sented thereto. (2.) The firm or company may be represented at the hearing and shall be liable to pay and may be awarded costs, as if such firm or company were the applicant. (3.) The Magistrate may refuse the application on the ground of want of fitness in the firm or company. (4.) The certificate of the licensee, if granted, shall state that the license is to be used for the benefit of the firm or company, and the license when issued shall contain the like statement and shall be exercised for the benefit of the firm or company and not otherwise. (5.) Two or more such licenses may be granted in favour of the same firm or company. (6.) Neither the licensee nor his legal personal representative shall be competent, except with the consent of the firm or company, to agree to transfer such license, but a transfer of any such license as aforesaid may be made to any person to whom the firm or company has agreed to transfer the same, and the consent of any such licensee, being the employee of the firm or company, or of his representative, shall not be necessary. (7.) A temporary license shall be granted in respect of such license as aforesaid except with the consent of the firm or company. The liability imposed by subsection four of section fourteen shall in the case of a temporary license granted by virtue hereof, attach to the firm or company and not to the licensed auctioneer. (8.) A firm or company for whose benefit and such license has been issued shall not be entitled, by virtue thereof, to act as auctioneer; but, with this exception, the provisions of section twelve of this Act shall not, within the limits to which the license extends, apply to such firm or company so long as the license remains in force and any business done under the license may be transacted in the name of the firm or company. (9.) If during the currency of any such license as aforesaid the firm or company desires to transfer the benefit of the license to any firm or company, the transfer may on the application of the proposed transferor and transferee be made by the resident magistrate of the district in which the license was granted, but the provisions of section ten shall (subject to such modifications as may be prescribed) apply to and in respect of such application and the proceedings thereon as if the application were for a transfer of a license. After the transfer, the license shall be held and exercised for the benefit of the transferee as if it had been granted for that purpose. (10.) For the purpose of this section "firm" means a firm consisting of two or more persons registered under the Registration of Firms Act, 1897, and "company" means any incorporated body of persons which but for this Act would be competent in law to transact or engage in auctioneering business.

The PREMIER: The amendment is a fair one. At present a firm may pay for a license for one of their employees, and he may leave them and take his license away with him. There is only one licensed auctioneer for one license fee, and only one seller can sell un one license.

Mr. Pickering: Is not the license transf able to another employee?

The PREMIER: Yes, the individual licensed, and not the firm. It is transferal if the court approves. There will be pro sion for transfers. I move—

That the amendment be agreed to.

Question put and passed; the Counci amendment agreed to.

Resolutions reported, the report adopt and a Message accordingly returned to t Council.

House adjourned at 3.30 a.m. (Saturday

Legislative Council,

Tuesday, 13th December, 1921.

The PRESIDENT took the Chair at 4. p.m., and read prayers.

SELECT COMMITTEE—WYNDHAM MEAT WORKS AND STATE STATE SHIPPING SERVICE.

Final report presented.

Hon. J. J. Holmes brought up the fin report of the select committee referring the State Shipping Service.

Report received and read.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES (North) [5.8]: chairman of the select committee I move—

That the report and the evidence printed, and that the consideration the report be made an Order of the Day f Tuesday next.

I trust that those responsible for the prin ing of the evidence will expedite matte as much as possible, and I wish to reque the Leader of the House to accord the co

sideration of the report a prominent place on the Notice Paper for this day week. Whatever the House may think of the report, or whatever the Government may think of it, I believe it will be conceded that the committee have put a great deal of work into the report. We members of the committee hope that good will result from the report. I do not think it is fair to the committee that the report should be dealt with on, say, Christmas Eve in a hurried manner.

Question put and passed.

STANDING ORDER SUSPENSION.

Close of Session.

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION (Hon. H. P. Colebatch—East) [5.9]: I move—

That Standing Order No. 62 be suspended for the remainder of the session.

This is the Standing Order which precludes the taking of new business after 10 p.m. I think that at this stage of the session it is necessary that the Standing Order in question should be suspended, though I hope we shall not have to sit very late at night. It may expedite matters a little if we can take new business after 10 o'clock.

Hon. A. LOVEKIN (Metropolitan) [5.10]: I hope that if this motion is carried the Minister will put the resolution into effect as little as he possibly can, because if we take much new business after 10 p.m., members will not have a fair opportunity of looking into it. I would suggest to the Minister that instead of sitting after 10 p.m. we might sit a little earlier in the afternoon, and so get through the business.

Hon. J. DUFFELL (Metropolitan-Suburban) [5.11]: To me it seems strange that the Leader of the House should move this motion, seeing that he has this very afternoon given notice of motion for leave to introduce a new Bill at to-morrow's sitting. The two things strike me as inconsistent. We are all desirous of disposing of the business on the Notice Paper, and therefore are quite prepared to meet the Minister by suspending this Standing Order. But unless the Bill of which the Minister has given notice is imperatively necessary, I hope he will not proceed with it.

The Minister for Education: It is quite non-controversial.

Question put and passed.

SITTING DAY, ADDITIONAL.

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION (Hon. H. P. Colebatch—East) [5.12]: I move—

That for the remainder of the session the House shall sit on Fridays in addition to the days prescribed by Standing Order No. 48.

Hon. J. CORNELL (South) [5.13]: This is the motion on which the question whether the House should not meet earlier can be raised. I do suggest to the Leader of the House that he should give notice that as from to-morrow, or, say, from Thursday, the House meet at 3 p.m. That, I think, will meet the convenience of hon. members generally. An hour and a half from 3 o'clock to half-past four is likely to be more productive of good than the same period between 10.30 p.m. and midnight. The earlier meeting hour has been adopted towards the close of previous sessions.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES (North) [5.44]: I do not wish to offer objection to the motion, but, still, it seems to me that extensions of time do not improve matters. It is quite fresh in my memory that during last session the life of Parliament was extended for six months in order that an earlier start might be made, and that Parliament might finish its business long before Christmas. We agreed to that extension, only to find that here we are as far behind as ever, notwithstanding that the Government have had an additional six months to put up the business in such a way that the session might finish decently and in some proper order. I am forced to the conclusion that this House gave to another place an extension of six months to which it was not entitled.

Hon. J. W. KIRWAN (South) [5.15]: I should like to suggest that, at whatever time the House may meet on other days, certainly on Friday it would be advisable that it should meet earlier than half-past four. That would be in the interests of country members, who wish to get back to their respective constituents for the week end. I ask the Minister, if he can find it convenient, to fix the hour for the meeting of the House on Friday at not later than 3 o'clock.

Hon. Sir EDWARD WITTENOOM (North) [5.16]: I am a busy man, and generally I am about the city, but I am very much inclined to support the suggestion of Mr. Cornell that, if possible, we sit at 3 o'clock, so that we may give due consideration to the numberless measures that must come before us. If the business on the Notice Paper of the Assembly is all to come down here, we still have a great deal of work to do, and it is only fair to the country that we should do that work as thoroughly as possible. I think Mr. Cornell's suggestion worthy of serious consideration.

Hon. J. W. HICKEY (Central) [5.17]: I, too, support the suggestion that we should meet at an earlier hour in preference to sitting till late at night. An hour or two earlier in the day would make all the difference, and would not hurt us. At the same time it would give country members a chance to get home for the week end. Mr. Kirwan, of course, has in mind members using the East-

ern Goldfields railway, whereas I am thinking of men from more distant provinces, who would like, if possible, to finish up, not on Friday night, but on Thursday night. If we were to meet at 2.30 p.m. each day we could do that. I have pleasure in supporting the suggestion, and I urge the Minister to favourably consider it.

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION (Hon. H. P. Colebatch—East—in reply) [5.18]: I desire to meet the wishes of the House in every way. However, it does not appear to me that we should derive any advantage by sitting at 3 o'clock on the next two or three days, because our Notice Paper is not yet congested, nor even heavy. This motion to sit on Fridays is in anticipation of business still to come to us. I think it necessary to adopt both suggestions, the one that we should sit on Fridays, and the other that we should sit at 3 o'clock. If the motion before us be carried, I will give notice to-morrow to move to sit at 3 o'clock. That motion will come up for discussion on Thursday: so we could sit at our usual hour to-morrow and again on Thursday, and could start the earlier sitting on Friday.

Question put and passed.

BILL—CONSTITUTION FURTHER AMENDMENT.

Second Reading.

Debate resumed from 8th December.

Hon. Sir EDWARD WITTENOOM (North) [5.20]: I have listened with interest to the debate, and particularly to the remarks of those in support of the measure. I must congratulate them on the moderation they have displayed. Most Labour candidates, when up for election, pledge themselves either to broaden the franchise of the Council or else abolish the Council altogether.

Hon. A. H. Panton: Abolition is the only thing; that is the platform of the party.

