly, and so the licenses would become all the more valuable and trade in them would be keener than ever. Vested interests would continue to grow. That was the great difficulty in any reform of the sort. By

preventing further licences being issued the Bill would build up vested interests and make the drink traffic more wealthy than ever. It was unnecessary to remind hon. members what wealth could do in politics, or what the brewery influence and the liquor influence had on more than one occasion done at elections, and in more places than Western Australia. The Government had promised again and again to bring in a Bill dealing with local option but hon. members had no guarantee that it would be brought down next session. And seeing the state that politics were in it was impossible to know what might happen in the meantime. It might even be found that next session the Ministerial benches would be occupied by members more or less susceptible to the influences of the great monopoly which would be built up by the amendment. What was necessary was a safeguard which would provide that the measure would be dealt with again. Hon. members would be well advised in making hay while the sun shines and in using the chance they had.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL : The objection taken by the member for Greenough was one that on examination had but very little ground. If the Government of the day were not in a position to bring in a Bill dealing with the whole of the liquor traffic, it would be necessary for them to bring in a Bill similar in character to the one now before the House. It mattered little whether the sub-clause was struck out or left in. The only thing was that by leaving it in hon. members would be imposing a duty on whatever Government were in power to re-enact a measure of a similar character if they had not in the meantime brought forward the more comprehensive measure.

Mr. BOLTON : It appeared to him that the danger lay in the possibility that the Government might introduce the comprehensive measure right at the end of the next session and, knowing that the measure now under consideration would become null and void at the end of that session, engineer the defeat of the greater measure in another place. In such case there would be no time to introduce another temporary measure and consequently there would be no limit to the licences

which would be granted in the interim. Hon. members should support the amendment to strike out the sub-clause.

Mr. MALE : To support the amendment would be to go against the principle established when the Bill was introduced. In voting for the second reading he for one had distinctly understood that he was voting for a temporary measure. There might be a change of Government before next session and so the greater measure might be postponed for an indefinite period. He would support the clause as it stood.

Mr. SCADDAN : The amendment was one that ought to be opposed if only for the reason that the people of the State in unmistakable terms had asked the Government for a comprehensive liquor reform Bill. The present Government had promised to bring down such a Bill this session.

*The Premier* : No.

Mr. SCADDAN : In the pre-session speech delivered by the Premier at Bunbury on the 20th July, 1908 there would be found a statement that it was the intention of the Government to introduce in the first session of the new Parliament a comprehensive Bill consolidating the law relating to the licensing of public houses and the sale of liquor which, the Premier had gone on to say, had been under consideration for some time. The Premier ought frankly to admit that he had thus promised to bring in the Bill in the first session of the new Parliament. He (Mr. Scaddan) had no faith in the Government in this respect; he did not think they were sincere in the matter. Although he had no desire to build up a monopoly in the State, still he was prepared to permit this monopoly to stand until the end of next session. Should the comprehensive Bill not come down next session, then the one now before the House would have to remain on the statute book. However, he was opposed to building up a monopoly for all time, although he thought that perhaps the Government ought to be given an opportunity of bringing down the bigger measure.

Mr. FOULKES : Even if the Government did not bring down the Bill dealing with local option, surely there were

other members in the Assembly who would be prepared to bring in such a Bill. Undoubtedly there was an overwhelming majority of hon. members in favour of local option. Knowing this, no Government anxious to retain office could afford to shut their eyes to the fact and to the further fact that the people of the State were unanimous in desiring a Bill dealing with local option as soon as possible. He desired to make the granting of licences as difficult as possible. If the amendment were agreed to no licensing court would be able to grant further licences.

The PREMIER : What he had said with respect to this matter prior to the general elections was in the form of an expression of regret that during the recent session of Parliament, the endeavour of the Government to pass a Bill preventing the issuing of any further licences had been frustrated. He had gone on to state that as the Bill did not pass it would be well to re-introduce a somewhat similar measure. He desired now to say that if those hon. members who were so anxious to see this Bill brought into force had exercised some sort of self-restraint and allowed the Bill of last session to go to the Legislative Council, in all probability it would have been passed last session. Whether intentionally or not he did not know, but several members apparently stone-walled the measure.

Mr. Scaddan : On a point of order, is the Premier in order in reflecting on the action of members on this matter ?

The PREMIER : The member for Ivanhoe was the right one to bring up a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN : I do not know what the member is referring to. Does he consider that he has been attacked by the Premier ?

The PREMIER : A guilty conscience.

Mr. Scaddan : The point I raise is that the Premier accuses members of stone-walling the measure last session, and this reflects on their action. I on a previous occasion reflected on members in a similar way, according to your ruling, and had to withdraw ; why should not

the Premier and I be placed on the same footing ?

The CHAIRMAN : I am entirely unable to know what members the Premier has alluded to.

Mr. Bolton : The member for Ivanhoe (Mr. Scaddan).

The CHAIRMAN : Where there is no personal reflection on an individual there is no breach of order.

Mr. Scaddan : The Premier said he was replying to my statement and so I can apply his remarks to me. Anyhow, I deny them.

The PREMIER : The member was very susceptible. It would have been quite in order for him (the Premier) to raise the point that the hon. member had charged him with being insincere. If a little more self-restraint had been exercised the possibilities were that the measure would have become law. The Government were doing what they could to obtain all the information possible with regard to local option. It was not the smallest matter in the world, and it was essential that we should have up-to-date information on the question. Notwithstanding the recent elections in New Zealand, where the "no licence" party secured a very great victory, the fact remained that the liquor bill of that country had not gone down one penny. Therefore it was necessary to have all the information in order that the Government might satisfy themselves as to the best methods of coping with the liquor traffic. Surely by holding this question over for two or three months—if the present Government were not in office the information would be available for some one else to put before the House—the Government should be commended for the trouble they were going to in order to obtain the information, rather than be criticised.

Mr. COLLIER : Those who were present last session would agree that the explanation of the Premier was unsatisfactory. It was all very well to attempt to place the blame on members of the Opposition for the loss of the Bill ; but if the Government had been sincere they would not have waited until the eleventh hour to push the measure through. There had been plenty of opportunities during

the last three years to bring the measure down. The Government alone were responsible. Giving the Government credit for the best of intentions as to bringing the Bill down next session, it must not be forgotten there were many possibilities which might interfere with their plans. There would be a rush of business next session and the Bill might not pass the Chamber, he doubted whether it would pass, but if it did it would have to run the gauntlet of a debate lasting for some months. It might not reach another place at all, or not until so late in the session that it would be laid on one side. The Bill might be lost and then there would be a monopoly. Again, there might be another Ministry, or there might be a general election during the next session. Many things might happen which would prevent the Government from getting the Bill through, even if they desired to do so. All knew what the vested interests in the liquor traffic were. Licences would be falling in during the next year, and if the Bill failed to pass, the consequence would be that landlords would be demanding an enormous sum as ingoing by reason of the fact that it would not be possible to get new licences granted in the neighbourhood of the hotel. There would be more cases like that of the Shanrock hotel where, he believed, £10,000 had been paid for ingoing. That sort of thing should not be permitted. The amendment would entirely defeat the object the member for Claremont had in view.