Hon. Sir EDWARD WITTENOOM: That is your opinion, but you do not represent all the political thought on the Labour side. On this occasion the question has been argued very moderately. I have been in the House a good many years, and have seen many Labour members come here and make their initial bows. At first they have been a little insistent on reforming the members of this Chamber, and sometimes they have argued warmly for the abolition of the House. That is almost invariably their attitude on coming here. But after a short experience, they seem to moderate those views, and almost without exception have they settled down in a most excellent manner and proved to be of the greatest assistance in carrying out the work of the Chamber. In their present attitude I think they are representing more nearly their pledges to the electors than their convinced opinions. In all seriousness I ask, is the proposed alteration of the Constitution necessary? Is it expedient in the interests of the country? Any superficial listener to the debate, or anybody who was not clearly aware of the existing state of affairs, would imagine that those people for whom certain members are trying to get votes for the Council are entirely unrepresented in Parliament, that because they have no vote for the Council they can have no real interest in the welfare of Western Australia. The statement has been made that there is a strong demand for the putting of a large number of people on the Council rolls. What is the actual state of affairs? Let us look at our Constitution. Every adult person in Western Australia, whether man or woman, boy or girl, over 21 years of age, has a vote. Not one is excluded. They are all free to vote and, moreover, they have a vote for the more powerful House of the two, the House exclusively permitted, as we found the other day, to deal with money Bills, the House that can impose taxation. Therefore it cannot be said that those people are without effective representation. But members supporting the Bill go further, and break away from the old principle recognised all over the world that there shall be no representation without taxation. When the exemption from taxation was £200 per annum, there were thousands who never paid a penny in direct taxation, and who, nevertheless, had a vote for Parliament. Even now, when the exemption is £100 and £156, there are numbers that have a vote without paying any direct taxation. Lots of women who do not receive £100 per annum have votes. I know what I am talking of, for some of my own family are in that position. So there is not the least use in saying that there is no adequate representation for all people to make their wants felt. We find many persons who have no interest in the country beyond the mere wages they earn. Those people have the same voting power as has Sir James Mitchell. Their votes are quite as weighty as the votes of any other section. Under those circumstances, nobody can say that not every adult in Western Australia has representation in Parliament. The existing qualification applies to numbers who have no fixed abode and no fixed interest in Western Australia, who, if circumstances required it, could walk out of the State at any moment; who, after voting for members pledged to increase taxation, could walk off without paying one penny of it themselves. That cannot be contradicted by any reasonable thinker. Every adult in Western Australia has adequate representation in the more powerful House of the two. Having given this qualification to numbers who can leave the State at any moment, is it unreasonable to ask for some little protection for that class of the community who are thrifty, who invest their money here and do everything they can to develop the country? What is the qualification? Merely 6s. 6d. weekly. Can anybody tell me that any industrious person

cannot qualify under that? I think it would be unwise to alter the existing state of affairs.

Hon. T. Moore: How can those thousands of men in your mills qualify?

Hon. Sir EDWARD WITTENOOM: They qualify just as soon as they are paying a rental of 6s. 6d. weekly. It is of no use having the same class of voters in both Houses.

Hon. A. H. Panton: We are not asking for that.

Hon. Sir EDWARD WITTENOOM: Practically, you are. Anybody can see that it is the beginning of the end. If we were to have two Houses elected on the same franchise, the only reasonable thing to do would be to get rid of one of them—and, I know which one we ought to do away with. Take the instance of the Federal Parliament. The Senate and the House of Representatives are elected on the same franchise. For years the Senate consisted exclusively of Labour members. Certainly all the Western Australian members of the Senate were of the Labour brand of political faith. The result is that to-day there is hardly one member representing the Labour Party in the Senate. That shows the mischievous nature of the position. If we only knew how to repair that, I am sure we should soon have that millennium, the Labour Party, which most of us so much desire. It is my intention to vote against the Bill. If we reduce the qualification much lower than it is, it will be no use having it at all. I cannot see what argument can be used as to the lack of representation, when we find that nearly everyone has a vote for the other House. I have never heard the demand and outcry, that are so much spoken of, for a universal vote for the Upper House, and I travel a great deal through the country. People have not complained to me because they have not a vote for the Council. I fail to see that any such demand exists. The leaders of the Labour movement have in my opinion got up this demand and outcry, and very properly too from their point of view, but I do not think they are very greatly supported from outside. At every election that takes place there is the greatest difficulty in getting as many as 50 per cent. of the electors to the poll. I ask Mr. Moore what percentage of the electors of the Central Province voted for him. If he tells me they rushed to vote and that there was a strong demand to do so, I will have to admit that there is something in it.

Hon. T. Moore: The intelligent ones voted.

Hon. Sir EDWARD WITTENOOM: No doubt the hon. member will say that, with such a satisfactory candidate, there was no necessity for them to come forward. That does not always apply. There is no great rush to take advantage of this marvellous privilege, and I am sure the demand is greatly over-stated. No one can say that this is an exclusive House. We have all classes of political thought represented here, and, I am pleased to say, well represented, no less than one-third representing Labour views. As I have said before, we could go the world over and would not find a better debating chamber than this Council. In these circumstances, how can our franchise be so faulty and voters have such poor qualifications when we have such excellent results? I trust members will look at the Bill from a proper point of view, and will see that the present satisfactory state of affairs is not interfered with. We have a capable House and one that can deal with legislation of all descriptions. We have a House representing all shades of political thought, and, therefore, there cannot be much wrong with the electors. Very much worse might be done if any alteration were made. I ask those who introduced the Bill, and supported it, to think twice before they disturb the existing state of affairs, and not interfere with the debates, the excellence of which has so largely been contributed to by those representing the Labour interests.

Hon. J. W. HICKEY (Central) [5.35]: I welcome the Bill, for many reasons, particularly in view of the fact that we must keep abreast of the times and modern thought, and make some alteration in our Constitution. There has been no alteration in it for the last 11 years, although many attempts have been made with that object in view. Bills have been brought before both Houses on several occasions since I have been a member, but have always been numbered amongst the slaughtered innocents. The last Bill of this kind was a Government measure containing many clauses, some of which were of a controversial nature. One of the clauses had to do with votes for soldiers, but, like other Bills of a similar reformatory nature, it was scrapped. Whatever justification existed in the past for throwing out legislation of this kind, that justification does not exist in connection with the Bill now before us. It is a different measure to any that we have yet been called upon to deal with. The title seems to me to be wrong; it should be called an interpretation or an explanatory Bill. This is a Bill to clear up many of the difficulties that we previously suffered from. It will clear up the question as to who should be on the roll, and who should not be. Sir Edward Wittenoom has made many references to this point. I have been brought closely into contact with every election that has taken place in Western Australia for the past 25 years, and my view is that there has been great dissatisfaction in connection with every election that has been held for the Legislative Council. People who come to the poll are cross-examined by this official and that official and all kinds of difficulties are placed in their way. Irrespective of what may be the result of this Bill, I cannot help feeling that it would remove most of these troubles and let us know where we are. The war has

brought about many changes, and constitutions throughout the world have been placed in the melting pot. Even the Mother of Parliaments of recent years has altered its constitution, with the result that twelve millions of people have been added to the rolls. It is time, therefore, that we amended our own Constitution and made it more clear than it is to-day. The Constitutions of New South Wales and Victoria provide for nominee Upper Houses. Although I am not prepared to defend that principle, I do say it gives the people a greater opportunity of having their opinions voiced than does our own franchise. The Government of the day, with power to nominate members for the Upper House, afford people the opportunity of having their views put forward along the lines of the policy upon which the Government were elected. In this State we have approximately 160,000 electors on the Legislative Assembly roll. On the other hand, we only have about 50,000 electors on the Council roll. It is unfair that this small proportion of electors should be able to legislate for the rest of the State. For years past, because of the nature of the Federal Constitution, people have been looking to the Federal arena for an improvement in the position. They trusted the Federal Parliament for many years, but to-day are waking up to the position that is gradually being brought about. They find that even a Federal Parliament by its recent action is not doing all it might do. Unless we wake up to the true position, and agree that the people must be considered in connection with the elections that are held in this State, and unless there is some unanimity amongst us, they will continue to cling to the Federal arena. Much has been said by members of our own Parliament as well as of the Federal Parliament with regard to the smaller States' movement. Mr. Hughes promised that next year he would bring down a Bill to alter the Federal Constitution. So far as the Convention is concerned, apparently that has gone by the board. As the outcome of this attitude and the action of the Commonwealth Parliament, all shades of political opinion in this State will probably have to join together against the Federal Government. What will be the position of members of the Council who oppose this Bill when that time comes, as I believe it will come next year? If our rights are being encroached upon by the Federal authorities it will be our duty to cast party aside, and meet on a common ground in the interests of the State as a whole. What would be the position of Mr. Ewing, for instance, who would probably have to go to Forrest to speak on this subject? There are only about four persons enfranchised for the Legislative Council in that district, and how can he ask probably 3,000 electors for support when they have not a voice in the government of the country? Is the hon. member going to ask the mill employees who have reared their families there, to became enthusiastic in support of a movement against the Federal Government, if they cannot be given a vote their own country? I wonder how enthu astic I am going to become in Meekatharra in any other distant part of my electora where men have built their homes and ha lived in them for many years and rear their families, and who are denied a vote f this Chamber. I can quote the case of o man who was married in the house in whi he was born.

Hon. J. Duffell: They were sufficient numbers to return you.

Hon. J. W. HICKEY: And they will pro ably be sufficient to return me again. B it is not a selfish matter with me. I ho there will be a sufficient number on the r to again return me to this House, but it a question of principle with me, and I wa to see on the roll the names of all the who are entitled to have their names the Mr. Mills knows that country well, and knows, too, that there are many worthy ci zens there who are a credit not only to the selves, and to the town they live in, but the whole State. The present franchise not sufficiently elastic, and the Bill will he us to expand it if hon. members will ass us to put it through. If there is anythi to which they object or which they think capable of improvement, let them endeavo to effect the improvement when the Bill is Committee. I know that hon. members wi to preserve a certain dignity in this Cha ber, and I know there are members here w hold the view that once a man assumes t rights of citizenship, he is entitled to a vo That being the case, why do we r give that man the franchise to whi he is entitled? I have no desire to refer the incidents of a few years ago, and I ha no wish that they should occur again. T Bill before us is on all fours with the Sou Australian Act, which has worked admiral in that State. I do not think the most p judiced mind would say that South Aust lia is a socialistic State or that it is labo ridden. Their Act was brought into ope tion by a conservative Government, in fa with all due respect to other Australian G ernments, the most conservative Governme in the Commonwealth. Surely if such a G ernment is satisfied that such an Act is wo ing satisfactorily, we who, I have no hesi tion in saying, are more enlightened th South Australia, can safely follow their ample, without fear of any grievous ha We follow precedents very often, and in t case no harm can accrue by taking a cha in the way of emulating the South Aust lian legislation. The Bill before the Ho does not contain anything of a controvers nature; it clearly defines where we sta Mr. Hamersley referred to this Chamber the taxpayers' Chamber. But let me info him that taxpayers are not on the roll this House to-day. If he requires it to come a taxpayers' House let it be such.

Hon. E. H. Harris: And then you wo have fewer names on the roll than are th at the present time.

Hon. J. W. HICKEY: Probably so, but we will not take that into consideration at the present time. If, however, the hon. member will assist, I will not pursue that line of argument, but at the same time I do not think the hon. member is quite conscious of the fact that the exemptions are so low that very few people escape taxation. I wish to give an illustration of what may occur, and I have no doubt has occurred, in connection with the Legislative Council franchise. This perhaps is characteristic of many. A man whom I know lived on the goldfields for a number of years and reared a family there. He lived for over 20 years in the same house. In the earlier years he had a vote for the Council, but remembering the mix-up that occurred on the Eastern goldfields—I can call it nothing else—this man, with many others, refrained from enrolling. His home, as I have already said, was a very comfortable one, even to the extent of possessing a piano. Yet that man was rated at under £17 for a home which was quite good enough for anyone to live in, and as a consequence was debarred from a vote. Recently he came to Perth, and, unfortunately, struck bad luck. He went to live in what I can only describe as a hovel.

Hon. J. Nicholson: In Perth?

Hon. J. W. HICKEY: Yes, and I am sorry to say there are hovels in Perth, though the hon. member will not see them in St. George's terrace. Now, while that man was denied the franchise during the time he occupied his own property on the goldfields, he becomes enfranchised in Perth, where he is residing in a hovel which is not his own. That is a state of affairs which should not be permitted to exist. When the Bill reaches the Committee stage, perhaps Mr. Nicholson, with his legal mind, may aid in framing an amendment which will help us to get over any difficulty which other hon. members may see in the way of the Bill becoming law. Every person who has a habitation of his own should be entitled to exercise the franchise for the Upper House. It has been said here on more than one occasion that people are not crying out for an alteration of the Legislative Council qualification. Probably hon. members do not see as much as I do of the people who suffer from the disability of not having a vote for the Upper House. These people have been crying out for an alteration for so long that they are beginning to lose interest in our legislation. Mr. Hamersley remarked that if the House supported the Bill and carried it into law, the Labour Party would swamp the Chamber. That is unworthy of the hon. member.

Hon. V. Hamersley: Read the clause.

Hon. J. W. HICKEY: The hon. member is guilty of fear. I did not think he would be afraid whatever else he might be guilty of. Adult franchise for another place has been in operation for many years. Yet how many times have the Labour Party had the reins of office. The same may be said of other States of Australia. Certainly the Labour Party could do no worse than is being done by the Government at present in power. At the same time the hon. member need not be too fearful on that score. I would remind him that drastic action and extreme steps are the result of such utterances and intolerance or uncompromising hostility towards the people. Thrones have tottered before to-day because rights have been denied the people, as for example the fate of the Hapsburgs, the Romanoffs and the Hohenzollerns. If people are not prepared to give way a little at times, very often trouble arises and then someone gets hurt. I hope that will not occur here. In fact, I do not think it will occur. From time to time, questions have cropped up in this Chamber concerning which I have had no local knowledge. I have been guided by those members who spoke with knowledge, and I have acted accordingly. On the present occasion I claim a little reciprocity on the part of other members in connection with the Bill under discussion. I trust that they will see in the Bill a utilitarian measure, and will view it from a practical standpoint. If that course is adopted, it may lead to the eradication of the anomalies at present existing in the outer portions of the State and clear away some of the disappointment which exists at present. I trust members will agree to the second reading of the measure, and if there are provisions which they regard as objectionable, they can be dealt with during the Committee stage.

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION (Hon. H. P. Colebatch—East) [6.4]: It has been mentioned by, I think, the mover, or some other members who spoke in support of the Bill, that the measure before the House is practically a reproduction of Clause 3 of the Bill presented to this House by the Government last session with the exception that it does not include the enfranchisement of soldiers, which provision was included in the Bill referred to. That is quite correct and, consequently, I feel it incumbent upon me to put before members the attitude of the Government regarding the present measure before I cast my vote. It was felt by the Government that the Act as it stands was unsatisfactory and that it did not express what we thought was the intention of the legislature. It was thought when the amount was reduced from £25 to £17 that any person occupying property of a value of 6s. 6d. per week, or paying rent to that amount, would be qualified to vote for the Legislative Council. It was subsequently ruled—and rightly so, in view of the wording of the whole—that a householder would mean a person who occupied premises of the annual value of £17 and that the amount would not be at the rate of 6s. 6d. per week plus all rates and taxes. In many cases that might mean a very considerable sum of money, and many people occupying property of a clear annual value of £17, or paying rent at the rate of £17, were disqualified from voting for the Legislative Council because, when

rates and taxes were deducted from the payments, it brought the rental below £17 per annum. Another feature, regarding which the Government felt the working of the Act was unsatisfactory, was in regard to the provisions whereby occupiers of separate portions of a building might exercise the franchise. There are a great many disputes under that heading. In the Bill which the Government introduced last session, Clause 3 was the one which they hoped would clear up the difficulty. That clause, as introduced by the Government, corresponded exactly with the one before the House with this exception, that, as introduced, it read—

> For the purpose of this qualification—(a) the term "dwelling-house" means any structure of a permanent character, being a fixture to the soil, which is ordinarily capable of being used for human habitation, and in respect whereof the occupier is liable for and pays a rent at the rate of not less than 6s. 6d. per week, or which is of a rental value of not less than 6s. 6d. per week, irrespective of rates and taxes.

The remainder of the clause was practically identical with the one before us in its relation to buildings being separately occupied as dwellings. The Government felt that by providing for the rates and taxes as I have indicated, they would do away with the difficulty that had existed. In the Legislative Assembly, however, that portion of the provision was struck out contrary to the wishes of the Government. When the Bill came before this Chamber I pointed out the alteration and expressed the hope that in Committee that aspect would be reconsidered. Had this Bill come forward in the form in which it was introduced last session, I would have supported it. In its present form, it is not supported by the Government.

On motion by Hon. T. Moore debate adjourned.

BILL—AUCTIONEERS.

Assembly's Message.

Message received from the Assembly notifying that it had agreed to the Council's amendment.

BILL—WORKERS' HOMES ACT AMENDMENT.

Received from the Assembly and read a first time.

BILL—GRAIN.

In Committee.

Hon. J. Ewing in the Chair; the Minister for Education in charge of the Bill.

Clause 1—Short title and commencement:

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: In conformity with the suggestion I made to the House on Thursday, I move an amendment—

> That in lines 1 and 2 the words "and shall come into operation on a day to be fixed by proclamation" be struck out.

The words indicated have no meaning, if the Bill is merely to be a ratification of an agreement.

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: I understand that all the clauses of the Bill are to be struck out—

The Minister for Education: Except the agreement and those relating to the agreement.

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: That is so. I think, however, it would make a better job of the Bill if we struck out the whole of the clauses and put any amendments we desire into the schedule of the Bill which is the agreement. Then we could pass a short clause ratifying and confirming the agreement. It would then be a one-clause Bill and would provide a clean lease which could be read by anyone. If we proceed as suggested, and make amendments to the clauses, it will result in a botch; anyone desiring to see what is included in the agreement, will have to study the clauses and interpolate the alterations in the agreement itself.

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: The suggestion by Mr. Lovekin is not practicable. The schedule comprises the agreement which has been entered into.

Hon. J. Cornell: It has to be ratified by Parliament.

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: It does not require ratification. If the Bill were thrown out, the lease would still stand. It is within the province of the Governor in Council to enter into such an agreement and it has been entered into.

Hon. J. Cornell: What is the Bill here for then?

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: In entering into the agreement, however, the Government protected the rights of Parliament by providing that the lease shall be subject to alterations or modifications made by Parliament within a certain period. It is, therefore, competent for Parliament to make amendments by way of altering the clauses of the Bill, but Parliament cannot alter the agreement itself. Amendments made in the clauses to the Bill will override the agreement.

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: The schedule contemplates the suggestion I have made. I think the Minister on consideration will agree that it is better to proceed in the way I suggest. We can then amend the schedule so that the agreement will meet our wishes and merely pass a small clause ratifying and confirming the agreement itself.

Sitting suspended from 6.15 to 7.30 p.m.

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: In view of the discussion before tea and in order to expedite

the business of the Committee, I propose to ask you, Mr. Chairman, to give a ruling so that this matter may be referred to the President under Standing Order No. 257. The schedule to the Bill contains what purports to be a lease entered into between His Majesty and the Grain Growers' Company. The last paragraph of the schedule sets out that the terms of the lease may be altered or modified by Parliament. I understand you have ruled that the lease having already been signed——

The CHAIRMAN: I have not given any ruling; I have not yet been asked to do so.

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: I understand that you suggested——

The CHAIRMAN: I did not suggest anything.

Hon. J. Duffell: The Minister made the statement.

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: It is stated in the schedule that this lease may be altered or modified by Parliament, and I submit that under that provision it is competent for the Committee to amend the schedule. I ask your ruling whether we may alter or modify the schedule in lieu of proposing new clauses to the Bill.