Mr. SCADDAN: The Premier had taken him to task for doubting the sincerity of the Government in the matter. Surely one would expect a Government, prior to making a public announcement on a question, to satisfy themselves as to the necessity for bringing down a measure. We were now told that the Government wanted to get more information. They had already been three years in getting it. In 1905 they thought it was necessary to bring down a Bill, for the Treasurer, who was then Minister for Works, said in that year—

“The Government recognise the necessity of dealing thoroughly with liquor reform. A new Bill making provision for a full measure of local

option in regard to new licences will be introduced, and power will be given to some extent to deal with the number of present licences. This Bill will be introduced to the next Parliament.”

That referred to the Parliament recently expired. In 1908 exactly the same thing was said by the Premier. But now we were told the Government were not satisfied that such a Bill was necessary.

The Premier: I said we are getting the fullest information.

Mr. SCADDAN: The Premier, to show the necessity, said just now that in New Zealand, in spite of the fact that the “no licence” party had carried the poll, the liquor bill had not gone down one penny. This showed that he was beginning to waver on the question.

The Premier: It shows that he wants information, and that he does not want to go blindfolded into the matter.

Mr. SCADDAN: The Premier was either misleading the country or the Committee.

The PREMIER: I rise to a point of order. The hon. member accuses me of misleading the Committee.

Mr. Underwood: So you are.

The CHAIRMAN: The hon. member is not in order in accusing another member of misleading the Committee. I must ask him to withdraw, as an accusation of that sort is distinctly out of order.

The PREMIER: The member for Pilbara must withdraw also.

Mr. SCADDAN withdrew the remark. The Premier was attempting to mislead the Committee.

The CHAIRMAN: That is not a withdrawal. The hon. member must withdraw entirely.

Mr. SCADDAN withdrew the remark. The statement made by the Minister for Works in 1905 was repeated by the Premier in 1908. That was that the Government intended to bring down a comprehensive measure. The public were thus led to believe they would obtain the reform at an early date. Now it was found that the time was not convenient, as the Government required to obtain further information before intro-

during the measure. What was additional information required for?

*The Minister for Works:* There had been recent legislation in the other States.

*Mr. SCADDAN:* Perhaps it was in order to satisfy the licensed victuallers. It was well known that, in connection with the recent Menzies election, the Licensed Victuallers' Association circularised the licensed victuallers in the electorate, telling them to do their utmost to secure the return of the late member.

*The Premier:* You had a licensed victualler up to assist you.

*Mr. SCADDAN:* That state of affairs justified him in saying the Government were not sincere. He could also produce telegrams from individual licensed victuallers in Perth to licensed victuallers in the Menzies electorate, pointing out that the ex-member and the Government had always been their friends. It was justifiable to form his own conclusions from those telegrams as to the intention of the Government.

*Mr. ANGWIN:* The drink traffic had a great hold in the State; but the motion proposed by the member for Claremont would stop its extension. Mention had been made of a monopoly being established; but if local option came into force the monopoly would be strengthened by a reduction of the number of licensed houses. If the clause were struck out a great inducement would be provided to the Government to introduce a new Licensing Bill. If the clause were left in—in the event of the Bill becoming law, which he doubted—at the end of the second year the position would be unaltered. If the clause were deleted no further licences could be granted. The Premier had accused members of stone-walling a similar Bill last session; but he was mistaken, for he must be thinking of some other Bill or some other time. Reference to *Hansard* would show that, with others, the Wines, Beer, and Spirit Sale Act Amendment Bill went through all its stages in the one sitting, on August 11th, consequently there was no room for stone-walling. It was to be hoped the Committee would agree to

the amendment, as it would practically force any Government of the future to introduce an amending Licensing Bill.

*Mr. JOHNSON:* The Premier might have explained when referring to the necessity for getting further information, why he had changed his views on this important matter. A deputation waited upon him some time ago, and the Premier then declined to appoint a committee, or to nominate some one to go to New Zealand to investigate the question. He then said he could get the information by other means, and was most definite in the terms of his reply. Now, however, he was putting the country to the expense of doing what he declined to when asked by a public deputation. What influence had been brought to bear on the Premier to make him change his opinion upon this important matter. It had been said that if one wanted anything from the Ministry he should go to the Palace hotel. Was there anything in that matter that would lead one to believe there was some truth in the accusation that the Palace hotel had a great influence on the Ministry? To return to the amendment, he could not quite follow the arguments advanced by the member for Ivanhoe and others. These members claim that if these paragraphs were struck out we would be creating a monopoly. While that might be so, they had to realise that while voting for the Bill they were doing the same thing. If it was wrong to do it in 12 months' time, it would be wrong to do it now; and if hon. members were opposed to that clause they were opposed to the Bill. We should not limit this. The Bill should continue until the Government had redeemed the promises that had been given to the people, that they would have a full measure of local option. Dealing with local option one would think they, like the Government, were wavering on the question. It had to be realised that the very operation of local option was towards monopoly. It was exactly the same in New Zealand and New South Wales. The position was that if members agreed that it was wrong to create a monopoly, then the only remedy was not to go in for local

option, but to declare straight out for prohibition, and prevent the sale of liquor at all in the State.

Mr. NANSON: The member for Guildford forgot that local option created a monopoly. If a comprehensive licensing Bill were brought in, provision would be made that that monopoly should pay adequately for the benefit conferred upon it by the State. The small Bill before the Committee tended to create a monopoly, and did not charge the monopoly a single penny more. The monopoly that would be created by the Bill was a monopoly strongly limited in point of time. The member for Claremont, and the Government he was sorry to say also, tried to make that monopoly practically limitless in point of time. It was argued that if the Committee removed the proviso it would furnish an inducement to the Government to bring in a comprehensive Bill. How was that argument borne out? By something stronger than argument; the logic of fact. The proviso was a new one and had not yet appeared on the statute Book. Yet it was found that although a comprehensive measure had been mooted for a number of years past, that measure still waited to be introduced, and members were told by the Premier that the Government were seeking further information. He accepted that statement, but would like to point out that if a Government in office, wished to stave off reform in regard to such a matter, it would always be an easy excuse for them to say they were seeking further information. Possibly before next session came round some licensing Bill, with new features, would be introduced in some other part of the world, and the Government then in power would feel that they would like some further information in regard to the manner in which that new licensing system worked. At the present time there was a gentleman inquiring into the licensing methods in New Zealand and the Eastern States. It was possible to extend the scope of his inquiries, and send him further afield to the mother country, or to Scandinavia, where some of the most interesting experiments in

regard to liquor law reform were in force, and were being tried at the present time. Therefore the excuse of new information being sought was one that could be used with equal effect by politicians, who wished to stave off a question.