The CHAIRMAN: In my opinion the schedule cannot be amended, because it has already been signed by the parties. I rule that any amendments affecting the schedule should be embodied in clauses of the Bill.

Objection to Ruling.

Hon. A. Lovekin: I expected that, and under Standing Order 257, I take objection to your ruling. Standing Order 257 reads:—

> If any objection is taken to a decision of the Chairman of Committees, the objection must be stated at once in writing. The Chairman shall thereupon leave the Chair and the Council resume. The matter having been laid before the President, and members having addressed themselves thereto, shall be disposed of, and the proceedings in Committee shall be resumed where they were interrupted.

The Chairman: Objection having been taken to my ruling, I will refer the matter to the President.

[The President resumed the Chair.]

The Chairman: I have ruled that all amendments to the schedule of the Grain Bill should be embodied in the clauses of the Bill, and objection has been taken to my ruling.

Hon. A. Lovekin: The schedule to the Bill contains provision that the lease shall be subject to such alteration or modification as may be approved by Parliament within 12 months from the date thereof. I have asked the ruling of the Chairman of Committees as to whether we can amend the schedule to the Bill. He has ruled that we cannot amend the schedule on the ground that the lease set out in the schedule has already been signed and sealed between the parties. I take objection to his ruling under Standing Order 257 and, in accordance with that Standing Order, the matter is referred to you.

The Minister for Education: I take it that the ruling of the Chairman is that such amendments or alterations as it is desired to make to the agreement must be in the form of clauses in the Bill, and must not be made as alterations in the schedule itself. I want to point out that this is an agreement which is submitted to us for ratification. It is a completed agreement, signed by both parties, and signed copies of the agreement are in the possession of both parties. Therefore, it is not competent for them to be altered. The agreement itself provides that it shall be subject to such alteration or modification as may be approved by Parliament within 12 months from the date thereof. If this Bill is not passed, the agreement will stand as it is, it being an agreement which the Governor in Council was empowered to make and has made. I submit that the course suggested by Mr. Lovekin would be tantamount to the House, if it desired to amend an Act of Parliament passed last session, instead of embodying the alterations in a Bill, bringing forth the Act and making the amendments in the Act itself. We are dealing now with a completed document which has been finalised and signed, copies of which are in possession of both parties.

The President: Is this agreement part of the Bill?

The Minister for Education: As the Bill was originally introduced it was not and, as it comes to us, there is nothing in the Bill to indicate that it is part of the Bill. On referring to the Votes and Proceedings of another place, however, I find that the Premier moved that the agreement be included as a schedule, and the intention was that, in the clauses of the Bill which make some alteration to the agreement, reference should be made to the agreement as the agreement appearing in the schedule.

Hon. A. Lovekin: I wish to explain that I have made inquiries and the fact that the word "schedule" is not printed is due to a clerical error on the part of the Clerk. As a matter of fact, I put up some amendments on the assumption that the agreement was not part of the Bill, and I now find that the agreement is a schedule to the Bill.

The President: If this agreement is part of the Bill, alteration can be made in it. If it is not part of the Bill, if it is merely put in, as it were, as an exhibit, alterations cannot be made to it. If alterations were not meant to be made to it, it certainly should not be included as part of the Bill. The schedule of a Bill is alterable in any way the House desires. If the hon. member wishes me to make a suggestion I will do so.

The Minister for Education: I shall be pleased to hear it.

The President: If I were the hon. member, I should certainly withdraw the schedule.

The Minister for Education: I do not know whether it is necessary to do that, because it

is not a schedule to the Bill. "Schedule" is not in it, and it is not part of the Bill.

The President: If it is not part of the Bill, alterations cannot be made to it.

Hon. A. Lovekin: It is a schedule to the Bill. The Leader of the House has admitted that the Premier moved it as a schedule to the Bill. Therefore, under your ruling, Mr. President, I take it that it can be amended. If there is any dispute as to whether it is a schedule, there are means by which we can search the journals of another place and ascertain whether it is a schedule or not, but I take it the Minister will admit that the omission of the word "schedule" was a clerical error, if he has seen the Votes and Proceedings of another place.

The President: My ruling is that if it is part of the Bill, it is alterable and any amendment may be moved. If it is not part of the Bill, an amendment cannot be made. If I may make another suggestion, it would be for the Committee to resume and for the Minister to report progress.

The Minister for Education: I do not think that is necessary. We can go on with the business whatever the decision may be. I would be obliged if you, Mr. President, would give a ruling as to whether the agreement is part of the Bill, the circumstances being as mentioned by Mr. Lovekin. The word "schedule" is not there, but undoubtedly the Votes and Proceedings of another place show that the agreement was included in the Bill as a schedule.

The President: A heading such as "the schedule" is purely a matter for the clerks to arrange just as they may insert or alter the marginal notes in such a way as is obvious they must be altered. If I gather from the remarks of the Leader of the House that this agreement is admittedly part of the Bill——

The Minister for Education: One other point I would like to mention, Mr. President, there is no reference in the Bill to the schedule, and I doubt whether it is competent to have a schedule without any reference to it in the Bill.

Hon. A. Lovekin: The Minister is not quite correct in that statement. Clauses 19 and 20 contain references to it.

The Minister for Education: That is to the agreement.

Hon. A. Lovekin: What is the schedule but the agreement? There is a reference to paragraph (k) of Clause 2 of the lease. Where are we to look for Clause 2 of the lease but in the schedule?

The President: If the Leader of the House admits that the words "the schedule" should occur at the head of the agreement, then it is possible for the Committee to make an amendment. If, however, this lease is not to be considered as part of the Bill, but as attached to the Bill for explanatory purposes only, no amendment can be made. In the circumstances which have been detailed, my ruling is that amendments may be moved.

Committee resumed.

The CHAIRMAN: In deference to the ruling of the President, I now rule that this agreement is part of the Bill and that the Committee may now make any amendments desired to the agreement.

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

Clause 2—agreed to.

Clause 3—Right of company to construct elevators:

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: For the information of hon. members let me say that I invite the Committee to strike out every clause after this one until we come to Clause 19.

Clause put and passed.

Clauses 5 to 18—negatived.

Clause 19—Modification of the terms of the company's lease:

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: I move an amendment—

That the word "leases," line 4, be struck out, and "lease" inserted in lieu.

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: Under the ruling given by the President, this amendment can be made in the Schedule; and I contend that it can be better made in the Schedule, namely in the clause reserving the rent, than here as an isolated clause in the Bill.

Hon. F. A. BAGLIN: Clause 19 ought to be struck out altogether. It is of no use members of the Country Party trying to throw dust in our eyes. If Clause 19 is carried, we shall be giving the grain elevator company a monopoly right over a picked site in Fremantle. There are other sites, but they are not likely to be of use for ten years or so; that is, having regard to the harbour as at present constructed. Harbour extension is not likely to take place for the next five or ten years. During the second reading discussion it was suggested that the proper site for bulk handling was on the south side of the river; but we must first have a railway there. The extension of the Fremantle harbour to Rocky Bay, on the north side, would provide a very suitable site for bulk handling without any elevators at all.

Hon. J. Duffell: Yes; by gravitation.

Hon. F. A. BAGLIN: If we grant the company the lease, we grant them a monopoly of bulk handling for ten years.

The Minister for Education: The lease has already been granted.

Hon. F. A. BAGLIN: I do not wish Parliament to become responsible for that. Let us not condone the Government's mistake.

The Minister for Education: I rise to a point of order. I do not wish to interrupt the hon. member, but is he in order in discussing that question on an amendment that the word "leases" be struck out and "lease" inserted in lieu?

The CHAIRMAN: The hon. member must not go too far.

Hon. F. A. BAGLIN: I protest against the lease.

The CHAIRMAN: The hon. member would perhaps do well to wait until the clause itself is put.

Hon. J. CORNELL: I understand that this clause is all the company want from Parliament. Although we are in Committee, I think we should make a protest, which we have not previously had an opportunity of making, against the mode of procedure adopted in connection with this Bill. We should endeavour to expose the willingness of the promulgators of the Bill to give way in order to get something in the nature of a legislative enactment. Practically a majority of hon. members forecasted their intention of voting against the second reading.

The CHAIRMAN: What is before the Chamber now is a small, really formal amendment.

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: I suggest to the Committee the desirability of voting against the whole clause, including the word "leases." I am in favour of striking out the word "leases" as a part of the clause.

The CHAIRMAN: The hon. member cannot discuss the clause now. If he will allow the amendment to be dealt with, he can speak to the clause afterwards.

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: But some of us object to the whole of the clause, including the word "leases." If we strike out the whole of the Bill, leaving only the Schedule, or the lease, then that lease stands, with all its iniquities. Let us take advantage of the last clause of the Bill, and modify the lease. That is what we propose to do after we get rid of these clauses. The amendment represents the thin end of the wedge to get this clause in by altering it in respect of the word "leases."

The CHAIRMAN: The Schedule cannot be discussed under this amendment.

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: It is better to strike out the whole clause, and not tinker with it.

Amendment put and passed.

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: I move a further amendment—

> That after the word "Titles," line 4, there be inserted "as set out in the Schedule."

Those words should have been included in this clause when the Schedule was put into the Bill.

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: The feeling of the Committee can be tested on this amendment. I expected as much from the ingenuity of the Leader of the House. There is no necessity whatever for the clause, and I strongly urge hon. members to vote against it altogether.

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: There is no hidden design on my part. We are going to amend the schedule, but we must still have a reference to it in the clause.

Hon. A. Lovekin: No, not necessarily.

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: I do not see how we can have the schedule without some reference to it in the Bill.

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: By having in the Bill a declaratory clause to the effect that the instrument of lease between the King and the company, as modified and altered in terms of the schedule hereto is hereby ratified and confirmed. In the declaratory clause we can say that such modifications and alterations have been made, and are hereby ratified and confirmed. That is all we want.

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: There was wisdom in the suggestion that, having regard to the difficulties in connection with the clause, it would be wise to report progress.

The CHAIRMAN: We are discussing, not that question, but the insertion of certain words.

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: I agree with the necessity for referring in the Bill to this lease, but exactly how that should be done will not be resolved by discussing it in Committee. We must have a clause giving proper expression to what is intended. I notice that the lease has actually been registered.

Hon. G. W. Miles: But it says "subject to alteration by Parliament."

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: We have to deal with an Act.

Hon. A. Lovekin: Whether the lease be registered or not, an Act of Parliament can alter it.

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: It is the only thing that could alter it in respect of the Titles Office. If the Registrar of Titles were asked to take another document and alter it in conformity with the Act, I do not know under what section of the Transfer of Land Act he could alter it, unless he got the parties to cancel the existing lease and register a new one in conformity with the alterations we make. Of course we could make that obligatory on all parties to the lease.

Hon. A. Lovekin: You would not seriously suggest that!

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: It is the only way in which this can get on to the register in proper form.

The CHAIRMAN: We are discussing the insertion of certain words. Later on the hon. member will have an opportunity for discussing the whole clause.

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: I approve of the amendment suggested by the Minister. It may be necessary later to consider whether we shall vote against the clause as a whole and substitute another.

Hon. Sir EDWARD WITTENOOM: I should like the Minister to clear up the meaning of the last clause in the lease; because it has a bearing on what we are discussing. It says, "This lease shall be subject to such alteration or modification as may be approved by Parliament within 12 months." That seems as if there were no initiation in Parliament. If it were intended that Parliament should alter the lease, it would read, "This

lease shall be subject to such alteration or modification as may be made by Parliament."

Hon. C. F. Baxter: It means the same thing.

Hon. Sir EDWARD WITTENOOM: Nothing of the sort. It insinuates an approval, which is by no means an initiation. I am asking for an explanation by the Minister.

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: I am not going to argue that the word used is the best that could be used, but I say there is no question that any amendment of the schedule which Parliament may make, will become an amendment of the lease. The lease is made and done with, but at any time within 12 months Parliament may alter it.

Hon. J. DUFFELL: The lease was registered on the 21st March last, so the present will be the only opportunity, within 12 months from the registration of the lease, which we shall have for dealing with it. We must make the necessary amendments here and now, for we shall not have another opportunity within the prescribed period.

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: Mr. Nicholson suggests that the company should withdraw the lease and apply for another.

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: I did not suggest that. What I said was that in view of the fact that this is a registered lease, the document cannot be removed except by certain means. I suggest that we embody a clause in the Bill making it obligatory on both parties to enter into a new lease subject to the amendments made by Parliament, and that the existing lease be cancelled.

Hon. A. Lovekin: That would be the same as amending the lease and inserting a declaratory clause covering the registration.

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: No, we are confronted with an Act of Parliament which affects our land titles, and the Registrar of Titles can only act in accordance with the law, unless we give him certain powers under this measure.

Hon. A. Lovekin: That is what I propose to give him by a declaratory clause.

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: But he is not in possession of the whole of the documents. All that he has is the original. We would require to give the registrar power to call in the several copies of the document and make the alterations. I suggest we make it obligatory on both parties to sign an amended lease.

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: It amounts to the same thing. We prescribe that the registrar shall make these amendments in the registered lease. He can do it if we pass a declaratory clause.

The CHAIRMAN: The hon. member must keep to the amendment. I cannot allow so wide a discussion.

Hon. J. CORNELL: I offer no serious opposition to the amendment. Apparently all that the Assembly inserted is not required, and what we required to insert is what they have forgotten.

Amendment put and passed.

Clause as amended put and a division taken with the following result:—

Ayes	11
Noes	7
Majority for ..	4

AYES.

Hon. C. F. Baxter	Hon. G. W. Miles
Hon. H. P. Colebatch	Hon. J. Mills
Hon. J. A. Greig	Hon. A. J. H. Saw
Hon. E. H. Harris	Hon. Sir E. H. Wittenoom
Hon. J. W. Kirwan	Hon. J. W. Hickey
Hon. C. McKenzie	(*Teller.*)

NOES.

Hon. R. G. Ardagh	Hon. A. Lovekin
Hon. J. Cornell	Hon. J. Nicholson
Hon. J. Cunningham	Hon. A. H. Panton
Hon. V. Hamersley	(*Teller.*)

Clause as amended thus passed.

Clause 20—Modification of paragraph (k) of clause 2 of lease:

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: This clause should be retained.

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: This is a peculiar situation we find ourselves in. We are embodying in the Bill certain modifications of the lease. Why should not the amendments, of which notice has been given, to clauses 19 and 20 be embodied in the lease?

The Minister for Education: Why make any amendments to the lease?

Hon. A. Lovekin: It was decided to do it in this way. It is the President's ruling.

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: I object to those remarks. The President's ruling is that it was open for us to do that. The President is not called upon to discuss matters of this kind.

Hon. A. Lovekin: I am aware of that.

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: The House has decided to amend the lease by means of a clause in the Bill.

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: I thought when we got the President's ruling we were going to amend the Schedule. We are now going to put into the lease an amendment to paragraph (k) in regard to the distribution of profits, and the Minister for Education proposes in place of the words "paid up capital of the Company" to insert "on the amount actually paid up on each share." This is a lease of the land only.

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: There are certain conditions which must be complied with for the lease to be granted. One of these conditions is that the dividends paid to shareholders shall not be less than a certain amount, and another place has added the words "on the amount actually paid up on each share."

Hon. J. W. KIRWAN: I object to the suggestion of the Minister for Education that the last vote is an indication that the House wanted the lease amended in the Bill, and not actually in the lease. I am opposed to the Bill as well as the lease, and I want

to find some means by which this House can show that it is opposed to the lease. I move an amendment—

That the following words be added:—"and that the word 'eight' in paragraph (k) be struck out, and 'two' inserted in lieu."

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: The amendment is consistent with Mr. Kirwan's action in opposing the second reading of this Bill. His desire is to kill the Bill and destroy the lease. If the amendment is carried it will kill the Bill, and also destroy any opportunity Parliament has of amending the lease. The lease will stand as it is.

Hon. J. A. GREIG: The man who puts his wheat through the elevators without subscribing to the capital of the company will get the same benefit as the man who has invested his money in it. To carry the amendment will kill the Bill.

Hon. J. CORNELL: If the word "two" is inserted it will show that these great leaders of co-operation are engaged in co-operation for the purpose of profit.

Hon. J. A. Greig: A man could invest his money better outside.

Hon. J. CORNELL: One of the inducements to people to subscribe money to this company is the rate of interest offered. I should like to see the interest cut out altogether, and the profits distributed to the participants of this scheme by way of bonuses. Mr. Kirwan might alter his amendment to provide for 6 per cent., which is a fair return for the money invested. Eight per cent. savours too much of the capitalisation business.

Hon. C. F. BAXTER: Would either Mr. Kirwan or Mr. Cornell be prepared to invest their money at 2 per cent.? The farmers are not a wealthy class, and 90 per cent. of them in order to raise money to put into this company have had to pay the banks up to 7 per cent.

Hon. J. W. KIRWAN: This unfortunate Bill will go back to the Assembly in a form that will make it a mere caricature of what it was. Never in the whole of my parliamentary experience have I known a measure to be so mutilated. In view of the other amendments that will be submitted, I intend to ask leave to withdraw mine.

Amendment by leave withdrawn.

Clause put and passed.

Clause 21—Modification of lease:

Hon. J. MILLS: I move an amendment—

That the following paragraph be added to the clause to stand as (1b):—Any person who has applied for shares in the company prior to the 15th day of December, 1921, and whose wheat-growing lands are situate nearer by rail to the port of either Albany, Bunbury, or Geraldton than to the port of Fremantle, shall be relieved of all obligations to pay for any such shares or any calls in respect thereof until an elevator has been constructed at the port which is nearer to him than Fremantle.

The amendment will protect those men who in the early stages of this movement took shares in the company before they quite knew what they were doing. There is no evidence to show that elevators are likely to be erected at Geraldton, Albany and Bunbury, at any rate not for a long time to come. It would require £200,000 or £300,000 to make a harbour at Geraldton capable of accommodating ships that would be likely to call there for grain, so that an indefinite period must elapse before elevators can be erected at Geraldton. I hope the Committee will accept the amendment.

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: I cannot agree to the proposal of the hon. member, which has nothing to do with the Bill.

Hon. A. Lovekin: Then what has paragraph (1a) to do with it?

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: That paragraph is a proper paragraph to be in the Bill. It was put there to prevent the company going into one hand. Now it is suggested that there should be an alteration of the contract between the company and persons who apply for shares. If persons have applied for shares through improper representation, they have a different method by which they can get out of it.

Hon. A. Lovekin: I do not follow the logic of that argument.

Hon. J. W. KIRWAN: The paragraph suggested should be embodied in the Bill. One portion of the Bill has a distinct bearing on this clause inasmuch as paragraph (j) of Clause 2 of the agreement sets out that the elevator shall afford adequate and sufficient facilities for handling the whole of the grain to be raised within those portions of the State which are nearer to the port of Fremantle than to the ports of Geraldton, Bunbury or Albany. The result of the alteration to the Bill has been that the ports of Geraldton, Bunbury and Albany will really be outside the scope of the Bill and that the elevators will be only at Fremantle. Mr. Mills desires that those farmers who are in the Albany, Geraldton, and Bunbury radius should not be required to support a company that is purely for the benefit of farmers within the Fremantle radius.