The PREMIER: The temperance societies had rather taken him to task over the action in regard to procuring additional information. Mr. Carson was visiting the Eastern States and New Zealand, and it was thought that the opportunity would be a good one to secure every possible information with regard to the liquor laws in the various States. He (the Premier) had written to the Prime Minister of the Dominion of New Zealand some months before, but had received no information from him in regard to how the liquor laws worked in that country. He suggested that the Prime Minister should send him the addresses of various mayors throughout the different States, so that those gentlemen could be written to. In writing to the temperance societies he stated, as he had intimated during the recent elections, that it was the intention of the Government to take every opportunity of acquiring information with regard to the liquor traffic irrespective of whether he was approached by the W.A. Alliance or the Licensed Victuallers Association on the subject. Knowing that Mr. Carson was about to visit the Eastern States the Government decided to take advantage of his proposed trip and prevailed upon him to make certain inquiries. Mr. Carson had written from Wellington under date 18th November, as follows:—

"As you may be dealing with the liquor question when this reaches you the facts and my first impression of the situation may be of some service. In the first place, what struck the detached observer was the fact that here in New Zealand the vote in the liquor question practically overshadowed every other political issue, and to-day for every two persons discussing the election two hundred, I believe, are debating the 'no license' question. Now it is purely a matter for consideration



whether this is a good thing for the country. I would myself hesitate to recommend the local option vote being taken on the same date as the general election. I know this plan saves expense, but if you go in for local option—and certainly if you allow a vote to be taken on the issue “no license”—that is to say on the question whether or not all licenses in the electorate shall be wiped out—you can take it for granted that if such vote is polled on the same day as the Parliamentary election practically all other issues will either be a negligible quantity, or they will be confused and affected by the liquor fight. There is no doubt that a great wave of prohibition is setting in over New Zealand. The temperance party attach little importance to “reduction.” “No license” and a “State option” on a bare majority vote seem to be their objective. Yesterday’s voting shows that they are making progress. This year the four big cities each came within less than 1,000 votes of the required three-fifths majority to carry “no license,” and a bare majority of all the votes cast in the Dominion was cast for shutting up every licensed house in the country. The six districts already under no license gave increased majorities against “restoration” of license. At least eight new electorates have joined the “dry” areas, and “reduction” has been carried in at least six other districts. Altogether it is expected that nearly 150 houses will be closed. Yet it is more than doubtful whether much real good is being done. Houses are closed in one district and the drinking is transferred to the neighbouring district, while within the prohibited area a tremendous quantity of liquor continues to be admitted. A district on one side of a street may be a “dry” district, and the district on the other side “wet.” You can readily imagine how all this pans out. Some good is done, doubtless, but are the results commensurate with the machinery employed? At present, I think not. Next week, however, I shall be in Invercargill and Ashburton, and shall be then

in a better position to judge as these places have been “dry” for some years. The evidence at once apparent here is that the trade is a house more or less divided against itself. Moreover the traffic seems to have been conducted in the past in such a way as to provoke a public upheaval.”

He quoted that letter to show that the Government were endeavouring to secure this information through an unbiased channel. The gentleman in question had been instructed to furnish the Government with his views on the matter, and at the same time collect every information so that when the subject was discussed it would be possible to make available all the information that had been obtained. A consolidating Bill had been framed, and in fact was in print, but there were certain moderations which the Government thought it would be advisable to introduce, and when the Bill was brought down it would be more satisfactory for members to deal with them in Committee. There were many things existing here which did not exist in the Eastern States. As far as Western Australia was concerned the licensing bench had been very particular as to the style of license they had been granting.

*Mr. Taylor:* Only of late years.

The PREMIER: In this State one could go to the backblock towns and find very much better accommodation than could be found in the country towns of Victoria, and he pointed this out to show how different the conditions were here when compared to Victoria, where they could wipe out 100 licenses at a purely nominal cost. As soon as the information that was being procured was submitted to the Government it would be made available to every member.

*Mr. WALKER:* The member for Greenough (Mr. Nanson) had virtually stated that if members voted against the amendment, moved by the member for Claremont, they would be voting against the principle of the Bill, and he was sorry to hear it expressed that the principle of the Bill was monopoly. If the object were to create a monopoly of the liquor traffic he confessed that he would not support it. Was it not the contention of the

Government that it was purely an expedient, or sort of stop-gap, and what he was objecting to was that the Bill was being introduced as a stop-gap measure; or until the Government got a mass of information from New Zealand, this Bill was to be made permanent, meaning that it was to be continuous. It was to prevent this emergency measure becoming anything in the form of a permanency that he was going to vote against the amendment of the member for Claremont.

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

Ayes	..	..	24
Noes	..	..	16
			—
Majority for	..	..	8

## AYES.

Mr. Angwin	Mr. Jacoby
Mr. Barnett	Mr. Johnson
Mr. Bolton	Mr. Keenan
Mr. Brown	Mr. McDowall
Mr. Butcher	Mr. Mitchell
Mr. Carson	Mr. Monger
Mr. Cowcher	Mr. N. J. Moore
Mr. Draper	Mr. Plesse
Mr. Foulkes	Mr. Taylor
Mr. Gregory	Mr. Troy
Mr. Hayward	Mr. F. Wilson
Mr. Heitmann	Mr. Layman

(Teller).

## NOES.

Mr. Collier	Mr. Nanson
Mr. Davies	Mr. O'Loughlen
Mr. Gill	Mr. Scaddan
Mr. Hardwick	Mr. Swan
Mr. Holman	Mr. Underwood
Mr. Horan	Mr. Walker
Mr. Male	Mr. A. A. Wilson
Mr. S. F. Moore	Mr. Hudson

(Teller).

Amendment thus passed ; the clause as amended agreed to.

Clauses 3 and 4—agreed to.

Clause 5—Australian wine licenses :

Mr. JACOBY moved—

*That in line 6 of Subclause 1 the words "thirty-five per cent." be struck out and "forty per cent." inserted in lieu.*

Under the Commonwealth Distillation Act the amount of fortification allowed was 40 per cent. proof spirit. Unfortunately, he was not able to produce the Act as it was not procurable in the Parliamentary library. However, he knew of his own knowledge that the quantity of

fortification provided was 40 per cent. In the original Commonwealth Distillation Act it had been 35 per cent, but it had been amended to 40 per cent. The Commonwealth authorities had full control of all matters concerning the fortification of wine and all the wines in the Eastern States were fortified under Commonwealth conditions: whereas, if this clause were to become law, Western Australian wine could be fortified only up to 35 per cent.

Mr. Taylor: What does this 40 mean?

Mr. Walker: Kill at 40 yards.

The TREASURER: No objection would be offered to this amendment. The clause had been drafted to coincide with the Commonwealth Distillation Act but, like the member for Swan, the Government had been unable to obtain a copy of the amended Commonwealth measure and so "35 per cent." had been taken from the original measure. Manifestly it would be absurd to have any difference between the State law and the Commonwealth law.

Amendment passed.

Mr. MALE moved an amendment—

*That the words "or roads board district" be added to Subclause 4.*

There was no reason for refusing to grant Australian wine licenses for any premises beyond the limits of a municipal district or duly constituted town site.

Mr. Jacoby: It was not clear whether under the existing law wine licenses could be granted in certain townships.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: The existing law, which was passed in 1903, provided that no wine licenses should be granted beyond the limits of a town. They had had the illustration of an application from Armadale. Armadale not being declared a town site, the magistrate had refused to grant the license; an appeal was made to the Full Court, and the Full Court had upheld the decision of the licensing bench.

Mr. JACOBY: As the wine growers of the State had great difficulty in competing with Eastern States wine, it would be advisable to extend the Bill to allow a wine licence to be granted outside town-sites. In South Australia one could buy

wine along the road, but here in Western Australia even if one went into a district famous for making wines, he could not purchase any of the local wine except at a hotel. In the circumstances the amendment should pass.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: We should not have these wine shops scattered all over the country. They should be under observation.