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: The proceedings in regard to this Bill will be a lesson to me to be slow about entering into any agreement as to following a certain course of action. On Thursday I read a letter from the company as to the action I was going to take. That undertaking had its basis on a letter I received from Mr. Lovekin which stated that the company would be satisfied with the deletion of all the clauses of the Bill except Clause 19. That letter was drawn up by Mr. Lovekin. It was presented to the directors of the company and they fell in with it and advised me accordingly.

Hon. J. Cornell: Did they consult the shareholders within the 24 hours?

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: They accepted Mr. Lovekin as speaking for those who were in opposition to the Bill.

Hon. A. Lovekin: I did not speak for anyone except myself.

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: Whether the hon. member gave an assurance——

Hon. A. Lovekin: I gave no assurance.

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: Then all I can do is to ask Mr. Lovekin to observe his own letter and those who supported him. The arrangement was made by which all the clauses except Clause 19 were to be abandoned, and the Bill was to be made one simply to amend the agreement. This arrangement was based entirely on the letter drawn up by Mr. Lovekin and which was presented to Mr. MacCallum Smith and Mr. B. L. Murray, as a result of which Mr. Murray or Mr. Smith wrote to me saying, "We are in accord with what Mr. Lovekin has suggested." On that undertaking I agreed to adopt the course that I suggested I would follow.

Hon. J. J. Holmes: You do not suggest that Mr. Lovekin bound this House?

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: I only suggest that Mr. Lovekin himself might be bound by the letter.

Hon. J. W. HICKEY: I am not much concerned with Mr Lovekin's petty squabbles with Mr. MacCallum Smith.

Hon. A. Lovekin: There are no squabbles.

Hon. J. W. HICKEY: Or with regard to Mr. MacCallum Smith going to Mr. Lovekin's house. I am only concerned about the amendment before the Committee just now. In spite of the Minister's explanation I think the amendment is necessary. It will assure those shareholders in the Geraldton district, many of whom took shares in the company believing that the company was going to operate in that district. I have viewed this as a co-operative concern right through, and my idea of co-operation is that the more you purchase the less you have to pay. There is no possible chance of any people in Geraldton, Bunbury or Albany getting dividends or bonuses out of this concern. Mr. Mills desires to see that these people are protected. If they are satisfied with 8 per cent., well and good, but if not, they should have an opportunity of withdrawing from the company.

Hon. G. W. Miles: They are not sure of getting their 8 per cent.

Hon. J. W. HICKEY: They are quite sure that the Government have a certain amount of responsibility, but judging by past experience, the Government have not shown much tendency to carry out their responsibilities in connection with Geraldton, because there is no possibility of elevators being erected at that port, seeing that the necessary harbour facilities are not provided for the shipping. When the proposition was put to these people, they were led to believe that elevators would be erected at Geraldton within five years. Now that provision has gone and it is only right that Parliament should give those people some assistance as sought by the amendment.

Hon. C. F. Baxter: How many shareholders are there in that district?

Hon. J. W. HICKEY: I have not the exact numbers with me, but if the hon. member is anxious to popularise this proposition, he should see that the people are granted the protection sought in the amendment.

Hon. J. CORNELL: I support the amendment. As the Bill came before us at the outset, it provided that within four years, elevators should be erected at Fremantle and that within five years elevators would be erected at Albany, Geraldton and Bunbury.

Hon. J. Cunningham: This is not a Government Bill; it is a Country Party Bill.

Hon. J. CORNELL: The object of the Bill is merely to secure an Act of Parliament so that the company may go to the Federal Government and say: "This is what the State Parliament has passed. Where is that money?" We find, however, that the Bill as it stands now, applies only to Fremantle and the provision for erecting elevators at Bunbury, Geraldton and Albany, has gone overboard. People were invited to subscribe capital for the company on condition that elevators would be constructed in the ports I have mentioned. Mr. Mills says I am right in that contention and Mr. Greig says I am wrong. I contend that some such inducement must have been held out to the farmers.

Hon. E. H. Harris: In view of the alteration, the company should return their money to the farmers who subscribed.

Hon. J. CORNELL: I think so too. Of what use is an elevator at Fremantle to the farmer at Geraldton. It simply means more centralisation.

Hon. J. DUFFELL: The amendment furnishes further evidence, if such were needed, that this Bill should have been introduced by a private member and not by the Government.

Hon. J. Cornell: Or not introduced at all.

Hon. J. DUFFELL: It is necessary that some protection should be given to the men who have taken shares in the company under a misapprehension. There is no chance of elevators being erected in Bunbury, Geraldton or Albany for some years to come. The farmer took up shares in the company because he was led to believe that he would not have to buy his bags for his future harvest. Now we find that he will have to continue buying bags and, in view of the fact that the price of wheat is rapidly approaching pre-war figures, I am afraid that many farmers will be landed in Queer-street in these circumstances. We have had ample evidence that the time is not opportune for the introduction of the bulk handling system in Western Australia. I do not think any harm would be done if the Bill were allowed to share the same fate as that which was be-

fore Parliament last session, in which case the matter would be hung up for a further period although the lease could go on.

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: The Leader of the House introduced my name into the debate somewhat unfairly, I think, because there is nothing wrong about the position nor is there anything to hide. On the morning after the debate on the second reading of the Bill, a letter appeared in the "West Australian" signed by Mr. J. MacCallum Smith, in which the writer pointed out that the directors of the company did not mind if the whole of the monopoly clauses were struck out of the Bill. I rang up Mr. Basil Murray, who is also connected wtih the concern, and asked him what was really intended by the letter. After a few words over the telephone, Mr. Murray came to my house and he said that the company never wanted the monopoly clauses and that a lot of the clauses were unnecessary. I said: "If that is so, if you don't want any of the clauses of the Bill, it will simplify matters if you give me a note to say that the clauses can go so far as the company is concerned. I will write that letter if necessary. Mr. Murray said: "Put down what you think is necessary." I did so, and he took it to his directors. He has since returned the paper to me and I have it at home. The note contains reference to all the clauses and I do not think there was any exception mentioned regarding Clause 19.

The Minister for Education: What I have was given to me as a copy of your letter.

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: My recollection of it is as I state. If I am wrong, I will put it right to-morrow. My recollection of it is that there was nothing about Clause 19 at all, but the note referred to all the clauses of the Bill. I pointed out that if he did as I suggested we could deal with the schedule on its merits. I think such a course would simplify matters for the House. That has been my attitude all the way through. I think that explanation is satisfactory to me.

Hon. J. CUNNINGHAM: I support the amendment. On account of a letter written by Mr. MacCallum Smith to the "West Australian," Mr. Lovekin rang up Mr. Basil Murray and a letter was submitted to the House, and we now have before us a Bill which is not the Bill introduced by the Government. This is where we have landed ourselves. We are asked to retain of the original Bill only the Title and Clause 19 together with the schedule. I agree that something should be done in the interests of the people in the Albany, Bunbury and Geraldton districts who have been induced to put their money into this concern. It has been clearly demonstrated that the company do not intend to do anything in the way of providing bulk handling facilities in those centres. This being so, it is essential to give the farmers in those districts some measure of relief. Unless we do so, we shall condone the action of the company in getting money from people who were under the impression that they were to have the benefit of bulk handling facilities; otherwise, the company will be able to use the money for erecting elevators at Fremantle. I understand that members of the Country Party are strongly opposed to centralisation. Let us take such action as will enable the Government to bring down a comprehensive measure next session to deal with bulk handling in a manner befitting the importance of the question.

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: I am sure that Mr. Mills and other members are actuated by the best of desires. Mr. Cunningham's remarks emphasise that a measure of protection should be afforded those who have taken up shares in the belief that certain promises would be fulfilled. The effect of the amendment, however, would be somewhat disastrous, and would have rather widely reformatory effect on companies. If a man takes up shares in a company, he undertakes a liability to subscribe a certain amount of capital.

Hon. J. Cornell: On wild and extravagant statements and nothing else.

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: The company have to depend upon applicants for shares fulfilling their part of the obligation in order that the company may carry out their obligations. The company could not erect these elevators without having the capital, and Mr. Mills asks that all those people who have taken up shares be relieved of the obligation to pay for them until an elevator has been erected at the nearest port.

Hon. G. W. Miles: That could be amended.

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: It would have to be seriously amended. These shareholders have always a remedy at law. If they have been misled into taking up shares, they can sue the promoters.

Hon. J. Mills: They have neither the means nor the time to do that.

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: I am not quarrelling with the hon. member's idea, but it is not legally possible to do as he suggests. No company could possibly start and commit themselves to obligations unless they had the liability of the shareholders to fall back on. In the circumstances, I cannot possibly support the amendment.

Hon. J. W. HICKEY: I appreciate the object which Mr. Mills has in view. If all the words after "thereof" were struck out, it would mean that shareholders who desired to continue could do so, and those who desired to withdraw could withdraw. It would not be fair to any company if shareholders could put their money in to-day and draw it out to-morrow.

Hon. J. Cornell: It depends how the company is floated.

Hon. J. W. HICKEY: The company must receive some consideration. Failing the adoption of my suggestion, a time should be stated in which those who desire to withdraw from the company may do so.

Hon. J. MILLS: Would Mr. Hickey's suggestion make it obligatory on those who hold shares to withdraw from the company?

Hon. J. W. Hickey: No, permissible.

Hon. J. MILLS: If shareholders desired to continue in the company they should be permitted to do so, but I doubt whether one farmer who would be affected by my amendment would remain in the company.

Hon. J. Nicholson: Mr. Hickey's suggestion would make your amendment worse than ever.

Hon. J. MILLS: Then I intend to stand by my amendment.

Hon. J. CORNELL: We should not quibble over a matter of phraseology. Mr. Mills has suggested a simple form of relief, and a lawyer has endeavoured to bewilder him over the phraseology. Often amendments have been passed and the Leader of the House has subsequently reported that the Crown law authorities have recommended different phraseology, and the Bill has then been recommitted and the revised phraseology accepted. The principle which the hon. member has in view is plainly indicated in the amendment, and if we accept the principle, the Solicitor General will be able to draft a clause to give effect to it. Let us lay down the principle so that these farmers will have an opportunity to withdraw from the company. I am satisfied that there will be only one terminal elevator in this State and that all the wheat will be hauled from Geraldton, Merredin and Narrogin to Fremantle. If we accept the principle of the amendment, those who elect to remain in the company will do so with their eyes open.

Hon. E. H. HARRIS: Mr. Mills desires to safeguard the wheatgrowers distant from the port where the first terminal elevator will be erected. I was going to suggest the earmarking of the money subscribed in other districts for elevators at the port nearest to where the wheat is grown. My suggestion is that the amendment should read as follows: "The company undertakes that all moneys received from applicants in payment of shares shall be applied to the construction of terminal elevators at the port nearest by rail to the wheat lands of the applicants." Then the first community of farmers prepared to put up sufficient capital to erect an elevator would have that elevator erected in their district, and thus the trouble would be overcome as regards the erection of the first elevator at Fremantle tending towards centralisation there.

Hon. J. W. HICKEY: I move an amendment on the amendment—

That after the word "shall," in line 6, there be inserted "if he so desires."

Amendment on the amendment put and passed.

Hon. J. W. HICKEY: In order to make the matter quite clear, I move a further amendment on the amendment—

That the words "until an elevator has been constructed at the port which is nearer to him than Fremantle" be struck out.

Hon. V. HAMERSLEY: I hope this amendment on the amendment will not be carried. The people concerned are all farmers, and when they applied for shares they knew what they were doing. The effect of this amendment might be very serious to the company.

Hon. J. Mills: We cannot victimise the farmers for the sake of Fremantle bulk handling.

Hon. V. HAMERSLEY: They might draw eight per cent. out of the company.

Hon. J. Mills: While paying 7½ per cent. for the money invested.

Hon. V. HAMERSLEY: I am altogether opposed to this amendment on the amendment.

Hon. J. CUNNINGHAM: I support the amendment on the amendment, because it would be unfair to ask the company to erect elevators at Albany, Bunbury, and Geraldton while relieving the farmers of those districts from the obligation to put money into the company.

Hon. J. MILLS: I am quite agreeable to the proposed deletion from my amendment. Mr. Hamersley's want of sympathy towards the amendment rather surprises me. Farmers far distant in the country did not quite understand the position, and were guided by those who solicited them to take shares. The matter has not worked out as was expected by those farmers.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: I hope hon. members clearly understand the position. What amounts have been paid in by applicants for shares, I do not know. Some of them may have paid in full for their shares.

Hon. V. Hamersley: Some of them have

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: Then, under the amendment, that money will be held by the company without any obligation. According to my reading, those who have paid will be making a sacrifice.

Further amendment on the amendment put and passed.

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

Ayes	13
Noes	6
Majority for	7

AYES.

Hon. R. G. Ardagh	Hon. A. Lovekin
Hon. J. Cunningham	Hon. G. W. Miles
Hon. J. A. Greig	Hon. J. Mills
Hon. E. H. Harris	Hon. T. Moore
Hon. J. W. Hickey	Hon. A. H. Panton
Hon. J. J. Holmes	Hon. J. Cornell
Hon. J. W. Kirwan	(*Teller.*)

NOES.

Hon. H. P. Colebatch	Hon. J. Nicholson
Hon. V. Hamersley	Hon. A. J. H. Saw
Hon. C. McKenzie	Hon. F. E. S. Willmott
	(*Teller.*)

Amendment thus passed.

Progress reported.

BILL—STAMP.

Assembly's Message.

A Message having been received from the Assembly notifying that it had made Nos. 1 to 3 and 6 to 11 of the amendments requested by the Council, but had declined to make Nos. 4, 5, 12 and 13, the message was now considered.

In Committee.

Hon. J. Ewing in the Chair; the Minister for Education in charge of the Bill.

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: Before we proceed to the consideration of the message, I should like to draw attention to the fact that in Sub-clause (2) of Clause 6, which we inserted in the Bill, an error was made in the date. It is there provided that the appointment of a Commissioner of Stamps published "in the 'Gazette' of the 15th Oc-

tober, etc.'' Actually the date was the 14th October. I ask, is it competent to amend the error at this stage?

The CHAIRMAN: I will see to it that the date is corrected.

No. 4, Clause 51, Subclause 1—Strike out the words ''except as hereinafter provided:''

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: This amendment relates to adhesive stamps. I strongly opposed it when it was before the Committee, and pointed out the extent to which it would open the door to abuse. I think it was argued that it was necessary in the interests of people outback, who might not be able to obtain the impressed form. But Clause 57 contains every provision for such an emergency. Under the amendment many promissory notes would not be stamped until they were to be used. I move—

That the amendment be not pressed.

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: I hope the Committee will not agree to the motion. People in the country will not know that under Clause 57 the Commissioner may give permission to stamp a document written on paper not carrying an impressed stamp. I can see no danger in the amendment, which will be of very great convenience to people in remote districts without resulting in defrauding the revenue.

Question put and passed; the amendment not pressed.

No. 5, Clause 51, Subclause (1)—After the word ''impressed'' insert ''or adhesive.''

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: This is practically the same amendment. I move—

That the amendment be not pressed.

Question put and passed; the amendment not pressed.

No. 12, Clause 98, Subclause (3)—Add the following words ''nor to any moneys deposited with or paid by one employee of a person or firm to another employee of such person or firm and to be used on behalf of such person or firm in his business or any branch thereof'':

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: I am at a loss to understand why the Assembly did not agree with the amendment. The Premier approved of it, and moved that it be made. There was no argument against it. Apparently, it was thrown out without consideration. I cannot give any reason why the House should not insist on the amendment. Perhaps the hon. member who moved it can explain.

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: I move—

That the amendment be pressed.

There is good reason for it. In many establishments where money passes between one employee and another in different departments or branches of the business it is essential that a stamped receipt should not be required.

Question put and passed; the amendment pressed.

No. 13, Second Schedule (agreement)—Strike out the second line in exemption No. 3 and insert ''supply or sale of any goods, wares, or merchandise or any order calling for the rendering of any particular service including the supply of electric.''

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: I move—

That the amendment be not pressed.

It was pointed out in another place that it might cover very large contracts which ought properly to carry a stamp. I am not going to suggest that some modification of the amendment might not be desirable, but I do think that in its present form the amendment is not desirable.

Question put and passed; the amendment not pressed.

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

BILL—HEALTH ACT AMENDMENT.

Second Reading.

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION (Hon. H. P. Colebatch—East) [9.40] in moving the second reading said: The Bill as it comes to the Council is a very inoffensive measure. It was introduced chiefly for two purposes, but each of those two purposes was struck out in another place, and so the Bill contains now only the minor provisions. But these minor provisions, I think, are necessary. The first clause relates to the definition of ''boarding house.'' At present a boarding house means any premises in which more than six persons, exclusive of the family, are lodged or boarded for hire from week to week. In practice the inspections are made during the day time. The boarders are then absent, and so it is quite impossible for the inspector to say whether there are six boarders or ten. Therefore it is proposed to include premises where provision is made for more than six persons to be lodged or boarded. That is to say, if a boarding house makes provision for more than six persons it is a boarding house, and subject to inspection. Although I agree with the attitude the House took up the other night in regard to bringing boarding houses under the Factories Act, there can be no doubt about the wisdom of bringing them under the Health Act. The next clause is merely for the correction of a clerical error in the compilation of the 1919 reprint of the Act. The words now inserted were actually in Section 37 of the 1918 amendment of the Act, but when the Act was reprinted in 1919 those words ''for a period of 10 days thereafter the practitioner shall'' were dropped out. The intention is to reinsert those words. Clause 6 is a very necessary amendment regarding midwives. Subsection

(1) of Section 280 provides that no one but a registered midwife shall keep or manage a maternity home or act as assistant nurse therein. This actually prevents the utilisation of probation midwifery nurses in such a place as the King Edward Maternity Hospital and the application of it to such an extent was not contemplated when the original secton was passed. It is therefore proposed to delete the words which prevent an unregistered person acting as an assistant, to strike out the words "or to act as assistant nurse in any such hospital." The proviso to Section 280 permits an unregistered person to attend a lying-in woman who does not reside within five miles of a doctor or a registered midwife; or in any case in which a doctor is unwilling to attend or a registered midwife is not available. The inclusion of the word "doctor" is out of place, because the presence of a doctor does not do away with the necessity for somebody acting as midwife. The references to the absence from the case of a doctor are misleading and unnecessary. A doctor does not substitute for a midwifery nurse. To actually apply the section it would mean that if no registered midwife were available, or within five miles of the residence of a medical practitioner, he himself would have to carry out the whole of the duties of the nurse in every midwifery case. The object is to make it quite clear that if there is no midwife within five miles this other person can act. Section 283, Subsection 2, specifies that candidates for registration in midwifery shall undergo at least 12 months' training in an approved institution. The almost universal practice is that a woman who has completed three years training as a general nurse need only undergo six months' additional training in midwifery. The Act as at present drawn provides that no matter what length of training and experience a woman may have as a general nurse, she must still undergo 12 months' training in midwifery. It is intended to alter that by substituting the following:—

> Provided that such regulations may provide that, in the case of any candidate who has undergone three years' general training in an approved institution as a nurse and holds a certificate, it shall be sufficient for such candidate to produce evidence of having undergone six months' training in midwifery at an approved institution.