Mr. DAVIES: How are the wayside-house licences under control?

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: Wayside house licences were granted outside townships for the purpose of giving accommodation to travellers; the licensees must provide sleeping accommodation; but wine licences were merely granted to supply drink, and it was clearly desirable that we should keep wine saloons only in districts where they could be under observation. Members should be satisfied that provision had already been made for the continuance of licences for the consumption of local wines, and that something had been done for the preservation of the local industry.

Mr. JACOBY: By carrying the amendment, we would be carrying into effect the intention of the law. No doubt it was the intention of Parliament when the law was passed to grant these licenses in any ordinary township throughout the State. The liquor consumed in these places would be far better for the ordinary consumer of alcohol than the strong drink sold in hotels, while it would be produced in the State, which could not be said of the beverages that could be obtained in a hotel. There were numerous possibilities regarding wine production in Western Australia. No other State was more suited for it and we should give to those producing the wine in this State the same facilities as were given to similar producers in other States where they were far more liberal than here. The time would come when the people would follow the natural course that always occurred in connection with those who drank wines namely, they would only drink dry wines; and then we would have the same conditions as obtained in European wine-producing countries, where drunkenness was prac-

tically unknown. Some of the wines produced in this State were equal to any of the wines produced elsewhere in Australia. That was the evidence of people here able to judge. Unfortunately, in some cases the wine was not as good as it should be, but in the development of this industry the State was more advanced than other States were at the same period of their history in this regard. Members should give every facility to local wine producers.

Mr. NANSON: If the wines proposed to be sold in these places were of a light description, one could support the amendment, but the clause dealt with heavy wines, and it would not be safe in the remote districts to have merely drinking shops without any accommodation for travellers. There would be no embargo on the sale of Australian wines outside townships, because they could be purchased at wayside houses or at hotels. We should provide that in purely country parts there should not be places merely for the sale of exceedingly intoxicating liquor with nothing in the way of sleeping accommodation provided.

Mr. BUTCHER: The amendment would be absolutely dangerous. It sought to allow these drinking establishments for the sale of colonial wines to be placed all over the country. In his experience these wines had a most drastic effect on the people consuming them. It was not the wines one tasted in the cellars that were sent out to the public, and he had too great a consideration for his constituents to allow an amendment like this to pass.

Mr. TAYLOR: The clause was sufficiently elastic without giving power to have wine shops dotted in every portion of the State. He opposed the amendment.

Mr. UNDERWOOD: If a wine licence was warranted in a town, it was warranted outside townships, and while publicans' general licences were granted outside townships, he would favour the granting of Australian wine licences outside townships.

Mr. SCADDAN: The difference between publicans' general licences and wine licences was that accommodation was

required in the one case, while all that was required in the other case was a drinking saloon. These drinking saloons should be under supervision. In fact there were saloons already under supervision which were considerably difficult to keep under control. In these places on the goldfields there were nothing but brawls going on all through the night.

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

Ayes	..	12
Noes	..	24

Majority against .. 12

AYES.

Mr. Brown	Mr. Male
Mr. Davies	Mr. S. F. Moore
Mr. Holman	Mr. O'Loughlin
Mr. Horan	Mr. Swan
Mr. Hudson	Mr. A. A. Wilson
Mr. Jacoby	Mr. Underwood

(Teller).

NOES.

Mr. Angwin	Mr. Keenan
Mr. Barnett	Mr. McDowall
Mr. Bolton	Mr. Mitchell
Mr. Butcher	Mr. Monger
Mr. Carson	Mr. N. J. Moore
Mr. Collier	Mr. Nanson
Mr. Cowcher	Mr. Price
Mr. Draper	Mr. Scaddan
Mr. Gill	Mr. Taylor
Mr. Hardwick	Mr. Walker
Mr. Hayward	Mr. F. Wilson
Mr. Johnson	Mr. Layman

(Teller).

Amendment thus negatived.

Mr. ANGWIN moved an amendment—

*That the following words be added to the clause:—"No wine licence shall be granted for any premises upon which the business of a fruiterer or confectioner is also conducted."*

A large number of fruiterers and confectioners were also the holders of wine licences, and the former businesses were merely a cloak to drag in our youths for the purpose of drinking. At more than one-half of the shops the stuff that was sold as wine was merely a concoction made up of water, with a little colouring and poison added. That took the place of Australian wine. Some time ago the licensing benches granted wine licenses to almost anyone who made an application, for the reason that the desire was to encourage the sale of Western Australian

wines. Now they could sell wine from any part of the Commonwealth and there were springing up a large number of shops chiefly occupied by foreigners who sold wine. These shops were open at all times, and in many instances all night, and on Sundays, and it was now recognised that the combination of wine and fruit shops was becoming a curse to the community.

Mr. Horan : Who recognise that ?

Mr. Jacoby : Those who know nothing about it—the lemonade party.

Mr. ANGWIN : Those who had an opportunity of visiting the shops. Recently rather a striking instance of the manner in which licences were granted occurred in a licensing court not far away. A lady through her solicitor applied for a wine licence. The application was objected to by the inspector of police, who knew that the licence was not needed and that there were other reasons why it should not be granted. He desired to get the applicant in the box in order to question her. The resident magistrate was discussing the question of whether the witness should be called, when the two justices sitting with him conferred behind his back and decided to grant the licence. They refused to take any evidence, although there were several persons in the court who wanted to give their testimony. The licence was granted. Very many licences were granted to persons objected to by the police. If licences were only granted to those who dealt in wine, better supervision could be maintained by the police and many of the present abuses would be rectified.

The TREASURER : It would be undesirable to interfere too much with the existing law, and it was to be hoped the Committee would not accept the proposed addition to the clause.

Mr. Taylor : This will not affect existing licences.

The TREASURER : If that were so the proposed addition was of no value at all, and should not be inserted in the Bill. Even if it could affect the existing licences, it would be unwise to insert it. The principal restaurants in Perth all had colonial wine licences and they were also confectioners and sold fruit. It

would certainly be much against the convenience of the public to do away with such licences.

*Mr. Gill* : Will existing licences be affected if the amendment is inserted ?

The TREASURER : No.

*Mr. Scaddan* : Could the proviso prevent persons who had received a wine licence from carrying on a fruit business ?

The TREASURER : Possibly it could.

*Mr. Walker* : Fruit shops having licences now would not be affected.

The TREASURER : That was so and the clause was therefore no good.

*Mr. JACOBY* : All licences ran out on the 31st March and holders would have to make new applications. On that date applications would be granted under the provisions of the measure we were now discussing. He had heard with regret statements made which were damaging both to the quality of the wine produced in the State and sold in the wine shops, and to the people who produced it. The member for East Fremantle (*Mr. Angwin*) had no justification for making the statement that most of the wine sold in the shops was made of water and poison. He did not know what particular beverage the hon. member indulged in, but evidently, if it led to the making of such misstatements as that, the sooner he changed his drink the better. The statement made by the hon. member was absolutely untrue in so far as the wine was concerned. The quality of the liquor was governed by the Health Act, and it was through the body controlling that Act that pure wine was ensured. No wine of the nature referred to by the member was made in this State or in any other State. "British made wine" was sometimes referred to in London, but where wine was grown it was absurd to say there would be any substitute for the real article, as any such substitute, as referred to by the hon. member, would be more expensive to produce than the real article. It was an injustice to the people in the business to make such misstatements. He would oppose the clause, because it would be extremely difficult to make a wine shop pay if no other business could be conducted in conjunction with

it. It was only right that wine should be sold in fruit shops, as wine was the product of the fruit itself. It was to be hoped the day would come when we could have the same conditions in Australia as in other wine producing countries, where the natural products of the soil could be sold without a licence.