The 12 months' experience has been altered to six months. The following clause relates to the examination of school children—

> Section 292 of the Health Act, 1911-19, is hereby amended by inserting the words:—"Or any nurse duly authorised in this behalf by the Commissioner," after the word "officer" in the first line of Subsection 3, and by striking out the words "his hand" in the third line and substituting the words "the hand of such medical officer or nurse."

The Act as it stands at present reads—

> Any medical officer may examine medically and physically any child attending any school, and such child shall submit to, and the parents or guardians of such child shall permit such examination as the medical officer deems necessary.

The second subsection deals with registered dentists, authorised by the Commissioner, examining the teeth of children. The third subsection, the one we are dealing with now, has to do with children in an unclean or verminous condition, and it reads:—

> Any medical officer who finds that any child is in an unclean or verminous condition may, by writing under his hand, notify any parent or guardian of the child of the fact and require such parent or guardian to remedy such condition forthwith, and to keep such child clean or free from vermin. Failure to comply with any such request tion shall be an offence against this Act.

In this subsection it is proposed to insert after "any medical officer" the words "or any nurse duly authorised in this behalf by the Commissioner." It is not intended that nurses shall have any authority in the matter of the medical examination of children, but that the nurses shall be qualified, after they are authorised by the Commissioner, to deal with this subsection of Section 292 relating to children who are in an unclean or verminous condition. The provision is a necessary one. There are many children attending schools in this condition, and we have not sufficient doctors to constantly visit the schools and remedy the trouble. If the nurses are allowed to make these examinations it will assist very much in this direction. That is all the Bill provides. They are relatively unimportant alterations to the existing Act, but it is desirable that the amendments, particularly those relating to midwives in country districts, should be passed. I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

Hon. A. J. H. SAW (Metropolitan-Suburban) [9.50]: The most important part of the Bill is, to use an Hibernianism, that which does not appear in it. It will be within the recollection of members that in 1915 an extremely stringent amendment to the Health Act was introduced by the then Government. In the somewhat stormy passage of that measure I had the honour of playing a small part. The Bill was an extremely drastic one, and conferred very extensive powers on the Commissioner. During the course of its passage through the House its effect was considerably minimised, and the powers of the Commissioner whittled away. In lieu of one of the drastic provisions contained in the Bill as originally introduced, a clause was inserted giving the Commissioner power, on a signed statement certifying that a person was suffering from venereal diseases, to take certain action compelling that person to obtain a medical certificate setting out whether or not

he suffered in that way. That clause was subsequently altered, and the portion of it dealing with the signed statement eliminated, power being left to the Commissioner, acting on information received, to require evidence from the person suspected, and on being satisfied as to the evidence, to cause that person to submit to examination and necessary treatment. As the Bill was introduced in another place I believe that clause was continued, but owing to the action of another place it has been altered, and the signed statement provision has been re-introduced. When the Bill was originally introduced I had something to do with the signed statement appearing in it, although I was not responsible in any way for the clause as it was drafted and adopted other than recording my vote. Subsequently the Commissioner stated that owing to the necessity that existed for obtaining a signed statement setting forth that a person was suffering from venereal disease he was unable to administer that portion of the Act. In consequence of that the provision for the signed statement was eliminated. I cannot congratulate the Government upon the attitude they have adopted towards the recommendations of the Commissioner. The measure was only brought forward for one year, but every year we have been compelled to discuss it. I do not know whether many people in this State believe in the transmigration of souls, but if they do not it must occur to them that the soul of the Government of this State formerly inhabited the body of a mouse. As a result of this want of courage that clause has continually had to run the gauntlet of both Houses of Parliament

The Minister for Education: The Government introduced it and passed it through the House as a permanent measure.

Hon. A. J. H. SAW: They do not seem to be successful with their followers in another place. I fancy that, even in the Bill as introduced in another place this session, it was only a temporary measure. I shall be glad to see finality in this matter. I am loth to have to take part in the somewhat nauseous discussion that we have to indulge in every year. It gives me no pleasure. The only people who can derive any gratification from it are those of somewhat morbid temperament and those whom we may call prurient prudes. Various women's organisations and religious bodies must feel that they have a certain responsibility in respect to this measure under which—I am not going to mince words—the prostitute, clandestinely or in an open way is allowed to ply her trade and inflict disease upon the community. As a result of the action of these bodies I am sure that many innocent women and unborn babes in the State will rue the action that has been taken. The powers given to the Commissioner have never been abused though they have been submitted to close scrutiny. Vigilance committees have been formed to investigate cases brought under the notice of the Commissioner, and these bodies have not been able to point to any abuse on the part of the Commissioner in the discretion he has exercised in the administration of this particular clause. These bodies have indulged in numerous arguments in support of their contentions, all of which have been fallacious, for instance, because a certain proportion of the people examined have not been proved to have this disease. The advocates of the restoration of the signed statement have assumed that these people were innocent. If they have read any medical literature, or have listened to the arguments which medical men, including myself in this House, have advanced, they will know that this disease as it exists in a chronic form is extremely difficult to detect upon a cursory examination. The fact that upon examination a person is not proved to have that disease is not proof that he is free from it. They have also entirely exaggerated the nature of the examination which these people are expected to undergo. It is an examination which thousands of chaste women for various maladies connected with their sex undergo in Australia every week, and yet when we read the awful things that are said about this examination we would imagine it was something particularly trying to a modest woman. Such is not the case. The complaint has also been made that the clause only applied to women and not to men. There are certain reasons why that contention is largely true. First of all these women contract and spread this disease because they follow a certain trade. There is also another reason why this applies chiefly to women. Girls who have the misfortune to contract this disease very often refuse to give evidence which would incriminate the man from whom they contracted it. I had an instance the other day of a girl who came to me suffering from this complaint. I urged here to communicate to the Commissioner the name of the person from whom she had contracted the disease, but she replied, "I do not want to be mixed up in anything of the kind." These are some of the reasons why this clause has for the most part only applied to women and not to men. From my personal observation I am convinced that the Act, as it was in force, was doing good in the direction of lessening venereal disease. One of the greatest benefits that resulted from the Act was to impress through the literature supplied by the department, and through personal statements by medical men, the necessity for continuing the treatment, and the great harm which they might inflict perhaps unwittingly on people in subsequent years through their having contracted this disease, and I say that those people who by agitation have succeeded in repealing this section, have indeed very great responsibility on their shoulders, and one which, at any rate, I would not like to bear. I think that a slight amendment might be made to the clause which has been reinstated by another place, which, without inflicting any harm on anybody or altering in any way the spirit of the clause, might

be productive of a certain amount of good. It is in this direction: The clause as it stands compels the person who signs the statement to the Commisssioner to certify of his knowledge that another person is suffering from this disease. This has been a great stumbling-block to the Commissioner, and it might easily be got over by making it read, that the person making the signed statement led the Commissioner to believe that the person named was suffering from the disease. A person may contract a disease and he may know sometimes from whom he got it, but it is a very difficult matter indeed for him to certify on paper that that person is suffering from the disease. He can give to the Commissioner such information as will lead the Commissioner to infer that the person has the disease, and if he signs that statement, it should be a protection against an innocent person who might be wrongfully accused. I propose in Committee to submit that the following words be deleted.

The PRESIDENT: If I were the hon. member, I would wait for the Committee stage before giving details.

Hon. A. J. H. SAW: There is another point to which I wish to refer now that we have the Health Bill before us. It will be within the recollection of hon. members that when the Coroners Bill was being considered, I brought forward an amendment giving a coroner on the application of the Commissioner of Health power to make an order to enable a medical man to conduct a post mortem examination on the body of a person who had died or who was suspected of having died from an infectious disease. I submitted certain arguments which convinced the House of the utility of such a provision. Unfortunately, when the measure got back to another place with that amendment in it, the amendment was ruled out of order because it was contended that it was not applicable to a Coroners Bill and should more properly have found a place in a Health Bill. Now that we have the Health Bill before us, I intend to submit this amendment again. I may point out that at the preesnt moment we are in great danger of the dread disease, bubonic plague, being introduced into the State, and to my mind it is necessary that there should be some power for the Commissioner to be able to order post mortem examinations in cases where people die as the result of these serious maladies which may inflict incalculable harm on the community. I support the second reading of the Bill.

The PRESIDENT: While it is quite admissible for hon. members who intend to repair omissions in a Bill to indicate those amendments in general terms, it is not desirable, indeed it is out of order, to anticipate a debate by discussing those amendments before they reach the Committee stage. I mention this in order to save time in the consideration of the second reading of this measure. Dr. Saw was quite in order in indicating in general terms the amendments he intends to submit, but hon. members will not be in order in debating those amendments.

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION (Hon. H. P. Colebatch—East—in reply) [10.6]: I merely rise to ask Dr. Saw to place his amendments to the Health Bill on the Notice Paper. I am entirely in accord with them.

Quesiton put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

BILL—NORTH FREMANTLE RATES VALIDATION.

Second Reading.

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION (Hon. H. P. Colebatch—East) [10.7]: This is a very short Bill, its object being to rectify an error which was made by the mayor of North Fremantle. The Act provides that the mayor shall sign every page of the rate book, but instead of signing every page, the mayor merely signed only the last page, thinking by so doing that he was complying with the Act. Without a validating Bill of this kind, the ratepayers may evade their responsibilities. I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee, etc.

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

House adjourned at 10.10 p.m.

Legislative Assembly,

Tuesday, 13th December, 1931.

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