*Mr. TAYLOR* : How would the clause dealing with wine shops in conjunction with fruit shops, affect the existing licences ?

*Mr. Jacoby* : Read Clause 7, that covers it.

*Mr. TAYLOR* : Why should one licensee have any privileges that could not be given to others. The Committee were dealing with the other forms of beverages in the Bill, and preventing new licences pending further legislation ; were the Committee, therefore, not justified in dealing with wine licences ? It was a remarkable thing that while in the House members heard so much about the wines which were produced in the State, when members attended any function where wines and beers were placed on the table, Western Australian wines were rarely seen there, although Western Australian people were running the show. The Committee would be wise if they carried the amendment and it was his intention to support it.

*Mr. GILL* : It was right and proper if the Committee were going to declare that these wine shops should have licences, to declare also that they should be wine shops only. Every second fruit shop, or a fish shop, owned by "dagoes," had a wine licence ; one could get a meal of wine and fish. What a peculiar mixture. He was not satisfied altogether with the action of the Government in dealing with this measure. The further issuing of licences in one direction was prevented, yet it was proposed to provide here for the sale of Australian wines. If that was an indication of the kind of liquor law reform the State was going to get he was afraid it would be most unsatisfactory. It looked as if the people were going to have a small brand of hotel under no particular control, which would become an even greater curse than the hotels were at the present time.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: Hon. members had failed to appreciate the sentiment of the Bill. Colonial wine licences had been declared by the police magistrate to be illegal and that position had to be faced. An appeal was taken to the High Court and the High Court refused to pronounce a decision, but clearly indicated that the decision would be in favour of those licences being invalid.

*Mr. Walker:* You are presuming.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: Although not present during the argument he had gathered the indication he had given from those who were there.

*Mr. Walker:* Well, I have heard to the contrary.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: Was the hon. member there?

*Mr. Walker:* Yes, I was there. The High Court Judges went so far as to want the whole thing reargued.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: At any rate the position was that a decision was given which was not successfully appealed against and the licences were declared invalid. It was necessary therefore to bring in some legislation, because these wine licences were renewable at this time of the year. For that reason the Government brought in the additional clauses to the Bill which were meant to prevent the granting of licences until a local option measure was brought down. It was only intended to reproduce, under the term of Australian wine licence, the conditions which were applicable before to our own local wines. He knew of no precedent where a House having power to enact laws had enacted a law which imposed a new condition of existing licences. The colonial wine licence had previously been granted without the restrictions that members were now seeking to impose. If Parliament chose to-morrow, in a wild mood, to confiscate any property it would be a most extreme proceeding to take, and one which would be warranted only by grave necessity. He hoped the hon. member would withdraw the amendment. It was not appropriate, and could only be justified by an explanation of circumstances that had not been put

forward. It would have to be shown that it was a great national evil which would justify such an extreme course being taken. The reason why, in the past, these licences had been granted, not subjected to such conditions, was that it was apparent that the sale of wine in itself would not afford a living to a shopkeeper; therefore it was absurd to imagine that any shopkeeper could undertake to rely solely upon the sale of wine to earn him a living. Shopkeepers generally had to fall back upon something else.

Mr. ANGWIN: In many of these places where wine was sold it was nothing but a vile decoction. He had been asked to speak to the Treasurer, with a view of prohibiting the sale by some of these people of these decoctions which were called wine, but which were certainly detrimental to the interests of the business that the member for Swan was advocating. It appeared from the statement of the Attorney General that when a Bill was brought down for one express purpose no one else must move an amendment. The Committee had waited a long time for the fulfilment of the promise made by the Government with regard to the liquor laws, and it was time now that something was done to liven up the Government and induce them to bring in a measure in the direction that members desired. It was time some action was taken to impress the Government with the fact that an innovation was required. He regretted that the Minister could not see his way to accept the amendment. The youths of the State were encouraged in these fruit shops to drink this poisonous wine, and he believed that if the fruit shops were debarred from holding a wine licence it would be much better for the younger generation.

Mr. WALKER: The Bill apparently had as a second object the anticipation of a judgment of the High Court. It was a piebald sort of measure. So far as the main question was concerned he could not support the amendment moved by Mr. Angwin. It was preferable, he thought, to have the wine business run

by the restaurants and the fruit shops than by straight out wine shops. To take away these wine licences from the restaurants and fruit shops would be still further to add to the monopoly of the public house. It was less of an evil to associate wine drinking with the tea houses than with purely drinking shops. Therefore, as a mitigation of the evil he would vote against the amendment.

Amendment negatived; the clause as amended agreed to.

Clauses 6, 7, 8 and 9—agreed to.

New clause:

Mr. JACOBY moved that the following be added to stand as Clause 10:—

*Section 11 of 48 Vict., No. 14, is amended by striking out the words "one gallon," in the fourth line, and substituting therefor the words "one reputed quart bottle."*

The section he was hoping to amend provided that an occupier of a vineyard could sell the product of that vineyard in quantities of not less than one gallon. His desire was to make it a reputed quart bottle. In South Australia the limit was a reputed quart bottle. As the law stood in this State to-day it was very difficult to dispose of wine. Some little knowledge was absolutely necessary for the handling of wine in large quantities; for the wine would quickly become tainted with vinegar except it were properly handled. Under the provision that nothing less than one gallon should be sold by the owner of the vineyard the sale had to be given into the hands of other people. In South Australia were several vineyards each making as much as 400,000 gallons in one year, or more than twice the quantity made in the whole of Western Australia in the same time. These businesses had been built up by the owners starting in a small way and selling each his own produce to his neighbours. The only possible chance of the Western Australian vignerons building up their establishments in a similar degree was by the direct sale to the consumer of the products of their vineyards, and this could not be accomplished while the minimum measure remained as it was

under the existing law, namely, one gallon. If these men were to be placed in a position to compete with the growers of the Eastern States it was absolutely necessary that they should be given the facilities enjoyed by their competitors. There were to be found in Western Australia vineyards, the equipment of which was perhaps equal to anything else in Australia. The only thing in which they were wanting was the magnitude of their operations; and this it might be said was due almost wholly to the law under which the vignerons had been working. The Government had given every encouragement to these men to start vineyards; but unfortunately the growers were now faced with adverse conditions that had not been foreseen and in consequence a good many of them were going out of the business. He (Mr. Jacoby) was himself going out of it, but he still hoped to be able to proffer some encouragement to those left in the field who were struggling very hard indeed against the adverse conditions. The Government ought to say to these men, "We will give you every possible facility, and encourage you as far as similar businesses have been encouraged in the Eastern States." If this were found impossible the Government ought to tell them that it was of no use their endeavouring to hang on; that they could not hope for the facilities which had been enjoyed in the Eastern States, and that they had better suffer a complete loss and get out altogether. If hon. members declined to agree to this amendment it would be practically telling these people that Parliament was not prepared to give them any measure of relief at all.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: The hon. member was not justified in laying any charge of want of sympathy in regard to the wine industry at the doors of the present Government or against the Committee. Any comment on the value of Western Australian wines was good-natured comment on a product we did not sufficiently appreciate. However, the Treasurer had no opposition to offer to the amendment. If it was of advantage to

the wine grower to sell a smaller quantity than a gallon, *quantum sufficit*.

Mr. ANGWIN: If we extended this concession to wine growers, brewers would ask for it. The matter needed further consideration.

New clause put and passed.

Title—agreed to.

Bill reported with amendments.

### BILL—NANNINE-MEEKATHARRA RAILWAY.

#### *Second reading.*

The PREMIER (Hon. N. J. Moore) in moving the second reading said: It is not my intention to detain the House at any great length in introducing this proposal for the construction of a railway from Nannine to Meekatharra, as it has already been discussed at considerable length in this House during the last two sessions of Parliament, and in December of last year a resolution in favour of affording this facility was carried on the motion of the member representing the district. The resolution was:—

“That in the opinion of this House, it would be in the best interests of the State, and especially of the mining industry on the Murchison and Peak Hill Goldfields, if the Government would immediately construct a railway from Nannine to Meekatharra.”

In October of last year, prior to this resolution being carried in the House, the State Mining Engineer, Mr. Montgomery, made an inspection of this field and reported at length in regard to the proposition. He gave a detailed statement on the various properties being worked at the time on the field, and possibly the main feature of his report was in regard to the question of mining timber. He said it was absolutely necessary if this field developed that an adequate supply of firewood and mining timber should be supplied at as cheap rates as possible. In June last I had the pleasure of visiting that field, and was accompanied by 16 or 17 members of Parliament who had the opportunity of making themselves acquainted with the possibilities of the Meekatharra district.

Mr. Taylor: It is very dry country there.

The PREMIER: Not exactly dry. The hospitality was unbounded. Whether it was extended with any ulterior motive I am not prepared to say, but I can assure members that the party returned with the highest opinion of the future of the district, and were prepared to justify Mr. Montgomery's report in regard to the need for making provision for mining timber and firewood. For several months past the attention of prospectors, investors and the general public has been directed towards Meekatharra; and in view of the probability of railway facilities being afforded there at an early date, information as to the possibilities and prospects of the districts was obtained from all available sources. It would almost seem that the pioneers of the district have themselves determined to prove to the outside public what their mines are capable of, and what the surrounding country can produce in the shape of gold, because there is no doubt that since the promise of railway facilities, the discoveries and development that have taken place almost rival those that took place in the early history of the goldfields of Western Australia. Several very rich mines are situated in and around Meekatharra. Possibly most of them are situated on what is known as the Ingliston line of reef, and included among these are the Fenian and the Marmout. Within the last six months prospecting for new reefs has been going on in all directions, and the efforts in many cases have resulted in important finds taking place. Among these can be mentioned Gap Well, Garden Gully, and White Horse, all of which are turning out well as development proceeds.

Mr. Troy: Do you say that White Horse is a new discovery?

The PREMIER: I say that the developments that have taken place there are most encouraging. Meekatharra is an almost natural distributing centre for many of the outlying camps in that neighbourhood which can be conveniently served, as they are in close proximity. Ilawarra, Chesterfield, Yaloginda, Garden Gully and other centres will be



conveniently served by this railway. The most recent reports show that the days of sensational gold discoveries, so far as Western Australia is concerned, are not over, as within the past month news has been received of a rich find made at a spot a mile South of the Revenue lease at Yaloginda, where Cook and party on their lease known as the Black Jack have obtained 1,454 ounces for a few weeks' work at a depth of 10 feet. Several new leases and prospecting areas have been taken up two miles to the South of Garden Gully, and there is every reason to believe the find will be payable and permanent. A mile to the North of Garden Gully pumping station there has been a large reef 14 feet wide, worth when opened up 14dwts. per ton, recently discovered. The gold output of Meekatharra for the year ending the 31st December, 1907, was 20,958ozs., while for the first ten months of this year, the return was 16,324ozs. The total gold production in that centre up to the 31st October of this year has amounted to 77,693ozs. During 1907, 157 men were employed in the mines, and 80 on alluvial, while last year there was considerably over that number both in the mines and on the alluvial workings. The urgent need for railway facilities for that district has been realised by all who have taken an interest in the question. The fact that the mining timber is practically exhausted, and that the firewood has been cut out within the vicinity, and that the future existence of the mining industry will largely depend upon securing an adequate supply of these essentials at a reasonable rate, makes this question really a very vital one. The success which has attended the erection of the State battery at this centre is very gratifying and is very largely responsible for the prosperity which reigns at Meekatharra at the present time. The output from that battery amounts to something like a quarter of a million sterling. I would point out that in addition to serving this particular centre of Meekatharra and Yaloginda the railway should be of great advantage both to Abbott's and to Peak Hill. Both these centres are having a rather hard time now and the fact that

the cartage would be reduced by something like 24 miles is a big item when mines are working on a narrow profit. The Government have already expended a considerable sum at Meekatharra in the direction of securing a water supply, no less than £10,000 having been absorbed in this direction. This is an evidence that the Government have faith in the prospects of the district. At the same time this has been responsible for increasing very considerably the output from the State battery. On the visit referred to, the members of the party had the opportunity of inspecting many of the mines in the vicinity, and a few particulars which were obtained at that time might be of some value to members in considering this proposition. I would point out that this field is essentially a small man's goldfield, and the whole of the money spent by the owners in machinery and development work has been earned from the stone they have put through the State battery at Meekatharra. The first mine visited on that occasion was the Marmont Extended. This is owned by Mr. Ryan. On the occasion of the visit to the mine they had just sunk the main shaft to a depth of 250 feet, while another shaft was started but had not reached that depth. Gold was found at the 70ft. level of No. 1 shaft. Machinery at a cost of £1,410 had been obtained and erected. The Marmont was another property visited, owned by a syndicate and managed by Mr. A. Jackson. There was on this mine a 10-head battery of which five head were working at the time of the visit. Cyanide vats were being made, six of which would cost £800, including timber. The manager stated that it had already cost some thousands of pounds for timber in connection with the mine. The shaft was down to a depth of 200ft., and work was being carried on at the 144ft. level, with stopes over 30ft. wide. The total tonnage crushed to date was 9,000 tons for an average of 19dwts., and gold to the value of £34,000 had already been taken out. The sum of £1,500 had been paid in carriage of machinery and timber during 15 months. The third mine visited was the Fenian. This was the second mine found at Meeka-

tharra—the Ingliston Consols being the first. There was a 10-head battery on order and a contract had been let for the carting and erection of the same. A crushing of 1,000 tons was being put through the State battery at the time of the visit, and it was estimated it would give a return of two and a-half ounces to the ton. The manager, Mr. Weekley, said that payable gold had been struck about four years ago, since when 4,322 tons of ore had been raised, which had yielded 12,421 ounces of gold worth £50,667. In addition, there was 1,000 tons of ore at grass, worth at least  $2\frac{1}{2}$  ounces per ton, or a value of some £10,000 and an accumulated dump of 2,078 tons of sands at the State battery, worth 10dwts. per ton, which it was considered would return, when treated, a profit of £2,909. The lode from which all this gold was obtained extended from the surface down to 350ft. and it was improving both in width and value with depth. In the Ingliston Consols payable ore is proved to exist for a total length of 450ft. and up to date 2,346 tons of stone have been crushed at the State battery for a yield by amalgamation of 6,776 ounces 2dwts. At the Ingliston Consols Extended, managed by Mr. Turner, the total tonnage of ore mined and milled to the date of my visit was 33,000 short tons, yielding 13,400 fine ounces of gold valued at £57,000, while the total wages paid amounted to £40,000, leaving a margin of £17,000. As to the heavy cost of mining timber it was pointed out that in the case of this mine 57 per cent. of the total transport of all goods from Perth, Fremantle, and all other centres had been swallowed up in cartage and charges from Nannine to Meekatharra, a distance of 24 miles. Some instances were given as to the cost of mining timber. For railage from Geraldton to Nannine the cost was 11s. 10½d. per set, or £108, cartage from Nannine, 22s. 2½d. per set; total 33s. 3d. per set, or £327. With the railway at Meekatharra the same timber could be transported to the mine for 11s. 6d. per set, or £114 for total transport, bringing the landed price for the same timber to 28s. 3d.

per set, instead of £2 10s. I would point out that so far as jarrah is concerned some evidence was obtained as to the cost of the transport of that timber to this district, and it was found that the railage from Geraldton was 6s. 3d. and the cartage from Nannine to the mine was 12s. 9d., a total of 19s. I mention these facts to give members some idea of the disabilities those labour under who are working the mines in this district. Really the strong point in favour of the railway is the fact that the country is practically denuded of timber. I have a copy of the report of the State Mining Engineer on the district. This has been on the Table of the House and can be found in the Votes and Proceedings for last session. I will briefly quote in support of the case for this railway what Mr. Montgomery had to say in this connection. In alluding to the necessity for the railway to Meekatharra, he said:—

“The district, however, is a rapidly growing one, and bids fair to open up several fairly large mines, and it is to the prospective traffic that we should have to look for profit. Forecasts of the future progress of the district are necessarily speculative and cannot be reduced to demonstrable figures; as a matter of opinion, however, it appears to me that there are good prospects of the mines and population of Meekatharra increasing—if railway connection is granted—to such an extent as to make the line a profitable one. The main argument for the extension of the railway rests upon the economies that would result from it in the working of the mines, and the consequent stimulus that would be given to their development, especially to such as are of low-grade. The district is remarkable for the size and number of its lodes and many of these have been proved to contain large bodies of gold-bearing ore too poor to be profitably worked under present conditions. Many of these low-grade ore-bodies are composed of clayey soft material, and cheap supplies of mining timber are a necessity for their safe working. They are also very dependent for success in development on cheap fuel, in order

that the mechanical and metallurgical handling of the large quantities of ore that must be treated to make low-grade stuff profitable can be carried on at a sufficiently low cost. The richer mines also are greatly concerned in the question of cheap supplies of mining timber and fuel, for though they may be able to carry on work in spite of all disabilities, it is at a heavy cost for transport of their supplies, greatly lessening their profits and preventing them from working their reserves of low-grade ore."

Dealing further with the supplies of mining timber and fuel, he says:—

"Supplies of mining timber and fuel are by no means good at Meekatharra, and it is on their account more than anything else that the railway is required. The mulga scrub in the vicinity of the mines is somewhat sparse and contains but little good heavy firewood or sound timber fit for underground support. Firewood carts have to go out seven or eight miles to get wood worth cutting, and will soon have to go much further. The nearest considerable area of heavy mulga scrub is said to be 15 to 20 miles out from Meekatharra, and this will soon have to be resorted to. If the railway were made, firewood could be cheaply brought in from the wood-line now being constructed North of Cue."

Summing up in regard to this railway, he refers to the benefit that would result by its construction to the outlying districts as follows:—

"The extension of the railway to Meekatharra would be of quite appreciable benefit to the Peak Hill and Abbotts districts, the road to which from Nannine passes through Meekatharra, as it would save them 24 miles of road carriage. These districts are very dull at present and making a hard struggle for existence, and every improvement, however slight, in their transport facilities is of considerable consequence. The Peak Hill Goldfield up to the end of 1906 has crushed 289,603 tons of ore and produced 206,368 fine ounces of gold. Abbotts

centre is credited to the same date with 33,726 tons crushed for 35,886 fine ounces of gold."

Summing up his conclusion of this very exhaustive report the State Mining Engineer remarks:—

"The Meekatharra Field is rapidly becoming more and more important and gives every promise of supporting a group of mines of very fair magnitude. Extension of the railway to it would be a very great assistance in rapidly bringing it into full productiveness and is almost an absolute necessity in order to provide the requisite supplies of mining timber and fuel. In my opinion the prospects of this field justify the construction of a railway to it as soon as possible, and there is every promise of its soon becoming a profitable line. The construction should not be costly, the route of the line being through flat easy country."

If ever there was a convincing report in favour of any district I think it is that submitted by the State Mining Engineer. His prognostications of the future are justified and borne out by developments taking place there every day. The district that will be served at the present time is populated by over 1,300 people. At Meekatharra there are something like 800 people, while at Yaloginda, locally known as the Eight-Mile, there are 250 people, and the balance are spread over Garden Gully and other places, and the numbers are increasing rapidly. Out of the total there are at least 740 men who are employed, besides those persons engaged in commercial pursuits in this particular district, besides women and children. In regard to Meekatharra itself, there are 40 head of stamps at work there, 10 ready to start, and several others, it is contemplated, will be erected soon, while 10 head of stamps are working at Yaloginda, and many other mines are equipped with machinery. The area of gold mining country here extends over some 36 miles, that is from the Gap, which is nine miles from Nannine, to Abbotts, which is 46 miles out. In addition to the present producing mines

there are many low grade propositions that should be successfully worked by the application of the latest mechanical appliances. I will put several papers that I have here on the Table of the House as well as a copy of the report of the State Mining Engineer, so that members may have the opportunity of reading some of the reports of the meetings of the local companies. In regard to the line itself, its length will be some 24 miles 24 chains. It will commence at Nannine, which is 310 miles from Geraldton, and its direction will be about North-North-East. The country is flat and presents very few engineering difficulties. As a matter of fact the surveyors were able to secure the ruling grade of one in 60 over this route, and it would be possible at comparatively small expense to reduce this grade to one in 80. The rails are of the same weight as those on other lines, namely, 45lbs., and the sleepers will be 6ft. 6in. by 5in. by 4in. The construction difficulties are very light indeed and the work will be carried out in a similar style to that adopted on the Cue-Nannine line. Clearing will involve only a small cost, there being only mulga scrub to remove.

*Mr. Taylor:* How much will the line cost per mile?

The PREMIER: It is estimated that the cost will be £1,752; that is, construction £27,500, rails and fastenings £15,000. The interest on the estimated total capital in connection with this work at 4 per cent. will be £1,700. In regard to the country that will be served, although this is a pastoral country it is not of such great importance as it would be if we were considering a railway proposition through an agricultural area. The pastoral land that will be available within 15 miles of the line is 179,000 acres, while 282,000 acres are held under lease, or the total area that will come within the influence of the proposed railway will be 461,000 acres. The gold mining leases held at present number 36, and the area is 460 acres, while seven others have been applied for, representing a total of 100 acres. There are two homestead leases

in addition, of some 30 acres. I do not think that I need detain the House at any further length in connection with this proposition. Personally I am satisfied it is one which is well worthy of the support of the House. Many members have had the opportunity of visiting that district, and I have no doubt they will express their views in connection with the proposition. The member for the district, who has collected a considerable mass of information in regard to this proposition, no doubt will be only too glad to make it available to hon. members. It seems to me that at the present time there is no proposition for a railway to a goldfields centre which will be more justified than the one which I have submitted to the House to-night. I have pleasure in moving—

*That the Bill be now read a second time.*

Mr. HOLMAN (Murchison): Needless to say I have great pleasure in supporting the second reading of this measure. It is not my intention to delay the House, seeing that already on two occasions I have brought the matter before the House and gone exhaustively into the question of the advisableness of constructing the line. Members will see a full report of what I said in *Hansard* of the 4th September, when I moved the motion referred to by the Premier, and also on the 16th October. Then again a deputation of nearly thirty members of Parliament waited on the Premier and presented a petition containing over 600 signatures, preferring the request that the line should be constructed at the earliest possible date. Then on a subsequent occasion seventeen members of the Legislature made a trip to that part of the State and saw for themselves the possibilities of the place. I, myself, would have been only too pleased for any board to have reported on this matter, but the fact that members visited the centre and saw exactly what the place was capable of, together with the figures already related by the Premier, should be sufficient to convince the House that the necessity for this railway is beyond question. It is the more necessary in a place like Meekatharra where the whole of the ground is

what in mining parlance is termed rotten. This renders it absolutely necessary when work is done that the ground should be thoroughly well timbered. It has already been shown in the previous speeches made in connection with this railway that owing to heavy freight the cost of timber increases by as much as 500 per cent. before the material lands on the mine. That renders a great many propositions very costly and extremely difficult to work. One property up there has been put to considerable expenditure owing to the fact that they did not timber properly in the first place; consequently the workings fell in and have since had to be re-constructed. In considering the total gold production of Meekatharra, it must be remembered that the first crushings at the State battery were made in 1901. There was practically no work done there before that time, and it was the starting of the State battery at Meekatharra that made the centre. The total gold production since that time amounts to £334,632, and there is a considerable amount of gold still left in the sands. It must be remembered that during the first five or six years of life at Meekatharra there was only sufficient water to keep the battery going half time. The first time we had sufficient water to keep the battery working full time the sands treated increased by nearly 100 per cent. Thus in 1906 we had 4,500 tons treated, and in 1907, 8,703 tons were treated. At the present time we have four 10-head batteries at work there. The value of the gold production at Meekatharra, as I have said, amounts to £334,632; from Abbotts we have had approximately £135,000 worth of gold, and gold to the value of £931,130 from Peak Hill, or a total value from the three centres of nearly a million and a half. This line will open up a considerable area of gold-bearing country from the Gap right through to the White Horse, and the several centres will benefit enormously. Some of them have already assumed important dimensions. It is unnecessary to detain the House on a proposition like this. If hon. members care to look it up they will find an abundance of information dealing with the

subject on page 107 of the last Mines Report. The whole of this £334,632, or almost the whole of it, has gone into the pockets of working miners. There are only two companies in the district, and one of them only lately started work. Probably nearly £300,000 of that gold has gone back to the prospectors. These men are quite willing to spend money, but they do ask that the cost of production shall be reduced by the provision of facilities for getting their firewood and timber through to their properties. If it were necessary I could deal extensively with this question; but in the circumstances seeing that seventeen members of the Legislature visited the district only so lately as last June, and that they all or most of them saw for themselves the difficulty of transport, and went underground and had a look at the properties, I am satisfied that there will no dissentient voice in this House on the motion for the second reading. I only desire that the work shall be pushed on at the earliest possible moment so that those who are there, those who have made the place, will reap the advantage they deserve. Our own people are up there and they are spending their own money in prospecting and opening up the country. I am pleased indeed to support the remarks of the Premier. The railway into that place is more warranted than is the case with perhaps any other railway project in Western Australia.

Mr. ANGWIN (East Fremantle): As one of those who had the privilege of visiting this district I have pleasure in supporting the Bill. I think we had an opportunity of going over the roads at the worst time; in fact we decided that motor boats were more suitable than a railway. One thing I noticed up there which I have not remarked anywhere else was that when you go on the dumps you can see the gold showing clearly on the stone. It suggests to my mind that with proper facilities the district will add greatly to the wealth of the State. For that reason I will support the Bill.

The MINISTER FOR RAILWAYS (Hon. H. Gregory): I had not intended to speak on this question until to-mor-

row, for there are certain figures which I had intended to deal with. However, I may say I fully agree with the remarks of the Premier and those of the member for the district in regard to this Meekatharra field. There is no doubt a very large area of mineral country exists there and a great deal of development work has been done. It is impossible to work these mines, to fully develop these properties, without facilities for doing it as cheaply as possible. And where mining timber is required in such large quantities as is the case in that district it is equally impossible for economic mining to be carried on without these facilities. There is an enormous amount of mineral country still further North. The Peak Hill country is one that made a name for itself years ago, and it is quite possible that with a railway extending further North facilities may be given to the Northern district which will enable the people there to profitably re-open some of the mines that have been closed down. I cordially agree with the Bill. The railway will tend to facilitate the economic development of the mines in that territory, and I am quite satisfied that from the State's point of view it is in every sense warranted. I cordially agree to the Bill, and I hope the House will approve of it and will allow it to become law.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

*House adjourned at 11 p.m.*

## Legislative Council,

Thursday, 10th December, 1908.

	PAGE
Question: Estate Repurchase, Mt. Erin ...	822
Motion: Agricultural settlers and taxation ...	822
Bills: Vermin Boards, 2a. ...	831
Bunbury Harbour Board, Com. ...	836
Motions: Fremantle Dock, to postpone construction ...	886
Crown Suits Act, 1898 ...	841

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

### QUESTION—ESTATE REPURCHASE, MT. ERIN.

Hon. J. M. DREW asked the Colonial Secretary: 1, What was the price paid by the Government for the purchase of the Mt. Erin Estate? 2, What was the area of the estate? 3, Exclusive of reserves, what quantity of the land remains unsold? 4, What sum will be realised when payment has been completed on all the blocks selected?

The COLONIAL SECRETARY replied: 1, £9,185 0s. 11d. This was the amount paid to the vendor for his interest. In addition an amount (estimated at about £11,000) has to be added to cover balance of purchase money on Conditional Purchase lands, together with a further amount for the 1,676 acres of Crown land added to the subdivision, and also the value of the pastoral lease. 2, 58,911 acres, exclusive of the 1,676 acres of Crown lands, making a total of 60,587 acres. 3, Nil. 4, £28,296 1s. 6d. (including additional areas, par. 1 and 2).

### MOTION—AGRICULTURAL SETTLERS AND TAXATION.

Hon. C. A. PIESSE (South-East) moved:—

*That having in view the need that exists for the further encouragement of the settlement and development of our agricultural lands, legislation should be enacted providing for the exemption from direct State and local taxation of all conditional purchase holders for a period of at least three years from date of selection.*